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Abstract

The legend of Governor Grey is a major feature of nineteenth century New Zealand historiography. This thesis seeks to understand Grey as a real person. Acknowledging the past as a strange and foreign place, it argues that Grey (and previous interpretations of him) can only be understood in context. The intellectual milieu of liberal Anglicanism and Victorian structures of imperial authority are crucial to understanding Grey’s policies of racial amalgamation.

Focusing on Grey’s first governorship of New Zealand, 1845 – 1853, this thesis begins by exploring the imperial networks within which he operated. The members of Grey’s web gathered and shared information to further a range of different agendas - scientific, humanitarian, and political. Grey’s main focus was native civilisation. His ideas about race were informed by liberal Anglican theology, scientific investigation and personal experience. Grey believed in the unity and improvability of all mankind. His mission as governor was to elevate natives to a state of true equality with Europeans so that all could progress together still further up the scale of civilisation. This model formed the basis of Grey’s 1840 plan for civilising native peoples, in which he proposed a range of measures to promote racial amalgamation in Australia.

Between 1845 and 1853 Grey implemented those measures in New Zealand. He used military force and British law to establish peace and enforce Crown authority. He used economic policies to encourage Māori integration in the colonial economy. He built schools and hospitals and enacted legislation to encourage the best features of British culture and limit the effects of its worst. He also augmented his power and encouraged amalgamation through personal relationships, official reports and the structures of colonial authority.

Grey was driven by complex, sometimes contradictory motives including personal gain, economic imperatives and political pressures. His policies have had ongoing, often devastating effects, on Māori and on race relations in New Zealand. This thesis brings to light the ideas and attitudes which formed them. Grey understood himself as a Christian governor ordained to civilise Māori and join them with British settlers in accordance with God’s divine plan for improving humankind.
Governor Grey is such a dominant figure in New Zealand history that most people have a general sense of his importance, even if they don’t know quite what he did, or why he did it. My interest in Grey was first piqued during John Stenhouse’s fourth year course in intellectual history. After reading a few biographies I was fascinated. What a complex man, what a tragic story. When I visited Grey’s home on Kawau Island I was hooked. It is a lush and verdant paradise with wallabies and peacocks cruising the grounds. Though motivation might have waxed and waned over the last few years, my interest never has.

Many different people have helped refuel my motivation, not least of all my supervisors. John Stenhouse has been encouraging from beginning to end. Erik Olssen helped shape my initial enquiries, Doug Booth offered positive support just when it was needed, and Tony Ballantyne provided a fresh perspective during the last stages. Barbara Brookes also offered helpful insights.

Though I started this thesis in Dunedin, it was mostly written in Hastings, with two little girls born along the way. It would never have been finished without my family’s support. I count myself extraordinarily fortunate to have been raised in a home where learning was valued so highly. My mother and father, John and Alison Kerr, have offered all the encouragement possible, giving practical and emotional support at every turn. During the last six months Mum has been a ‘Super-Nan’, picking up the girls most mornings for adventures around town and fun-times at Twyford. My brother Daniel and sister-in-law Helena looked after me on my first research trips to Wellington, and Daniel has always been a helpful proof-reader. My sister Chloe also helped with proof-reading, and she and Simon provided a sanctuary to return to during my last trips to Wellington. In between volunteer trips to Romania and Nepal, and work in Wanganui and Wellington, my sister Rosalind spent several months last year looking after my girls so I could head upstairs to the study. Her determination to invest her time in people rather than money or career has paid dividends in the devotion of two adoring nieces and an ever-grateful sister. My younger brother Christopher was always keenly interested and happy to help with child-minding, as well as shuttling library books backwards and forwards to Dunedin. On my first research trip to Auckland I stayed with my grandmother, Nancy Kerr, returning to Pukekohe each evening to recount my discoveries of the day over tender meat and salty potatoes.
Grandma also shared my trip to Kawau, her curiosity and sense of adventure making it a truly memorable day. My other grandmother, Ailie Cooke, has always provided loving encouragement. I started this project a year after marrying Shaun, so it is nearly as old as our marriage. George has been great company, but Shaun is probably happy to see him relegated to a less prominent place in the family! Thank-you to Shaun for his love and support. My daughters Isabella and Beatrice have been a constant source of wonder and joy as I wrote my ‘Story about George’. Peter Norris has been enormously kind and generous. We stayed with him during our last few months in Dunedin, and on more recent visits south he has been a perfect host, pulling cots, highchairs and chocolates out of the air as if by magic. Peter and Mum both offered a view from the other side of the PhD, reassuring me through a long, sometimes difficult process.

A huge number of others have also supported me, from fellow students in the History Department to friends from coffee group, Parent and Child, and kindy. A special thanks to Katharine Watson for her ongoing interest and encouragement.

I would like to thank the staff of the various libraries and research facilities I have used, particularly the Hocken Library, Dunedin, the Auckland Public Library, the Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington, and National Archives, Wellington. The Remote Services staff at the University of Otago library were particularly helpful, sending huge boxes of books up to Hastings with careful efficiency.

I would also like to thank the University of Otago for funding through the postgraduate scholarship programme.

**Terminology**

In the early twenty first century some of the key words recurring in this thesis are highly politicised and emotive terms. The language of Victorian imperialism was inescapably political and value-laden. This thesis seeks to understand Grey on his own terms, in his own terms. I have used words such as ‘native’, ‘race’, ‘civilisation’, and ‘mankind’ in their malleable mid-nineteenth century contexts. Except in direct quotes, they therefore appear without quotation marks.
Though early nineteenth century New Zealand society was intensely tribal, I have often referred to ‘Maori’ attitudes and responses. Where possible I have identified specific tribes and individuals, but have often been hampered by Grey’s vagueness in identifying his sources and subjects. Grey’s surviving papers, together with nineteenth century Maori newspapers, contain a tantalising wealth of Maori language sources which have yet to be tapped.
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On a warm October day in 1845, George Grey, the young Governor of South Australia, was riding along the coast near Adelaide with his step-brother, recently arrived from England. As they rode they probably spoke of family and news from Home. Perhaps they spoke of Grey’s success in restoring the colony to financial solvency, perhaps of recent reports from New Zealand, and of Governor FitzRoy’s failure to control the economy or to placate native unrest. In the midst of a brisk canter the pair were stopped by a man bearing fresh dispatches from Britain carried aboard the newly anchored Elphinstone. Grey jumped from his horse, sat down beside some trees and devoured his mail. It contained more news of New Zealand. Indeed, an urgent request from the British Government for Grey’s aid in resurrecting the collapsing colony. Flattered, anxious and excited, he mounted his horse and rode for home. His duty was clear.\(^1\)

On 26 October Grey and his wife Eliza boarded the Elphinstone and sailed for New Zealand. The passage was slow and stormy. George spent the time on board preparing for his new challenge. He read and reflected on the printed parliamentary papers relating to New Zealand, and probably perused some Māori language grammars. Eliza spent the time on board being sick. The Elphinstone sailed into Auckland’s Waitemata Harbour on 10 November. Grey landed and met with Governor FitzRoy. Hurt by his recall but relieved to relinquish authority, FitzRoy brought Grey up to speed with recent events in the turbulent north. Eliza stayed on board, her body recovering from the trip, her spirits sinking deeper under the gloomy Auckland skies and the distance from home.

On 14 November George and Eliza disembarked officially, a striking and dignified young couple. Officials and clergy watched in respectful silence. At Government House Grey eschewed the expected address, offering only a silent salutation to the surprised crowd of observers. Four days later he assumed office as Lieutenant-Governor of New Zealand. Technically lower in status than a governorship, the purpose of the auxiliary label was to distinguish Grey as a temporary special commissioner with special financial aid and wide discretionary powers. It was one of

several signs that the Colonial Office wanted the New Zealand crisis resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Grey took up his position armed with extra men and money, and a seemingly boundless supply of energy and optimism. He was charged with quelling the war in the North, reconciling Māori to British sovereignty, assuaging settlers’ fears and satisfying their hunger for land, whilst resurrecting an ailing economy at minimum cost to the imperial government. Above and beyond this formidable assignment loomed an even higher calling. For Grey, duty to the Queen and her Empire was inextricably linked with duty to God. Raised in an evangelical household and influenced by the liberal Anglican Richard Whately, Grey’s faith informed every aspect of his life. His theology was orthodox Anglican, but he was open to new ideas and tolerant of alternative religious perspectives. He sought and found God in scripture and in the natural world, experiencing his Maker in an intensely personal manner. In politics, he was a liberal, working for progressive reform as the practical application of Christian principles. His career was characterised by a humanitarian drive to improvement typical of the early evangelicals. But Grey is best described as a liberal Anglican. Referring more to a temper of heart and mind than to a defined theological position or party, mid-nineteenth century liberal Anglicanism can be characterised as an undogmatic national Protestantism animated by a mindset of optimistic tolerance and inclusion, and driven by a sense of Christian duty. George Grey relished the task of serving as God’s agent in New Zealand and playing a role in the fulfilment of His divine plan.

In 1845 New Zealand’s most pressing problem was the relationship between Māori and European. Grey’s native policy formed the foundation for his whole governorship. It was based on the same principle of racial amalgamation that had underlain the Treaty of Waitangi and the governorships of Hobson and FitzRoy. Drawing on a complex mix of Biblical, Enlightenment, and early nineteenth century ideas of race, Grey believed that Māori occupied a lower place in the scale of civilisation than Europeans, but that all races were innately equal and capable of elevation. As a liberal Anglican he believed that Māori civilisation was God’s will, and that bringing it to pass was his calling.

---

Grey’s programme for achieving racial amalgamation was simple in conception but vast in scale and ambition, incorporating political, economic, social and personal measures. It was predicated on the extension of full British sovereignty over New Zealand. Grey used military strategies and military force in combination with legal ordinances and proclamations to assert the authority and extend the reach of British law. He encouraged Māori integration into the developing colonial economy by employing them on public works such as road building, providing practical and financial aid for Māori business ventures, and implementing a vigorous programme of native land purchase. Grey’s government purchased over thirty two million acres of Māori land between 1846 and 1853. It paid an average price of less than a halfpenny an acre. Such actions helped form the context for the ongoing social, political and economic marginalisation of Māori, a process still causing strife in the twenty-first century. To Grey, however, the acquisition of Māori land was crucial to amalgamation. It offered the means for turning Māori and European into neighbours who daily engaged in the routine economic transactions and social interactions that Grey believed would aid Māori improvement and hasten their amalgamation with the settler population. It also offered the chance to sate settler demands for land, boost the colonial economy and enhance his reputation at the Colonial Office. Grey believed that economic integration went hand in hand with social elevation. Working through established missions, he developed a national education system focused on civilising Māori youth by means of Christian teaching, industrial education and the English language. He established the country’s first state hospitals as venues of both healing and acculturation, and he encouraged Māori to adopt the accoutrements of western civilisation as tangible proofs of cultural improvement.

Throughout his first governorship Grey maintained a direct approach to colonial rule and the goal of racial amalgamation. He was a gifted linguist and quickly mastered the Māori language. He was fascinated by indigenous cultures, and maximised every possible opportunity to learn Māori traditions and hear their stories of the past. As well as military, legislative, economic and social measures, he used relationships with key Māori leaders as a tool of government and a means of enhancing his authority. Ever conscious of his role as agent of God and empire, Grey also sought to augment his ascribed authority by manipulating the structures of colonial administration, embellishing his own legend in official dispatches to the Colonial Office, and participating in colonial and Māori ceremonies.

Controversial at the time and in the present, Grey's native policy encountered a mixed reception among Māori, but had an undeniable impact on those tribes closest to centres of colonial settlement. Grey himself used a range of indicators to measure the progress of racial amalgamation. His reports to the Colonial Office included statistics on the number of Māori owning firearms, prosecuted in the courts, owning boats, and attending government-funded mission schools. They also included qualitative evidence suggesting political, economic, social and cultural advances. Constructed in Grey's rhetoric as 'proofs' of Māori civilisation, these statistics and stories fed straight back into his faith in human equality and improvability. Further, they confirmed for Grey the godliness of his vision for New Zealand, and, he hoped, offered the British government evidence of his worthiness for promotion.

Grey carried out his liberal Anglican programme of Māori civilisation in partnership with the colonial churches. Actively ecumenical, Grey offered government support, private donations and personal friendship to churchmen of all denominations. Anglican, Wesleyan and Roman Catholic missionaries around the country provided the government with access to Māori communities, and often helped implement and monitor official policy. In this context, some saw Grey's notorious altercation with leading Church Missionary Society (CMS) missionaries over their large land claims as part of an unscrupulous drive for power. Grey was certainly motivated by personal interest and political agendas, but also by humanitarian principles. He believed that large land grants were detrimental to the advance of European colonisation and to the progress of Māori civilisation. This episode typifies Grey's political career, illustrating the messy interconnections between personalities, politics, religion and humanitarianism, and his ultimate commitment to a liberal Anglican vision of advancing human civilisation.

Though profoundly assured of his authority and his mission, and unapologetic for his style of government or his policies, Grey felt opposition keenly, particularly as his time in New Zealand wore on. By the start of 1853 he had won the acclaim and devotion of many Māori and settlers. From others, especially colonists in the Wakefieldian settlements, he had won hatred and disdain. During their last year in New Zealand George and Eliza were acutely uncomfortable in the small settler circles of Auckland and Wellington. By the time winter arrived they were desperate to

---

4 George Grey to W. E. Gladstone, 17 October 1846, CO209/45, pp.345-346; George Grey to Andrew Sinclair, 16 December 1851, Sinclair Letters and Journals, ATL.
return to England. George was confident of advancement and eager for a new challenge. Eliza longed to escape the miserable Auckland weather and enjoy the comforts of a more genteel society.\(^5\)

In August 1853 Grey received notice that his plea for leave of absence had been granted. Travel plans began immediately. So too did farewell events. Grey wished to leave New Zealand in a stable and prosperous state. Over the next few months he travelled throughout the North Island meeting with Māori and reassuring them of their special relationship with the New Zealand government and the British Crown. Many tribes mourned his departure as the loss of a friend and father figure.

On 31 December George and Eliza sailed from Auckland for England. Grey’s original mission – to save the colony from imminent disaster – had ostensibly been achieved. Māori and Pākehā seemed to be at peace and the economy was stable. Grey arrived in England to mourn the death of his mother only days before. He was simultaneously confronted by public strife. Though delighted with Grey’s success in ‘taming’ the Māori and resurrecting the economy, the Colonial Office was unimpressed by his wilful disregard for direct instructions. They particularly disapproved of his cheap land regulations, his efforts to avoid payment of the New Zealand Company’s debt, and his decision to leave before bringing the constitution into full effect. In private interviews and correspondence, Grey fought his cause and won. Vindicated for his actions in New Zealand, rested and reinvigorated, in June 1854 he was offered the appointment of Governor of Cape Colony and High Commissioner for South Africa. He accepted with alacrity.

On the other side of the world the full consequences of Governor Grey’s first New Zealand governorship were barely beginning to emerge. At the start of 1854 peace and stability appeared to reign. Unwittingly, however, his policies had sown the seeds of long term discord. More immediately alarming, he had left behind a system of native administration overly dependent on him alone for its day to day operation and efficacy. By the time Grey returned in 1861 New Zealand was once again at war.

\(^5\) Eliza had never felt at home in New Zealand. She poured out her misery and resentment in letters to her friend Maggie in South Australia. Eliza Grey to Maggie Watts, GL:AST, APL. By mid-1853 Eliza was “all in the bustle of preparation” for leaving, looking “forward with no slight feelings of pleasure to being once more in dear Old England”. Eliza Grey to Andrew Sinclair, 12 July 1853, Sinclair Letters and Journals, ATL.
Contextualising Grey’s Governorship

The story of Grey’s first governorship in New Zealand inevitably leads on to a multitude of other stories. His failures and successes have been the subject of intense scholarly scrutiny for more than one hundred years. Historians have documented and analysed his policies in considerable detail, generally focusing on their effects. This process has invariably led to the pronouncement of historical, political and moral judgments. From the 1890s to the 1990s, historians have interpreted Grey’s policies as benevolent or malevolent according to the political priorities of their own historical situations. We are left with little more than tired reiteration of the same ‘facts’ given a positive or negative spin, as discussed below. The corollary of this emphasis on results has been an almost complete disregard for the ideas informing Grey’s policies and the intentions with which they were implemented.

In a recent essay on New Zealand colonial history, Mark Francis seeks to expose the bias inherent in “personalised” historical narratives, or “hindsight” historiography. Francis argues that historians of the nineteenth century “embrace more with warm sympathy than intellectual rigour some combination of beliefs common enough in the period when they write, but scarcely or not at all evident in the times of which they write”.6 Judged by the moral standards and political principles of later commentators, historical figures such as Grey lose “any semblance of humanity as well as individuality”.7 To combat this effect, Francis insists that historians must be “more careful with their ascription of intentionality”.8 W. H. Oliver issues a similar warning with reference to the Waitangi Tribunal. Using the Taranaki and Muriwhenua claims as case studies, Oliver shows that the Tribunal has reconstructed an idealised nineteenth century past based on late twentieth century priorities and politics.9 He calls for “an atmosphere less clouded with retrospective recrimination”, encouraging historians to recognise the distinctiveness of the past, and to appreciate the impact of that context on historical actors.10

---

7 Ibid., p.168.
8 Ibid., p.188.
10 Ibid., pp.27-9.
With this challenge in mind, I seek to illuminate the motives and beliefs that drove Governor Grey. I want to understand the development of Grey’s worldview within the intellectual context of early Victorian Britain, and to explore the dialectic between ideas, personality and politics played out in early Victorian New Zealand. At the same time I want to use Grey as a lens with which to focus on the relationships between Victorian science and religion, between the imperial centre and the colonised periphery, between Anglicanism and Enlightenment thought, between knowledge and domination, and between evangelical humanitarianism and imperial policy.

The intellectual context in which Grey formulated and implemented political policy was both fluid and dynamic. Scholars have characterised the first half of the nineteenth century as an era of transition affected equally by optimism and anxiety. The scientific and industrial revolutions, the evangelical revival, liberal Anglicanism and early Victorian imperialism form the crucial contexts for understanding Grey’s civilising mission in New Zealand.

Though modern historians have often sought to explain religion away, Clifford Geertz argues convincingly that “belief matters, and matters terribly”. Geertz notes that the personal dimensions of religious experience have received even less scholarly attention than communal religion. As a result, the “interworking of religious convictions and practical actions, the impartibility of belief and behaviour, tends to be lost sight of”. This thesis explores the connections between Grey’s faith and his politics, seeking to shed new light on mid-nineteenth century networks of Christian humanitarianism, and on Grey’s personal beliefs about God and humanity.

Religious faith and religious issues formed comprehensive frameworks for thinking and living in pre-Victorian Britain. George Grey’s mother Elizabeth was a devout, well-educated evangelical, and his stepfather, Sir John Godfrey Thomas, was Vicar of Wartling and Bodiam, Sussex. The tenets of early Anglican evangelicalism formed the backbone of Grey’s belief system. He believed in a personal God who was active in the world, and maintained a devout approach to church attendance, prayer and bible-reading. Throughout his life Grey found consolation in

---

12 Ibid., p.179.
13 Milne, pp.16-22.
“perfect reliance upon the goodness of God, and the merits of our Redeemer”.\textsuperscript{15} He was firmly committed to the principles of evangelical humanitarianism. Inspired by late eighteenth century religious revival, humanitarianism was also influenced by the eighteenth century emphasis on feeling. With a sharpened sensitivity to others’ pain and a keen sense of Christian duty, educated nineteenth century Britons were increasingly confronted by the ever-expanding social and moral problems engendered by rapid urbanisation and industrialisation. They were also concerned with the problems of imperialism. Operating within an implicit model of advancing Christian civilisation, nineteenth century humanitarians strove to protect and assist indigenous peoples maltreated under British rule, as well as those they perceived as suffering under native customs and laws. In the early Victorian context, humanitarian sentiment focused on the moral imperative of ameliorative action to mitigate human suffering.\textsuperscript{16} It was this sentiment that underpinned George Grey’s career as an explorer, a colonial governor, and an elected politician. From a twenty first century perspective, however, Grey’s actions were interpreted in light of their negative consequences for Māori culture and society. Post-colonial historians tended to attribute the detrimental impact of his policies to malevolent intentions, and often discounted Grey’s humanitarianism as artificial and insincere.\textsuperscript{17} While hindsight confirms that some of Grey’s policies served to intensify rather than ameliorate human suffering, his papers and actions reveal a genuine concern for Māori welfare. His first governorship of New Zealand was undoubtedly influenced by power plays and personal ambition. But Grey’s humanitarianism was much more than a pious façade erected and maintained to conceal the unpleasantness of political reality. It was the primary social impulse of the family culture in which he was raised, and remained fundamental to his own worldview, serving both as motivation and justification in his drive for native improvement and racial amalgamation.

Grey’s other formative influence was the liberal Anglicanism of Richard Whately. Whately was an unconventional thinker and challenging teacher, one of the leaders of the Oriel Noetics.\textsuperscript{18} He

\textsuperscript{15} George Grey, \textit{Journals of Two Expeditions of Discovery in North-West and Western Australia}, London, 1841, vol.1, p.384.
\textsuperscript{17} See ‘Historiography’ below.
\textsuperscript{18} The ‘Oriel Noetics’ refers to the young liberal intellectuals who dominated the Oriel Common Room at Oxford in the 1820s.
first met Grey at Cheltenham where he was courting Grey’s aunt.19 Grey had run away from boarding school at Guildford, objecting to the strict discipline and rigid classical syllabus. “It was like keeping a boy’s spirit and imagination in prison, instead of allowing them free communion with the world around”.20 At Cheltenham Grey’s education was much more varied. Some days he sat between his aunt and her suitor as they took him through his lesson together, and others they spent out walking and talking in the countryside. Whately showed him the ancient Briton and Roman remains in the area, and taught him how his ancestors had foraged for food and made fire.21

Whately was an orthodox Anglican professing true Christianity to be a “quiet and deliberate religion” characterised by “a steady, habitual, and continued improvement of the heart and the conduct”.22 His daughter described him as occupying “an intermediate position throughout life, between the high dogmatic school in the Church, and the school which refines away dogma into mere sentiment”.23 Historians have labelled this position liberal Anglicanism, applying it to the like-minded group of theologians and politicians who dominated liberal British politics in the 1820s and 1830s.24 The main goal of liberal Anglicanism was to build a “united, Christian and non-sectarian British nation out of the apparently antagonistic elements of Protestant and Catholic, Anglican and Nonconformist, Irish and English, High Churchmen, Broad Churchmen and Evangelicals”.25 The Noetic approach to Biblical interpretation implied that once the fundamental truths of Christianity were established, all these different groups could be accommodated within an all-embracing national church.26 Whately opposed Catholic doctrine on principle, though he forbade Protestant proselytisers in his diocese.27 He was vocal in his

20 Milne, p.22.
21 Ibid., pp.25-6.
24 Some historians present liberal Anglicanism primarily as a precursor to the Broad Church movement of the 1850s and 1860s. As Richard Brent argues, there are many continuities between the two movements, but also a fundamental difference in that liberal Anglicans like Whately believed both faith and reason were crucial to Christianity, while Broad Church philosophers looked to German theologians, emphasising faith over reason. Richard Brent, ‘Note. The Oriel Noeties’, in M. G. Brock and M. C. Curthoys, ed., The History of the University of Oxford, vol.6, part 1, Oxford, 1997, p.75.
26 Ibid., p.167.
27 Akenson., p.135.
opposition to the Tractarian movement, and strongly disapproved of evangelicalism—"a deep-seated canker eating the very vitals of Christian faith".\(^{28}\) But he was also a staunch proponent of religious tolerance. He believed that excluding "any class of men from public offices, in consequence of their religion, was to make Christ's a 'kingdom of this world' which He and His disciples had distinctly and expressly disclaimed".\(^{29}\) Attempting to coerce Catholics or nonconformists to Anglicanism was an invitation "to hypocrisy and false profession".\(^{30}\) Christians who persecuted men of other faiths were "worshippers of a false god; since though they use the name of the true God, they give a totally false representation of his nature".\(^{31}\)

Liberal Anglican principles had a strong influence on the Whig government that came to power in 1830 under Earl Grey.\(^{32}\) The Whigs pursued an aggressive imperial policy, advocated free trade, worked to improve the conditions of the working classes, and strove to include both Catholic and Protestant Nonconformists in every area of national life.\(^{33}\) This inclusive approach had its roots in Enlightenment philosophy. Roy Porter argues that Enlightenment thinkers in England socialised their emphasis on individual happiness and liberty by employing strategies of social openness and inclusiveness. Reason was a "potentially comprehensive attribute", and those who did not fit in could be liberated (or confined) by humanitarian philanthropy.\(^{34}\) Like Thomas Arnold and other liberal Anglican thinkers, Whately was vehemently anti-erastian (believing that the church should maintain ecclesiastical independence from the state), yet together they exercised a strong influence on government.\(^{35}\) As Sheridan Gilley writes, "England was erastian in fact if not in theory".\(^{36}\) Whately was appointed Archbishop of Dublin in 1831, bringing him directly under state control. He advised the government on ecclesiastical preferment, on the Irish Poor Laws, and on Irish education, but he also used his position to lobby for the separation of church and state.

\(^{29}\) E. Jane Whately, vol. 1., p.74.
\(^{30}\) Ibid. See also Richard Whately, *Lessons on Morals*, p.145.
\(^{32}\) Though the Whigs were the party of reform and improvement, they were still dominated in the early and mid-nineteenth century by aristocratic interests. In the second half of the nineteenth century they gradually became more and more liberal, evolving into the Liberal party. Joseph Hamburger, 'The Whig Conscience', in Peter Marsh, ed., *The Conscience of the Victorian State*, Syracuse, New York, 1979, pp.19-34.
\(^{33}\) Brent, *Liberal Anglican politics*, p.22.
\(^{35}\) Ibid., p.139. See also David de Guistino, 'Disconnecting Church and State: Richard Whately's Ideas in the 1830s', in *Albion*, 35, 1 (2003), pp.53-70.
The inter-connections between liberal theology and Whig politics reflect the sense of duty inherent in liberal Anglican Christianity. In *Lessons on Morals and Christian Evidences* Whately wrote that God “has supplied to us all our powers of mind and body, and He requires us, as He certainly has a full right to do, to employ these in leading a Christian life and devoting ourselves to his service”.\(^{37}\) God’s Providence was a presupposition of liberal Anglican thought, but they believed that in the modern era it was the Christian’s duty to discover and implement policies for advancing human progress.\(^{38}\) Their social status as English country gentlemen amplified this sense of public duty and responsibility. Many liberal Anglicans were also heirs – like Grey - to the evangelicalism of their parents, combining upper class humanitarian philanthropy with religious assurance and activism.\(^{39}\)

Under Whately’s tutelage Grey developed a strong Christian faith based on inner conviction and intellectual reasoning. Ideals of Christian tolerance, Christian unity and Christian progress came to dominate his evolving worldview. As a young soldier in Ireland he was exposed firsthand to the human carnage wrought by religious division – “it seemed to me nothing less than a blasphemy, a mockery of all true religion, and I thought it terrible to have to bear a part in the business”.\(^{40}\) In New Zealand Grey shared his vision for a Christianised, civilised world with Anglicans, Methodists, and Roman Catholics. He shared much in common with many of the evangelical CMS missionaries and also worked closely with Bishop Selwyn, whose high church tendencies were a source of ongoing tension between Bishop and missionaries. Though open and adaptable, Grey’s liberal Anglicanism was strongly anchored on fixed principles. Drawing heavily from the Enlightenment thinkers of the eighteenth century, it centred on ideals of human equality and improbability, on the power of the law, and on the principle of activism in God’s calling. These ideas provided the framework for Grey’s understanding of racial difference, a model by which he believed aboriginal peoples could be elevated, and, most importantly, the motivating force which impelled him to act on these convictions.

Like many other liberal Anglicans Grey was passionately interested in science. In Britain, Australia, New Zealand and Africa, he carried out extensive research in philology, botany,

\(^{40}\) Milne, p.29.
geology and geography, achieving some distinction in the burgeoning field of ethnography. Grey's fascination with the natural world was deeply spiritual. Sailing toward Australia on the 'Beagle' in 1837 he collected a huge range of scientific specimens and made detailed observations at sea and on land.\(^41\) Nature's "great works" inspired him with "a calm, sweet solace",\(^42\) and an overwhelming sense "of the presence and majesty of the Maker".\(^43\) "No doubts enter", he declared, "when you are confronted with the great spirit, which seems to preside over virgin nature".\(^44\) As part of an extensive network of amateur and professional scientists spread around the world, Grey was thoroughly up to date on all the most recent scientific developments in Europe and abroad. His own investigations arose from personal interest, but in nearly all cases served a larger agenda. Grey's ethnography served to further the British imperial project of information gathering about other lands and other peoples. It was also a tool of governance, giving him both a deeper understanding of native peoples and the ability to form politically useful relationships. Science affected Grey's first New Zealand governorship at several levels. It confirmed his Biblical belief in the common descent of all mankind and strengthened his resolve to elevate Māori to European standards of civilisation. It helped him understand their language and culture. It underlay his support for industrial education and his encouragement of geological and geographical exploration. More obliquely, the scientific and industrial revolutions of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries seemed to Grey to provide conclusive evidence of British superiority, and validate his attempts to confer on Māori the blessings of British civilisation.

The optimism and sense of progress stimulated by the scientific and industrial revolutions and magnified by the evangelical revival was also important to the project of British imperialism. Sure of success and empowered by a vision of Christianity and civilisation spreading across the globe, Grey saw office in the colonial service as the ultimate means of fulfilling his duty to God, Queen and Empire. He believed that God had "laid down certain natural laws, regulating the winds, the seas, the earthquakes, regulating all things which interest man in that way", but that He had "left to human beings the governance in other respects". "You are either His ministers to give effect to His desires for the welfare of his creatures", he argued, "or are turning traitors to
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\(^{43}\) Milne, p.44.
\(^{44}\) Grey, *Journals*, vol.1, p.45.
that duty, to prevent His wishes for the welfare of all being carried out".45 Grey was first appointed Governor of South Australia in 1841 at the age of twenty eight. His next twenty eight years were dedicated to the cause of empire as a political, economic, social and cultural entity, and as the fulfilment of God’s plan for Christian civilisation.

**Historiography**

Deified and vilified, honoured and despised, the legend of Governor Grey has passed through several forms since his first arrival in New Zealand. The historiography surrounding Grey and his time in New Zealand is rich, deep and conflicted. From the mid nineteenth century to the early twenty-first century, however, it disregards the imperial intellectual context in which Grey lived and worked. Late nineteenth and early twentieth century historians depicted Grey as father and saviour of our nation. Reflecting both Liberal notions of progress and New Zealand’s colonial status, they focused on his dynamic leadership and political prowess, presenting Grey as a leader in scientific circles and an exemplary Christian. They failed, however, to relate these elements of Grey’s intellectual world to his political agendas and achievements. In the wake of twentieth century decolonisation and the rise of indigenous nationalisms throughout the world, historians became more willing to criticise two of the fundamental assumptions of their predecessors: that New Zealand was a paradisical New World characterised by harmonious race relations, and that George Grey had played a central role in creating this idyll. Emphasising Grey’s ruthless and manipulative methods, recent historians have paid particular attention to the negative impact of his policies upon Māori.

The first biography of Grey was published in 1892 as part of the celebrations surrounding his eightieth birthday. It was written by Grey’s good friend William Rees and his journalist daughter Lily. Consciously adopting the role of disciples, Rees and Rees explicitly present their subject as a model for future New Zealanders, as our first true hero. Their purpose is conceived as twofold:

> One, to give in a connected form the incidents, the adventures, and the achievements of a life at once noble and beneficent; the other, to preserve the record of principles, of actions, and of aspirations which are likely to influence for good the youth of this and of succeeding generations.46
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The Life and Times of Sir George Grey is based on Rees and Rees’ first hand observations and on Grey’s own reminiscences. It functions not only as exemplar, but also as a vehicle of self-defence and self-justification, giving Grey the opportunity to refute his critics in the guise of historical veracity.47 The Rees’ hagiography does acknowledge some aspects of Grey’s intellectual life, commending his devout Anglicanism and passion for science. It does not, however, integrate them into a wider analysis of Grey’s policies or of the forces that motivated him.48 Schooled in the dictates of nineteenth century historical method, Rees and Rees viewed personality and politics as the only valid axes of biographical analysis.

Like Rees and Rees’ biography the earliest general histories of New Zealand depicted Grey as a godlike figure. The most influential of these was William Pember Reeves’ The Long White Cloud, first published in 1898. A member of the Liberal government of the 1890s, Reeves, like William Rees, was as much politician as historian. Proudly claiming Grey’s mantle of leadership, the Liberals drew heavily on aspects of his radical democratic ideology. As their chief theorist it is unsurprising that Reeves should be held responsible for first articulating and publicising the myth of ‘Good Governor Grey’. In fact this is the title of Reeves’ seventh chapter, which describes Grey’s first governorship of New Zealand as a glorious catalogue of successes stemming from his hero’s “moral courage and good sense”.49 He minimises the difficulties and failures of Grey’s second governorship, blaming them on lack of support.50 Reeves’ radicalism, his imperialism, and his friendship with Grey are central to his interpretation of New Zealand’s history, and of Grey:

Of such a man destiny might have made a great visionary, a capable general, an eloquent tribune, or a graceful writer. He had in him the stuff for any of these. But the south wing of the British Empire had to be built, and the gods made Grey a social architect in the guise of a pro-consul.51

Most New Zealand histories of this period were published in New Zealand or London, and most espoused similar views to Reeves. In general they took pride in New Zealand as a ‘Better Britain’ and lauded Grey as a founding father. The most notable exception is Dom Felice
Vaggioli’s *History of New Zealand and its Inhabitants*. First published in Italy in 1896, Vaggioli’s *History* unreservedly damns both British colonisation and Protestant evangelism. Vaggioli was a Catholic missionary who served in New Zealand from 1879 to 1887, working in Gisborne, Auckland and the Coromandel. His style is polemical, calling English and Protestant readers to “pause to wash their hands, dripping with Māori and Australian blood”.52 The book finishes on an apocalyptic note, warning the unrighteous that a “world infected with such corruption will become one vast cemetery in the midst of which the grim reaper will reign. Pointing his finger at any terrified survivors on the barren earth, he will exclaim: Here lie the crawling maggots who chose to ignore God!”53 Sectarianism aside, Vaggioli was a devoted champion of Māori interests and his repudiation of British colonisation is reasoned and compelling. He assesses Grey’s governorship from 1845 to 1853 as peaceful and vigorous in spite of some mistakes.54 Though more critical of Grey’s second governorship, Vaggioli always distinguishes between Grey, the New Zealand parliament and British colonial policy. He sees Grey as a tool used by the British government and manipulated by his New Zealand ministers to ill-effect.55 Though Grey is implicated in the affairs of both entities, he emerges from the text as a real person with strengths and weaknesses.

James Milne’s 1899 biography *The Romance of a Pro-Consul* is subtitled *The Personal Life and Memoirs of the Right Hon. Sir George Grey*. It relies even more than Rees and Rees upon the intimate relationship between subject and biographer, and includes large portions of conversation with Grey. Significantly, it is this biography, the one with least authorial interpretation and analysis, which places most emphasis on Grey’s religious convictions.56 Yet Milne’s approach is anecdotal rather than scholarly, intending to present a series of “life pictures rather than any chronology of dates”, and avoiding the kind of analysis that might relate Grey’s Christian beliefs to his political policies and practices.57 Despite such gaps *The Romance of a Pro-Consul* remains invaluable as a source for understanding Grey’s intellectual world. As a young New Zealand journalist living in London, Milne sat by Grey’s side during his final years, acting by turns as

53 Ibid., p.311.
54 Ibid., p.128, 131, 133, 134, 135, 146, 156, 165.
55 Ibid., p.219.
56 Milne, pp.14, 17, 210-11.
57 Ibid., p.100.
interviewer, amanuensis, and author. The resulting collection of memories, quotations and observations is vivid and intriguing. It gives particularly significant insights into Grey’s attitudes and ideas about race. Perhaps even more importantly, it gives a sense of how Grey viewed himself. Though he cautioned Milne to beware “vainglory” in his text, Grey was acutely aware of his own place in history. He too conceived his life as that of hero and exemplar, a sense conveyed with utter conviction in his quoted words and in the very structure of his stories. Such valuable access to Grey’s emotional and intellectual worlds makes Milne’s portrayal by far the most personal and appealing, if not the most scholarly, of the six biographies.

In 1907 George Henderson, Professor of History at Adelaide University, published the first attempt at an impartial academic analysis of George Grey. Like Milne, Henderson recognises the strength of his subject’s religious convictions, but fails to relate them to his analysis of Grey as a ‘missionary of imperialism’. Henderson makes brief allusion to Grey’s intellectual context by arguing that he was a child of the nineteenth century, a radical romantic devoted to liberty, equality and fraternity. While promising, the argument is undeveloped and unsupported by evidence. To Henderson Grey was first and foremost a public servant – genuine, conscientious and competent in the performance of his duty. This is the first biography to acknowledge any failures or flaws, but Grey is still presented as an outstanding leader. Writing (just) in the twentieth century, Henderson focuses on celebrating the achievements and mood of the nineteenth century rather than offering meaningful criticism. This tendency is predictable and perhaps natural when many of the individuals featured in his text were still alive, and the political radicalism of Grey’s later years was still in favour. Early twentieth century prejudices also affect Henderson’s analysis of race relations. In line with most white colonial academics of the time, he viewed the histories of South Australia, New Zealand and South Africa as stories of white settlement and expanding civilisation. Natural selection was taken for granted. Henderson saw the Australian Aborigines as “doomed”. He framed Grey’s efforts at elevating them as a “splendid failure”, concluding that “man may fight against, but not overcome Destiny”. He saw Grey’s racial policy in New Zealand as more successful, but like many Europeans at the turn of
the century, believed that the Māori too were suffering degeneration. He viewed the natives of Cape Colony as even more savage than the Aborigines or Māori, supporting the concept of racial separation in South Africa as the best means of maintaining racial purity.

James Collier’s 1909 biography also works within the heroic model. It is by far the least convincing of the biographies, lacking both intimacy and scholarliness. Grey is presented as a great man flawed by vindictiveness and megalomania. His activities as philologist and ethnographer are discussed briefly while his religious beliefs are blithely dismissed as unenlightened and unimportant. In all three earlier works the authors’ racial views obtrude, but none approach Collier’s overt racialism. Subscribing to popular theories of racial purity and progress, he viewed the South African blacks as “failures and abortions of humanity”, and suggested that Grey had overestimated the virtues and underestimated the savagery of the Māori. Collier derounced Grey’s policy of racial amalgamation as fundamentally misguided, pointing to the experience of animal breeders and the “inevitable degeneracy” of mixed breeds. The ease with which Collier expressed such highly politicised opinions (presented, moreover, as facts) reflects some white New Zealanders’ complacency about race relations in the pre-war era.

Anglocentrism continued to dominate New Zealand historiography during the first half of the twentieth century. First published in 1936, J. B. Condliffe’s The Making of New Zealand relates the early colonisation of New Zealand to British industrialisation, the conservatism of the 1880s to laissez-faire political economy, and the Liberal policies of the 1890s to philosophical socialism. In a general sense Condliffe does much to balance Reeves’ reliance on politics and personality. Yet he adds little to our understanding of George Grey, remaining firmly in thrall to Reeves’ myth of ‘Good Governor Grey’. In fact, he mentions Grey rarely at all, ignoring the specific intellectual context in which the Governor operated, and favouring broad historical movements over the detail of individual lives. Condliffe and Airey’s Short History of New Zealand similarly articulates the myth of harmonious race relations that held sway in the 1920s.
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With Grey at the helm, they contend, "there was never any danger of war between the Māoris and the Pākehās."\(^{70}\)

*Our Nation’s Story* was the most popular primary school text of the 1930s. More than any other, this text popularised the myth of ‘Good Governor Grey’. Juxtaposed against the weak and foolish Robert FitzRoy, he is presented as wise and clever and strong - saviour of the country and friend to the Māori.\(^{71}\) "When Grey left New Zealand, in 1853, New Zealand was a land in which white men and Māoris were living together in peace and prosperity".\(^{72}\) This positive interpretation stems directly from the book’s imperial perspective. *Our Nation’s Story* is subtitled *A Course of British History*. Of its two hundred pages, fifty relate to New Zealand, twenty five to Australia, and the rest to Great Britain. In the inter-war period New Zealand retained strong economic and cultural ties to the ‘Motherland’, and it is these that are reflected in *Our Nation’s* uncritical view of British imperialism and affirmation of effective protagonists of empire such as Grey.

The decline of imperialism and concomitant rise of indigenous rights movements in the mid-twentieth century saw a gradual change in historical perspective. New Zealand historians became ever more willing to challenge the orthodoxy established by men like Rees and Reeves, and acknowledge the negative impact of colonisation. At the same time, the prosperity and confidence of the 1950s saw a new wave of increasingly nationalistic New Zealand histories. Led by Keith Sinclair and W. H. Oliver, the national revisionists wrote about New Zealand removed from the traditional context of British imperialism.\(^{73}\) Though generally positive about Governor Grey’s role in New Zealand, they were far more ambivalent than their predecessors. Sinclair’s *History of New Zealand* emphasises Grey’s penchant for deception, his ruthlessness, and his loneliness in old age.\(^{74}\) In *The Story of New Zealand* Oliver emphasises Grey’s “greatness”, but stresses the long term negative effects of the Governor’s native policy on race
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\(^{69}\) J. B. Condiffe and Willis T. G. Airey, *Short History of New Zealand*, 5th edition, Auckland etc, 1935, p.2. “The two races have for many years lived side by side in friendship. Gradually, as the Maoris become absorbed into the dominant white race, there will grow up a people rich in the stories and traditions of both races, looking back with equal pride to the Maori explorers and navigators and to the great leaders of the British people.”

\(^{70}\) Ibid., p.83.

\(^{71}\) *Our Nation’s Story*, Auckland, date and place of publication unknown, [c.1930], pp.26-7.

\(^{72}\) Ibid., p.28.


relations. John Miller’s *Early Victorian New Zealand* similarly lacks the reverence of earlier histories. Miller characterises Grey as “a cool, subtle administrator”, downplaying his significance altogether. Far from the masterful leader of earlier interpretations, Grey figures as a cautious consolidator working on a small scale with limited success.

James Rutherford’s study of Grey was published in 1961. It is by far the most well-researched and scholarly of the six existing biographies. Rutherford presents a generally laudatory account of a life lived with courage and commitment, but he also acknowledges many of Grey’s mistakes and failures. He describes his approach thus: “I have tried to reconstruct and analyse the principal situations with which Grey had to deal, to enter into his strange mind in order to explain his actions from his own point of view, and then to detach myself and judge his behaviour impartially.” Unfortunately, his attempt to enter Grey’s “strange mind” is ultimately unsuccessful. Working along the twin axes of politics and personality Rutherford never takes the next step to grapple with the ideas that occupied Grey’s mind and determined his behaviour. The intellectual context of Victorian Britain is largely ignored and, as with the other biographies, Grey’s scientific researches and religious beliefs are briefly mentioned as asides rather than integrated into the political analysis with which the author is chiefly concerned.

International historiography follows a similar pattern to New Zealand historiography. Nineteenth century Australian historians interpreted Grey as a beneficent agent of Providence and imperialism, while post-colonial historians have been far more critical. Douglas Pike’s 1957 *Paradise of Dissent, South Australia, 1829-1835* is harshly critical of Grey’s governance. It attributes Grey’s successes as governor either to his predecessor or to economic conditions. Aborigines are eerily absent from Pike’s analysis, making for exceedingly unbalanced history. Grey is lambasted for interactions with settlers that stemmed mainly from racial policies that Pike ignores.
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Post-colonial politics have also affected Grey’s representation in British imperial history. In the 1950s Ronald Robinson and Jack Gallagher revolutionised imperial historiography by questioning the traditional assumption that European expansion was driven solely from within by a coherent imperial ideology. They emphasised, rather, the impact of interactions between Europeans and indigenous peoples on the colonial peripheries. Historians became increasingly focused on empire as an economic entity driven by pragmatism. In 1963, John Galbraith’s contribution to *British Imperialism: gold, God, glory* dismissed humanitarianism as an insignificant influence on the course of nineteenth century imperialism. He argued that the language of humanitarianism was little more than a nineteenth century convention, applied liberally in the cause of many different interests. As imperialism fell from favour, so too did its protagonists. In some cases the shift from sympathy to skepticism can be seen in the works of an individual author. In 1930 W. P. Morrell’s *British Colonial Policy in the Age of Peel and Russell* presented Grey as imperial hero. The sequel, *British Colonial Policy in the Mid-Victorian Age* was not published until 1969. In the intervening years World War Two had brought a gradual end to the age of imperialism. Morrell was writing in a radically altered political and intellectual environment. His second text still depicts Grey as a great leader, but the hero-worship is gone. Morrell is more critical of the empire itself, and willing to recognise Governor Grey’s faults and failings.

The most radical mid-century revision of Governor Grey’s role in New Zealand history was A. H. McLintock’s *Crown Colony Government in New Zealand*, published in 1958. McLintock describes Grey as brilliant, successful, and capable – “The Master Hand” – but also as cold, calculating and unscrupulous. He sees the motive of Grey’s native policy not as humanitarianism, but as personal ambition. Grey “warmly espoused the native cause since, as he well knew, success in pacifying and civilising the Māori people would win for him the approbation of the Colonial Office and the more tangible reward of gratified ambition”.

Employed in schools as a sixth form history text, *Crown Colony Government* had a strong...
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influence on the post-colonial portrayal of Governor Grey. To the baby boomers Grey was an
important figure, but a somewhat disreputable one also.

By the 1970s he was ‘Bad Governor Grey’, as New Zealand historiography placed increasing
emphasis on racial conflict. In The Shadow of the Land. A Study of British Policy and Racial
Conflict in New Zealand 1832-1853 Ian Wards depicts Grey as a duplicitous despot. He argues
that Grey pursued a self-interested and opportunistic “policy of trickery and deceit” which
eventually led to war.89 Exemplifying a recurring theme in nineteenth and twentieth century
historiography, Wards counterposes Grey and FitzRoy. He finds no reasonable explanation for
FitzRoy’s recall and contends that FitzRoy was a far superior man and governor than his
successor.90 Cartoonish in its simplicity and exaggeration, Wards’ portrayal of Governor Grey
fits snugly with his central thesis. As a military historian he argues that far greater importance has
been attached to humanitarianism in New Zealand’s history than is warranted. He sees the early
years of government as a series of ad hoc responses to achieve short term military and financial
goals.91 “I can see in Grey”, writes Wards, “only the nadir of British rule in New Zealand”.92
Wards’ deprecatory view of British imperialism and of Grey’s governorship reflects the
increasingly radical post-colonialism of the 1960s. Yet despite his anti-British, pro-Māori
approach, Wards subscribes to the same notions of Māori barbarism and European civilisation as
his nineteenth century predecessors.93 He takes the narrative of Māori conversion and civilisation
as a given94 and describes the Māori uprising in the north as mischief-making by “misguided
children” with no real grievances.95

Alan Ward’s 1975 A Show of Justice is a more measured and less politicised analysis of
nineteenth century race relations. Ward argues that despite its humanitarian principles, the policy
of amalgamation led to Māori subjugation. Though he focuses on government policy, he is
particularly successful at recognising Māori agency. He does little, however, to illuminate the

89 Ian Wards, The Shadow of the Land. A Study of British Policy and Racial Conflict in New Zealand 1832-1852,
90 Ibid., pp.169-170, 147.
91 Ibid., p.ix. Wards’ thesis is outlined in the preface and reiterated strongly time and again in the text itself.
93 Ibid., p.174. For example, he describes the colonisation of NZ as “the process of bringing civilisation to a
backward race.”
94 Ibid., p.38.
95 Ibid., pp.102, 146.
character of George Grey. Failing to consider Grey's ideas about race, Ward judges his actions as immoral and illegal. He sees Grey's personal approach to government as sly, and his vigorous land purchase policy as a crucial factor in the deterioration of race relations. Ward dismisses Grey's humanitarianism as insincere and argues that the Governor did not pursue amalgamation honestly enough to secure its success.

Peter Adam's 1977 *Fatal Necessity* similarly challenges the notion that British intervention in New Zealand was based solely or predominately on humanitarian motives. He argues that the Colonial Office was concerned with British interests as well as native welfare. Adams contends that the Colonial Office and the Colonial Government used pre-emption to keep the letter, but break the spirit of the Treaty of Waitangi. Governor Grey's policy of large-scale land purchase for minimum payment, was not, argues Adams, intended to protect Māori rights, but to fund future British settlement.

In *The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict*, James Belich reviles Grey's artifice. He glosses over Grey's racial attitudes in an attempt to make the Governor fit his own interpretation of Victorian beliefs about race. Though Belich is never as scathing as Wards, Grey also figures as master manipulator in his general history *Making Peoples.*

This hardened approach to Grey also dominated late twentieth century Māori historiography, often written from a highly politicised and personal perspective. Immersed in the ongoing struggle for tino rangatiratanga, Māori writers were highly conscious of the negative effects of past policies on their own communities. Authors such as Donna Awatere convey deep anger towards the proponents of British colonisation, and in some cases towards all Pākehā. Ranginui Walker's writing emphasises the Māori experience of colonisation and expresses a sense of personal and community grievance. In *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou. Struggle Without End*
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he shows some sympathy for aspects of Grey’s second governorship. But it was Walker who coined the devastating epithet “the hit-man of colonisation” to describe Grey’s first governorship. Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou draws particular attention to the disastrous impact of Grey’s land purchase policy on Māori. For many twentieth century Māori Grey is ‘Bad’ by virtue of his position as governor.

In the same school as Walker, Tania Thompson’s 1993 Master’s thesis focuses on Grey’s first governorship more closely. Redefining Grey’s primary goal in this period as reducing British parliamentary aid to New Zealand, Thompson interprets his policy of assimilation as nothing more than a means to this end. She offers fresh insights into the relationship between Grey and the Colonial Office, and into Māori reactions to Grey’s racial policies. Her argument is undermined, however, by a myopic focus on the detrimental effects of those policies and a lack of contextualisation. Christian faith in monogenism, Enlightenment ideas about universal equality, and scientific theories about racial difference are all ignored, despite their dominance in Victorian intellectual debates, their impact on Grey’s writing, and their explanatory power for understanding his racial policies. Thompson’s Governor is a malevolent oppressor bent on augmenting his own personal authority and on extending the economic and political power of the British Empire.

This evil Governor also figures in recent South African interpretations. J. B. Peires’ The Dead Will Arise is a well-researched account of the cattle killing movement of 1856-57. It focuses on Grey’s role in the tragedy. Though scholarly and insightful in most parts, Peires is excessively colourful in his vitriolic descriptions of Grey. The Governor is described as “half Superman and half Devil”, with “despotic inclinations and paranoid obsessions”, which “fuelled his extraordinary capacity for crushing and subjugating indigenous peoples, while loudly and
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103 Ranganui Walker, Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou. Struggle Without End, Auckland, 1990, pp.117-8. Walker is sympathetic towards Grey’s runanga scheme and towards his efforts to minimise large scale land confiscation after the wars. His sympathy is particularly interesting because it is usually Grey’s second governorship that is emphasised in analyses of “Bad Governor Grey”.
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sincerely proclaiming that he was doing so in their best interests".  

Peires’ interpretation is informed by his own experience of life in twentieth century South Africa. Faced with on-going racial discord, Peires sees the concept of reconciling the interests of settlers and indigenous peoples as impossible. Because Grey argued otherwise, Peires attacks him on all fronts. Peires’ defence of indigenous participants in the cattle killing movement likewise reflects the political and intellectual climate of white liberal South Africa in the 1980s. Having explored Xhosa mythology, he understands the reasoning that led to Nongqawuse’s prophecies, and exonerates her on grounds of sincerity. The Governor receives no such leniency. Ignoring the intellectual and religious framework in which Grey worked, Peires pronounces him a “fake humanitarian”. Post-colonial anti-imperialism and ongoing racial strife undoubtedly influence this analysis of Grey’s South African governorship.

Such interpretations restore a vital sense of indigenous agency, but their depth of insight into indigenous cultures is destabilised by a narrow, simplistic approach to colonising cultures. With full respect for Māori culture, Michael King warned that he would not “allow anyone to demean or diminish the status” of his culture “in the process of establishing or elevating that of Māori”. He advocated “a mutuality of respect between the two major cultures” in New Zealand, arguing that only a strong, confident Pākehā culture and a strong, confident Māori culture could establish “an equitable relationship”. By idealising Māori behaviour and vilifying Pākehā leaders like Grey, historians have produced narratives “as patronising and as offensive” as earlier histories which ignored Māori altogether.

The late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries have also produced more balanced accounts of Grey’s career. In the school text Milestones, Tom Brooking and Paul Enright argue that the debunking of Grey has gone too far. They recognise him as a visionary of great ability but also stress his powerful sense of cultural superiority and its detrimental effects. The Oxford History of New Zealand also treads the middle ground. M. P. K. Sorrenson emphasises the humanitarian
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Governor who brought about peace and promoted Māori education, health and agriculture. Ann Parsonson and W. J. Gardner both focus on the agent of empire bargaining hard for Māori land. Raewyn Dalziel emphasises the autocratic ruler and the skilled politician inspired by democratic ideals. The overall picture is balanced but disjointed; ‘Good Governor Grey’ irreconcilable with his evil twin. In part, this balance reflects the collaborative nature of the Oxford History. The Flinders History of South Australia similarly compartmentalises the economic, social, religious, political, and racial elements of South Australian history. As a result Grey is presented in some chapters as a ‘Bad’ governor, and in others as a ‘Good’ governor. While he was certainly more successful in some areas than others, the Flinders History fails to recognise that the ‘Good’ and ‘Bad’ governors were both the same man. Michael King’s Penguin History of New Zealand, published in 2003, offers a balanced and accessible account of New Zealand history. King acknowledges Grey’s strengths and recognises his flaws, judging his first governorship of New Zealand “well executed” on the whole.

Edmund Bohan’s To Be A Hero was published in 1998. It claims to contain “significant new material” and to be a “timely re-evaluation of a complex and fascinating man”. In fact, it adds little to our understanding of Grey. Its strict chronological structure precludes any in-depth analysis and the limited time and space available to its author are reflected in the text’s relative brevity. Reverting to the familiar paradigm of epic hero, Bohan maintains this theme throughout. His introductory chapter pays particular attention to the influence of Carlylean theory on the young George Grey. But while briefly hinted at, the potential for integrating ideas with personality and politics remains unfulfilled. Likewise, when describing Grey’s racial policies Bohan argues that “Grey and others strove for what they perceived to be the best”, but fails to explain why they believed their actions were for the best.
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absolve Grey of responsibility for his actions than are other recent historians less seduced by the Governor’s charisma and personal mystique.

This tendency reflects the difficulty of the biographer’s task. In striving to understand and identify with our subject, we feel we have come to know him or her as a person, even a friend. The urge to justify or defend arises involuntarily, and is difficult to suppress. Paul Moor’s biographies of Grey’s two predecessors illustrate the point. In his 1998 portrait of Hobson, he tries to look at circumstances through the Governor’s eyes.\textsuperscript{124} Like Grey’s biographers, however, Moon pays scant attention to ideas or intellectual context and never truly gets inside his subject’s head. Rather than explaining Hobson’s failures he excuses them by pointing to the bad advice of others.\textsuperscript{125} He is even more sympathetic towards FitzRoy.\textsuperscript{126} Like a host of others, Moon falls into the trap of juxtaposing Grey and FitzRoy as diametrically opposed. “Grey’s main achievement”, he claims, “was to lay waste to the foundations of inter-racial cooperation that FitzRoy had endeavoured to construct.”\textsuperscript{127} His approach fails to acknowledge that both men shared a common set of humanitarian ideals, deep religious convictions, and a genuine desire to help Māori.

These two common themes in New Zealand’s biographical literature – the glossing over of ideas, and the tendency to defend and justify one’s subject – are intimately related. Without understanding the thoughts, beliefs and intentions that motivated a person’s actions the historian has difficulty explaining those actions. The alternative to explanation is blame. In many cases, subjects of biography are made responsible for the positive effects of their actions and the negatives blamed on others or on circumstance.

While Grey’s biographers have failed to relate his religion to his politics, nineteenth and twentieth century scientific and religious histories recognise his faith and his contribution to science in isolation from his wider career. In most cases, they emphasise his philanthropy. For example, W. Morley’s \textit{History of Methodism in New Zealand} makes “honourable and respectful
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mention ... of the zeal, energy and munificence of Sir George Grey. In an article on the history of the New Zealand Society Grey figures as the driving force behind early New Zealand science. By their nature such texts present only one dimension of Governor Grey. They offer no clues as to how that dimension fits with the rest of his character or career. The exception is those religious histories that delve into Grey’s clash with CMS missionaries over their large land grants. Whether written in the nineteenth or twentieth century, these histories generally argue that Grey was motivated by politics and self-interest. They deplore his behaviour towards the missionaries and tend to dismiss his whole governorship out of hand. Though they refer to politics, they make no meaningful connections between Grey’s political and religious beliefs.

As a case-study, Grey’s story also relates to wider imperial historiography. In 1983 John Halstead argued that economic factors constituted the major push behind the second British empire. He viewed imperialism as “an auxiliary of foreign policy”, describing debates about racial ideas as “sterile and overworked”. Driven by the impact of Edward Said’s Orientalism, the influence of feminist histories of empire, and the Studies in Imperialism series, the late 1980s saw a shift to more culturally inflected approaches to empire. In 1992 Nicholas Thomas’ Colonialism’s Culture. Anthropology, Travel and Government argued for imperialism and colonialism as far more complex forces than had hitherto been acknowledged. Understanding colonialism as an ongoing process, Thomas describes it as a fractured project “riddled with contradictions and exhausted as much by its own internal debates as by the resistance of the colonised”. He argues for colonialism as a cultural process incorporating both negative ideologies of denigration and also more positive imaginings of racial difference and interaction.

In recognising these ambivalences Thomas does not seek to defend or rehabilitate imperialism, but to understand how and why it proceeded as it did. Thomas’ emphasis on contradiction and ambiguity in the colonial project also makes sense of individual imperialists such as Grey - a mass of contradictions and ambiguities. James Gump’s 1998 article in the *Journal of World History* acknowledges Grey’s Christian faith and liberal activism as fundamentally important to his colonial career. It does not, however, develop the relationship between faith and policy in any specifics. Gump judges the Governor according to twenty-first century expectations and priorities, focusing on the legacy of Grey’s “imperialism of cultural assimilation”.

At the turn of the twenty-first century historians are increasingly acknowledging the connections between local, national and imperial histories. Where nineteenth and early twentieth century histories generally adopted an imperial perspective, and late twentieth century histories privileged indigenous stories, recent histories have started to relate each to the other. Tony Ballantyne’s *Orientalism and Race* looks at Aryanism as a structuring feature of imperial culture. Transcending the limitations of metropolitan and colonial histories, he seeks to “foreground the relational quality of the imperial past, emphasising the complex and shifting relationships that constituted the empire”. Ballantyne conceives these relationships as a series of overlapping webs linking local, national and imperial concerns. While Ballantyne focuses on one idea – Aryanism – to illuminate his webs, Catherine Hall uses biographical case-study to dissect the relationships of empire. In *Civilising Subjects* she tracks the controversial career of George Grey’s colleague and sometime subordinate, Edward Eyre, travelling from England to Australia, New Zealand and Jamaica. Hall insists on the “imperative of placing colony and metropole in one analytic frame”, using Eyre’s story as her starting point for a detailed exploration of Victorian notions of savagery and civilisation.

Recent histories also acknowledge the profound influence of religion on nineteenth century Britain and its empire. Andrew Porter argues that “existing perspectives on imperial expansion
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could benefit greatly from recalling both the creative power of religious beliefs and institutions, and the extent to which nineteenth century British society itself was powerfully moved by religious conviction or inspiration'. Colley’s portrayal of Britons in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries shows that religion was a crucial element of British identities. In particular, she shows that Britons defined themselves as Protestants in relation to their Catholic enemies, the French, with whom they warred intermittently for most of this period. Colley acknowledges the internal debates within British Protestantism, but contends that such debates should not obscure the basic divide between Protestants and Catholics. “Protestantism lay at the core of British identity, and this was only to be expected. Religion was the crucial unifying force in most nations within Europe as outside it”. The implications for imperial biography are wide-ranging. Colley’s interpretation of early nineteenth century Britain as a fundamentally religious entity demands a reappraisal of nineteenth century British leaders with a new sensitivity to issues of faith.

Recent histories of William Ewart Gladstone rise to the challenge, acknowledging his Christianity as fundamentally important to his policies and practice as politician. Peter Marsh suggests that Gladstone “embarked upon a career in politics as a vocation every bit as religious as Holy Orders”. The main thrust of Peter Jagger’s 1991 biography is Gladstone’s true vocation as a churchman, and his struggle to discern God’s will. “For William Ewart Gladstone the Christian faith was the foundation of every word and daily action in both private and public life”. David Bebbington’s 1993 biography concurs: “Gladstone brought Christianity into every sphere. His mind was shaped by a Christian worldview, and his actions by a Christian conscience”. Bebbington explicitly refutes historians who suggest that Gladstone kept his religion separate from his politics. He acknowledges that Gladstone enjoyed power and exercised it pragmatically, but Bebbington argues that political pragmatism was a vehicle for
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Gladstone's ultimate vision of Britain as a liberal Christian society. These religious interpretations expand our understanding of Gladstone and of Victorian faith and politics in general. They also point to the possibilities of similarly exploring the religious beliefs of other nineteenth century leaders. Gladstone was not only Grey's contemporary, but also, for a time, his direct superior as Colonial Secretary.

In the local context, John Stenhouse's recent article in the *New Zealand Journal of History* discusses the striking marginalisation of religion in New Zealand history, and the prevailing negative depiction of religious figures. Stenhouse draws attention to several recent histories that approach religion with more respect, integrating it with other aspects of our past such as "war, politics, race relations, gender, family and community". He also explores the international historiography, showing that the Victorian 'crisis of faith' has now assumed "more modest proportions". Scholars of British imperialism, such as J. C. D. Clark and Chris Bayly, as well as those discussed above, increasingly acknowledge the role of religion in shaping imperial policy and practice. In *The Birth of the Modern World 1780-1914* Bayly presents the long nineteenth century as an age of "imperial religions", witnessing the "triumphal re-emergence and expansion" of all the world's great religions. As the dominant figure in nineteenth century New Zealand history George Grey offers the perfect opportunity to explore the nexus of religion and race in local and imperial contexts.

**Black, White or Grey?**

In this thesis I hope to find a more human Grey than the black and white figures who dominate historiography. Like all human beings Grey had strengths and weaknesses. In his case those strengths and weaknesses were magnified by a forceful personality and displayed in his performance of imperial authority. Grey was motivated by a complex combination of religious and scientific ideas, personal interests and political circumstance. The same applies more...
generally to Victorian imperialism. Imposing modern values on past peoples and phenomena hinders historical understanding. Condemning imperialism in its nineteenth century context is “somewhat like condemning feudalism because it was medieval”.152 If some of the motives of empire were “humane and some violent, some benevolent and some acquisitive, we might perceive them more clearly if we refrain from passing judgement on them and accept them for what they are: a reflection of human nature”.153

This thesis seeks to understand the motives of Grey’s native policy in his first governorship of New Zealand. As Belich observes, the relationship between Māori and Pākehā in nineteenth century New Zealand developed just as much in the realm of ideas as of actions.154 Grey’s interactions with Māori were based on his understanding of their culture and traditions, and on his image of himself as God’s agent of Christian civilisation. It is impossible for us to understand those interactions without assessing the ideas that informed them. As Halstead acknowledges, the “ethical assumptions and moral standards of the nineteenth century were different from ours”.155 I believe Grey’s liberal Anglican Christianity holds the key to understanding his first governorship of New Zealand, and his subsequent career. All the disparate elements of his personal and political life can be pulled together with reference to his sense of Christian duty and his commitment to the progress of Christian civilisation. As governor, ethnographer, philanthropist, politician and citizen Grey was motivated primarily by his vision of a unified inclusive society based on civilised Christian principles.

Just as Grey’s politics must be placed in intellectual context, so his ideas must be understood with reference to their practical connections and consequences. This thesis seeks to integrate political and military analyses with intellectual and religious history. It acknowledges and respects Māori perspectives and experience, and strives to understand rather than denigrate nineteenth century Pākehā culture. By contextualising, rather than theorising or politicising Grey, I hope to illuminate the beliefs, relationships and controversies that characterised his turbulent career.

152 Halstead, p.34.
153 Ibid.
155 Halstead, p.34.
Inevitably, this thesis reveals significant gaps between Grey’s intentions and their effects. When he left New Zealand for the first time in 1853, Māori had not been successfully amalgamated into settler society. Nor had they when he left for the last time in 1894. Though motivated by humanitarianism, Grey’s insistence on the urgency of amalgamation and his extensive purchase of Māori lands laid the seeds of cultural alienation and Māori marginalisation. His humanitarianism was not, however, insincere, but rather, representative of a distinctly mid-nineteenth century British imperialism genuinely committed to improving native welfare according to British values and ideals. Though Grey worked hard to understand Māori culture, he did not comprehend the full implications of racial amalgamation implemented on his own dictatorial terms. Nor did he grasp the notion of cultural adaptation as opposed to conversion. Prosaic concerns also inhibited the realisation of Grey’s vision for New Zealand. Like all governors he was subject to a complex range of personal and political pressures. In the mid-nineteenth century New Zealand’s fledgling colonial state had barely enough resources to maintain peace in the main centres of European settlement, let alone expand health and education services in the isolated interior.

The story of Grey’s career as colonial governor is inextricably bound up with New Zealand’s national story and with the history of imperialism. By assessing Grey’s place in the intellectual milieu of early Victorian humanitarianism I hope to understand more about the man and the context. By acknowledging his liberal Anglican humanitarianism I hope to perceive better the personal and local face of imperial authority. By understanding Grey’s intentions in mid-nineteenth century New Zealand I hope to grasp some of the overlooked roots of our cultural identity.

George Grey’s career spanned most of the nineteenth century and several different countries. I have chosen to focus on Grey’s early career, and in particular, his first New Zealand governorship, 1845 – 1853. As McLintock points out, the Crown Colony period in New Zealand is especially profitable for the student seeking to understand “the nature of the man beneath the trappings” because of the highly personal nature of government in the early years of British rule.156

156 McLintock, p.117.
This thesis begins with an exploration of the scientific and humanitarian networks within which Grey operated, establishing his role in an international web of imperial improvement. Chapter two pays specific attention to Grey’s ethnography and his understanding of human unity and improvability. Chapter three assesses Grey’s use of force and law as tools of political control, justified by the rhetoric of Anglo-Saxon superiority and native improvement. Chapter four describes Grey’s attempts to integrate Māori within the colonial and imperial economies, acknowledging both his fiscal and ideological motives. Chapter five looks at Grey’s native education, health and cultural measures, designed to elevate Māori in the scale of civilisation and equip them for amalgamation with European settlers. Chapter six ties many of these themes together with a close examination of Grey’s personal rule as a style and a tool of government.

Grey is a polarising figure who has captivated and repelled generations of historians. In focusing on personality they have tended either to succumb to the Governor’s charm or take umbrage at his arrogance. Their emphasis on political consequences has led to politicised assessments of Grey’s career. This thesis seeks to avoid moral judgements and illuminate the real Governor Grey by returning his story to its original setting. Early Victorian intellectual debates and imperial structures provide the crucial contexts for understanding the ideological underpinnings of Grey’s policy of racial amalgamation and the constraints that impinged on his power as Governor of New Zealand between 1845 and 1853.
Chapter One
Information & Improvement: an Imperial Web

George Grey spent most of his career at the farthest reaches of Britain’s vast empire – Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. He was often lonely, but never alone. Grey was encouraged and supported in his work by a vast “web” of British scientists and humanitarians spread across the globe. Some were motivated primarily by personal advantage, others by scientific advancement, some by imperial gain, and others by religious conversion and native civilisation. Like Grey himself, many were influenced by a complex combination of all these factors. Serving a range of varied purposes, the essence of the web lay in sharing information. From London to Singapore to Otaki, scientists, explorers, government officials and missionaries collected, pooled and processed information about other peoples and places. Wittingly or not, they formed part of an immense British project of information gathering and improvement. In the imperial imagination, information could improve both the old world and the new, both individuals and societies.

This chapter uses Grey’s relationships to focus on the intellectual contexts of post-Enlightenment science, humanitarianism and imperialism that were crucial to his first governorship of New Zealand. The web metaphor illuminates the way in which nineteenth century scientists, humanitarians and imperialists overlapped in a complex network of evolving connections. It also elucidates the nature of imperial authority, showing the sharing and shifting of power between metropolitan centre and colonial peripheries. After a discussion of the web as metaphor, I use Grey’s correspondence to demonstrate the web in action. Grey’s web served a varied range of purposes at several different levels. For individuals, it provided networks of practical and emotional support. For the British empire, it provided access to indigenous resources and avenues of colonial control. From a deeper cultural perspective, and for Grey himself, the web acted as a mechanism of improvement. By sharing information Grey and his colleagues sought to advance themselves, science, religion and civilisation. Fractured by internal tensions and subject to strong external resistance, this programme of improvement was unified by the Enlightenment notion of progress. Though Britain remained the uncontested centre of imperial authority, scientists, officials and missionaries on the periphery exercised significant power as collectors and mediators of colonial information. The process of analysing Grey as part of these
networks also reveals the constraints on his power, embedding Grey securely in the intellectual and imperial contexts of early Victorian Britain.

The Web as Metaphor

The men and women with whom Grey engaged on issues of science, religion and race were widely diverse. Some had only their relationship with Grey in common, while others corresponded with each other independently. This chapter employs the concept of a web from Grey’s perspective. All the men and women he corresponded with served as the centre of their own unique webs. Together they overlapped and combined to form an over-arching web centred in Britain and extending to the colonies and beyond.

This schema of multiple individual webs combining to form an over-arching web is a useful tool for analysing information-flow. The centre was usually, but not necessarily, the target for information gathered and shared within the web. If people are seen as intersecting points on the web, and the lines between them as channels of communication, information can be imagined going in and out between the centre and the periphery or right around the edges without ever going to the middle. It could follow all sorts of convoluted paths through the web, getting altered in the process as each collector / conveyer processed, deconstructed and reconstructed that information according to his or her own priorities.

The metaphor of the web also allows for change over time. Each point on the web was dependent on a particular relationship. Over the course of a lifetime – for Grey the whole of the nineteenth century – old relationships faded from significance and new relationships developed. Channels of communication were constantly realigned and re-charted. In the broader context of nineteenth century social change, the webs of empire also tightened over time. With huge leaps in scientific understanding and the emergence of new scientific disciplines and institutions, British science became steadily more professional as the century progressed. At mid-century Grey was a highly respected ethnographer. At the end of the century he still retained the high esteem of metropolitan and colonial scientists, but functioned more as a patron for emerging career scientists than a scientist in his own right. The colonial service underwent a similar process of professionalisation. New forms of communication such as the telegraph helped make connections between metropole and periphery more efficient and direct, and career diplomats
gradually replaced military appointments such as Grey. Humanitarian networks also became more formalised over the course of the century, as local and central government gradually accepted some of the responsibilities previously shouldered by philanthropic societies.

Grey’s web of correspondents can be roughly divided into two interconnected and overlapping networks – one of scientists and one of humanitarians. Some are easily categorised. Thomas Huxley, for example, was a professional scientist stationed at the metropole who corresponded with Grey only on scientific matters (though he also took an interest in humanitarian affairs as President of the London Ethnological Society). Thomas Buddle was a Methodist missionary based in the North Island of New Zealand who corresponded with Grey exclusively about race relations and native civilisation. Most in Grey’s web cannot be classified so neatly. Letters from scientists such as renowned naturalist Richard Owen and botanist Joseph Hooker range widely, discussing religion and politics and the specifics of Grey’s role as colonial governor. The CMS in London corresponded with Grey on matters of church organisation and missionary discipline but also aided him in collecting philological texts. Naval officers like Sir James Everard Home and John E. Erskine primarily focused on imperial interests but also collected ethnographical material and other scientific specimens.¹ Jane Samson has identified a strong humanitarian leaning in the officers of the Royal Navy.² Erskine’s letters to George Grey reflect this tendency in tone and content. He discusses the comparative improvability of Fijians, Samoans and Tongans and advocates the establishment of a magistracy in New Caledonia to keep the “white rascals” in order.³ Grey was motivated by a similar plurality of interests. His scientific investigations covered geology, astronomy, botany and zoology, but he was most intensely interested in the human sciences, particularly philology and comparative religion. His purpose in exploring these areas was to civilise and Christianise those within his reach as colonial governor. Grey’s interest in science was religious and his approach to religion was scientific.

The web also provides a satisfying model for exploring relationships between the metropolitan centre and colonial peripheries. The traditional metaphor of a spoked wheel, with authority radiating out from the imperial hub, ignores the power of local knowledge and the agency of colonial and indigenous cultures. Post-colonial analyses that focus exclusively on individual

³ John E. Erskine to George Grey, 22 September 1849, 1 May 1850, GL: E23(2, 8), APL.
colonies restore that agency, but often lack international context. More recently, historians have recognised the vital inter-relationships between centre and periphery. In *Imperial Meridian* Christopher Bayly focuses on the period 1780 and 1830, showing that the British empire can only be understood with reference both to social change in Great Britain and to developments abroad.\(^4\) Grey consistently acknowledged Britain as his cultural home and intellectual base. Working in New Zealand, Australia and South Africa he saw himself as a representative of British civilisation on the edges of the empire. Roughly half his correspondents lived in Britain with the others scattered around Europe, Africa, Asia, Australasia and the Pacific.

In this thesis the metaphor of overlapping webs stresses context and connections, linking local, national and imperial concerns on several different levels. Tony Ballantyne uses the web as metaphor in his study of Aryanism in the British empire. He insists on the need for “a multi-sited history of the empire that neither privileges the metropole nor accepts the nation-state as the self-evident unit for historical analysis”.\(^5\) Ballantyne conceives of the British empire as a “bundle of relationships” “collapsing geographical and cultural space”.\(^6\) He identifies several advantages to the web as an imperial metaphor. It underscores the empire as a structure whilst emphasising its relational nature; it conveys the fragility of empire, with connections being constantly broken and remade; and it highlights inter-colonial exchange. The web also lets us think of locations, individuals or institutions as the centre of their own unique networks, overlapping to form a complex and dynamic whole. With this approach, Ballantyne follows the history of one idea through the “bundle of relationships” which comprise the archives of British imperialism.\(^7\) My study focuses similarly on the story of one man as a guide through these many-layered webs.

**Networks of Support**

Spread across the globe, Grey’s web of information-gatherers served a number of different functions for its individual members. It provided a supply of data, books and specimens, a means of professional advancement, and a source of spiritual and psychological support.

\(^6\) Ibid., pp.1, 14.
\(^7\) Ibid., p.3.
At a purely practical level, British men and women around the globe provided each other with raw facts. When archaeologist, entomologist and politician John Lubbock was working on his *Prehistoric Times* (1865) he wrote to George Grey asking for the Governor’s views on Australian native religion. Florence Nightingale was gathering information on child health at the same time as Grey was grappling with Māori population decline. She sent Grey forms to be distributed among New Zealand’s native schools so that data on Māori children’s health could be added to and compared with data from other colonies.

Scientific specimens were a tangible form of raw information which also travelled the web. The Natural History catalogues of the British Museum record the enormous quantity of botanical, ornithological, zoological and geological material Grey collected and sent to Britain during his colonial career. Grey also dealt directly with individual metropolitan scientists, sending fossils to Charles Lyell, human mummies to Richard Owen, and birds to John Gould. Specimens also travelled from the heart of the empire out to the colonies. In 1864 British botanist William Hooker sent Grey two wardian cases and a box of seeds. Seeds and animals also circulated around the periphery, though more for the purposes of amusement and utility than for formulating scientific theory. From a range of friends stationed around the globe, Grey received variously seeds from Japan, blue cows from India and Persia, goats from Tibet, French olives from Australia, and plants from around the Pacific. In New Zealand, missionaries and colonial officials aided his collecting. Frederick Edward Maning, trader, historian, and later, Native Land Court Judge, collected specimens of native New Zealand fauna on Grey’s behalf. Maning used Māori connections to collect the actual specimens but ran into problems when they ate most of
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the Kiwi they captured and were too afraid to catch the Kaweaolizard, thought to be an ill
omen.\textsuperscript{14}

Grey used the same sources to procure philological and ethnographic texts. By accumulating a
mass of different vocabularies he hoped to find similarities and differences that might shed light
on the relationships between different races. Similarly, in collecting texts on native culture he
was compiling a resource for probing the connections and origins of those races. In 1866
Commodore William Wiseman sent Grey books obtained from Methodist missionaries on
Aneiteum, promising to send more from other islands in the New Hebrides.\textsuperscript{15} R. H. Codrington,
a leading missionary ethnographer, sent Grey several different texts from Norfolk Island.\textsuperscript{16} In
return for his help, Grey sent Codrington seeds, illustrating the way botanical and ethnographical
specimens both functioned as valuable commodities in this web of scientists and humanitarians.

The same theme appears in Grey’s correspondence with Archbishop Whately. In November
1849 Whately sent Grey a collection of English seeds, and in August 1852 he wrote to thank
Grey for a parcel of Māori language books, sending a few interesting books in return and
requesting the seeds of “any remarkable plants” from New Zealand.\textsuperscript{17} In 1854 Whately shared a
collection of Grey’s “highly valued” seeds with William Hooker of Kew Gardens and the
Botanical Gardens in Ireland.\textsuperscript{18} Whately and Grey continued to exchange books and seeds
throughout Grey’s colonial career.\textsuperscript{19}

Grey’s most important sources of ethnographical information were missionaries. British
missionaries in Australia, the New Hebrides and the Pacific Islands sent him native dictionaries,
spelling books, and religious texts.\textsuperscript{20} In 1857 Richard Burdsall Lyth, a missionary in Auckland,
sent Grey a selection of Tongan, Fijian, Tahitian and Samoan publications, recognising “the deep
and practical interest you have ever taken in the native races of our Colonies & mission, in
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missionaries and Mission work". Lyth’s collecting efforts on Grey’s behalf do not denote a simple trade-off for the Governor’s support, but rather, represent the context of shared concern for native welfare and improvement that underpinned both men’s work. A disgraced missionary turned botanist and linguist, William Colenso was another important figure in Grey’s web. The pair exchanged rare and interesting philological texts and Grey was a keen supporter of Colenso’s Māori Lexicon. CMS missionary and linguist Robert Maunsell also exchanged specimens of native languages and poetry with Grey. His letters are a jumble of information about native education and industry, thanks for Grey’s practical assistance to the mission at Waikato Heads, and discussions of philology. In an 1849 letter he apologised for his wordiness, pleading delight in “our common objects of interests”. Mission organisations at the metropole also supported Grey’s researches; he used the London offices of the CMS and the WMS to procure publications in a range of native languages.

Just as raw information travelled around the web so did processed information. In the mid-nineteenth century more and more books were written in the colonies and abroad, but most English language texts were published in Britain. Those living on the periphery relied on their friends at Home to send out the latest books, journals and pamphlets. In June 1854 mathematician Charles Babbage sent Grey several different books and papers, including a paper on mammals and one on light-houses. He suggested that if there were any duplicates in Grey’s existing library the Governor might place them in a public library. Whately was one of Grey’s most important sources of European literature, sending all manner of interesting books and articles. Once books arrived on the periphery they were willingly shared. In 1844 Grey informed L. A. Wilson, a fellow Englishman resident in South Australia, that he had recently received some new works from Britain on comparative anatomy. Wilson wrote to Grey in 1845,
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29 For example, Richard Whately to George Grey, 22 February 1858, GL:W17(16), APL. Whately sent with his letter a package of books including an enlarged edition of Bacon.
requesting to borrow those that Grey recommended. Grey responded by sending him Owen’s *Lectures on Comparative Anatomy* and offering a catalogue of his library for future reference.30

Englishmen and women spread around the empire also networked for personal and professional advancement. The most significant formal venues for making such connections in London were clubs. There were large clubs such as the Athenaeum, small dining clubs and more exclusive dining clubs within specific scientific societies. Nicholas Rupke asserts the importance of club membership in Richard Owen’s rise to power:

The exclusiveness of the more prestigious clubs endowed them with an aura of power, and membership of these could be a way of affirming or conferring social status. By being able to meet and mix with the membership of the select clubs, one became part of the social networks that dominated Victorian socio-political and intellectual life.31

Grey belonged to the Athenaeum and to several other clubs that he visited whenever in England.32 He dined in private at Roderick Murchison’s Belgrave Square Mansion and appeared at the inaugural dinner of Murchison’s exclusive Geographical Club.33 Charles Lyell invited Grey to be his guest at the Geological Society Club and to attend the society’s meeting afterwards.34 In 1869 Joseph Hooker wrote to invite Grey to the next meeting of “the little X Club” at The St George’s Hotel. The elite club numbered only a few members including John Tyndall, T. H. Huxley, Herbert Spencer and John Lubbock.35

For most of the nineteenth century the most important means of making new connections and pursuing advancement on the peripheries of empire were formal letters of introduction. Richard Whately sent several letters of introduction to Grey on behalf of hopeful young emigrants looking for the Governor’s favour.36 In November 1850 Robert Brown of the British Museum recommended Mr Ralph, “a Medicalman & Naturalist” to Grey’s notice.37 In 1882 Herbert
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other members of the Buxton family. In 1869 Charles Buxton invited Grey to a luncheon at Truman’s Brewery, Spitalfields. The party included Fowell, John Ruskin, Sir Charles Trevelyan, the Dean of Westminster Abbey, several members of parliament and several peers.

The practical support that travelled the web through data, specimens and introductions was accompanied by spiritual support. Around the empire, Englishmen and women prayed for each other, encouraged and exhorted each other, and provided each other with information. For those on the peripheries information about family and friends and political, scientific and religious developments at Home affirmed their identities as individuals and as members of the British empire, knitting them in to the cultural context of nineteenth century England. Richard Whately, for example, wrote to Grey about seemingly trivial day-to-day affairs, education, moral laxity, popular literature, scientific issues, and cultural trends such as the fashion for homeopathy. In November 1849 he wrote “You can hardly imagine ... what a lively interest we of this family have all along taken in your various doings & sufferings ...”. Richard Owen also kept Grey in touch with English life, conveying news of mutual friends and discussing scientific developments and political issues such as the sanitary reforms, the internment bill, and London’s water supply. Owen also affirmed Grey’s success in New Zealand. “Mrs Owen & I have eagerly perused every article descriptive of your progressive mastery of the difficulties which you had to encounter in your new Government, and we congratulate you ...”. In 1850 he wrote: “We often talk of you and of the society at Auckland of which some of our most esteemed friends are members”. As individuals and as a body, the Aborigines Protection Society (APS) provided moral support for Grey’s governorships. In their annual reports they eulogised Grey’s benevolence and “sound policy” towards the natives of New Zealand. Such expressions of encouragement and inclusion were crucial to those dealing with the often difficult psychological circumstances of life on the peripheries of empire.

---

46 T. Fowell Buxton to George Grey, 4 letters, 1894-1895, GL:B91, APL; E. M. Buxton to George Grey, 8 letters, 1894-1896, APL.
47 Charles Buxton to George Grey, 8 June [1869], GL:B88(1), APL.
48 Richard Whately to George Grey, 1847-1859, 17 letters, GL:W17, APL.
49 Richard Whately to George Grey, 6 November 1849, GL:W17(4), APL.
50 Richard Owen to George Grey, 7 November 1845, 8 June 1850, GL:O10(3, 6), APL.
51 Richard Owen to George Grey, 26 January 1848, GL:O10(5), APL.
52 Richard Owen to George Grey, 8 June 1850, GL:O10(6), APL. Owen was also friends with the Martins, the Swainsons and the Selwyns.
Letters also provided a means by which those in the colonies could support those at home in their own times of trouble. In 1883 Herbert Spencer wrote to thank Grey for his kindness to Collier and his sympathy for Spencer himself, struggling against public opposition to his extreme laissez faire philosophies. In 1883 he wrote again, almost overwhelmed by Grey’s kindness and his invitation to visit New Zealand: “In my frequently-depressed, and sometimes almost hopeless state of mind, a letter so cordially sympathetic as that which you have written me, very decidedly tends, for the time at least, to produce improvement”.

Those living on the edges of empire also supported each other. In New Zealand, for example, the Anglican and Catholic Bishops were among Grey’s staunchest supporters. His extensive correspondence with New Zealand’s first Anglican Bishop, George Augustus Selwyn, reveals a close personal relationship that weathered several storms. Grey and Selwyn conferred on church issues and native policy. They also shared an interest in philology, borrowing texts from each other’s libraries. At a personal level they affirmed each other’s successes and sympathised with each other’s sorrows. When Grey was knighted in 1848 Selwyn sent him two copies of the new Māori prayer book, “as an appropriate offering to one, who has preferred the peaceful union of the two races by equal justice and mutual interest to the pride of military conquest”. Six years later, after travelling back to England on the same boat, Selwyn commiserated with Grey on his mother’s death: “You cannot know but you may easily believe, how the thought of you and the hearing of your efforts in a good & holy cause, elevated her heart & prepared her for a further exaltation”. On Grey’s eightieth birthday, William Gaeden Cowie, the Anglican Bishop of Auckland, extended birthday wishes from himself and family. “We pray that you may have strength to continue your efforts for the firm establishment of liberty, equality, and fraternity in these islands”. Cowie supported Grey’s liberal Christian vision for New Zealand, praying further for “the liberty of the individual to all in accordance with his conscience…; the equality of all men before the law; and mutual sympathy and good will between all sections of the population”.
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Grey also enjoyed a good relationship with New Zealand’s first Catholic Bishop, Jean Francois Pompallier. The pair worked together on native education and other matters affecting Catholic clergy and laity. Their relationship was predicated on Grey’s liberal Anglican tolerance. As governor he saw it as his role to defend Roman Catholic New Zealanders from religious prejudice. In June 1846 he wrote to the Colonial Office defending Pompallier and his clergy from accusations of treachery in the recent war. Grey believed such accusations had “originated in prejudice and were wholly unfounded”. He was “perfectly satisfied that they did everything in their power to promote peace and good order” and had “received every assistance” from the Roman Catholic clergy since his arrival. Pompallier was keenly aware of Grey’s support. In May 1849 he wrote to the Colonial Office expressing “gratitude for the valuable protection [Grey] has so often extended to me, and ... admiration for his impartial and conciliatory conduct towards all denominations of Christians”. During the summer of 1866 Grey placed his home on Kawau at Pompallier’s disposal. In 1867, at the end of Grey’s second governorship of New Zealand, Pompallier expressed his “regrets for losing your admirable and paternal temporal ruling over us, my gratitude for all your kind advices and favours, and my earnest wishes for your welfare and for the protection of the almighty God over your respected and ever cherished person”. The Governor’s esteem among Roman Catholic clergy was so high that in 1853 he received the rare honour of nomination for a papal knighthood.

Māori networks also played a central role in supporting Grey’s governorship. The tribes of Otaki and Waikanae wrote to the Queen in March 1849 expressing approval of Governor Grey. “We have now adopted him as our father, and we consequently look upon you as our mother in the love of Christ Jesus” In an article in Te Karere Māori (The Māori Messenger), Piri Kawau described Grey as a great benefactor and the Māori as “his people”. “He drew us forth out of our evil state of ignorance and wickedness, and taught us to live orderly, to be kind and peaceable, to produce food, to be industrious, to grow wheat and other good things as the
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Europeans do’’. Chapter six deals more fully with Māori acceptance and support of Grey’s authority.

Support also extended around the edges of empire. In 1853 the Reverend John Inglis wrote to Grey from the New Hebrides:

For a long period & in many ways, you have proved yourself to be the sincere & enlightened friend of the aboriginal races; and my earnest prayer to Almighty God is, that in all your benevolent efforts on their behalf you may be guided by divine wisdom, & sustained by divine power, & be largely comforted by the approving smiles of Him who “hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth”.

In 1863 David Livingstone wrote to encourage Grey in his difficult second governorship of New Zealand. His letter discussed British politics and the decline of the slave trade, concluding “[i]f you still wish to do us a good turn write a line, for a word from you is ever valuable and exhilarating”.

**Imperial Power**

While individual relationships provided practical and emotional support for protagonists of empire such as Grey, together they formed an enormous information-gathering machine. Collected and collated, information about other peoples and other places constituted both cultural and actual capital for extending Britain’s power.

Much of the material collected by missionaries, officials, colonists and explorers on the peripheries ended up in metropolitan museums. In the nineteenth century museums flourished as expressions of post-Enlightenment zeal for collecting and classifying, and for advancing the project of encyclopaedic knowledge. Their displays and their processes epitomised the cult of Victorian progress. In his biography of Richard Owen, Nicholas Rupke analyses museums as loci of intellectual wealth and imperial power. The possession and display of new, rare or interesting specimens enhanced a museum’s institutional ranking and extended the cultural reach of the nation it served. The quality of every European nation’s museum collection was
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understood to bear “a direct relationship to the level of civilisation of each national community”. Rupke quotes from a speech Owen made in 1842 at the Hunterian Museum:

Collections of natural objects, selected for their significance, rarity, or beauty, have ever been regarded as the signs and ornaments of civilised nations; and, though at first viewed with feelings of curiosity and wonder, they soon became recognised as important aids to the acquisition of intellectual wealth.

Grey was just one of many collectors operating for Owen on the periphery. In 1839 he forwarded two large cases of Australian specimens and received an enthusiastic reply: “All the specimens which you sent were new to us, or of great rarity; and what is more to the purpose of much utility”. Owen’s acquisition policy for the Hunterian and later the British Museum of Natural History was “part of a planned, systematic enrichment of the collections to establish national hegemony, international parity and imperial grandeur”.

Information was thus a means of elevating Britain’s status among the civilised nations of Europe, and of extending its symbolic power over the peripheries. Tom Griffiths writes that museums “became institutional scrapbooks of nature and culture, presenting the newly conquered globe in microcosm”. Within the museum, scientists described, compared and named ‘new’ species from the peripheries. Stafford describes naming as an “act of supreme ego .... of cultural imposition and of despoliation”. In naming new species, British scientists demonstrated intellectual control over foreign matter, claiming new territories on behalf of the empire by “representing them with English terms”.

George Grey’s correspondence with the British Museum reflects the complex cultural processes involved in collecting information about the peripheries of empire. In February 1842 John Edward Gray of the British Museum wrote to thank Grey for a small box of specimens: “they proved most interesting: both appear to be new specimens, and the smaller one would have been quite a new genus if it had arrived only a week sooner”. A Frenchman had shown Gray drawings of a similar specimen only days before, establishing his own right to describe and name the genus
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and claim the glory for himself and his country.  

In August 1842 Grey sent a box containing forty three specimens of Australian natural history to the British Museum. He believed that most, if not all, were new specimens. Recognising the prestige involved in classifying and naming such specimens, Grey requested that his friend Robert Gould be allowed to examine and describe the birds, and that Mr Gray of the Zoology department be allowed to examine and describe the marsupial rats and mammals found to be new.  

In November 1843 George Robert Gray, also of the British Museum, wrote to thank Grey for another gift of bird specimens. They were “highly interesting and a grand addition to our national collection”. Several had “hitherto been great desiderati to the Museum”. Gray stressed “how important and valuable” Grey’s specimens were to the “cause of science”. In 1850 Grey forwarded three small rat-like animals preserved in spirits, and a small box of newly discovered shells. He was sorry to have no more “valuable contribution to the National Collections”, but assured Gray that he missed “no opportunity of obtaining any new specimens”. Grey was keenly aware of his specimens’ value in scientific, intellectual and cultural terms.

Information from the peripheries was essential to the process of understanding and symbolically controlling other peoples and places, but it also played a crucial role in forming British identity. Specimens and observations about other places were used to build and maintain a vision of Britain as civilised in contrast to her uncivilised colonies, Christian in contrast to their heathenism, and progressive in contrast to their backwardness. Britain was envisaged as the centre of an empire ordained by God to control and civilise native peoples. John Barnard Davis’ letters to George Grey reveal the way scientific specimens were interpreted as evidence of British superiority. Davis was a prominent British craniologist who enlisted Grey and others on the periphery to collect skulls. In an 1853 letter Davis described his findings on sawing open an Australian skull. In confirmation of Richard Owen’s researches he found that the Australian skull lacked frontal sinuses, a striking contrast with the “very spacious” frontal sinuses in the crania of ancient Britons. In 1854 Davis wrote to thank Grey for the skull of a Ngati Awa mar,
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“a highly interesting specimen and quite welcome to me”. The skull was typical of Māori skulls with “contracted and depressed forehead, and considerable bulk of the posterior regions ... Our ancient British ancestors, who have been compared with the Māoris, had vastly finer Skulls than this”.

Being concrete and durable, specimens were relatively easy to analyse, but the less tangible information collected on the peripheries of empire was no less important as cultural capital. Thomas Richards describes the vast amount of information collected and ordered through the networks of Englishmen and women on the peripheries as an “imperial archive”. He argues that real control of its colonies was out of the question, so Britain unified the empire through a fantasy of control based on the acquisition and monopoly of knowledge. Officials like Grey and private individuals gathered all manner of natural, historical and cultural information. “They surveyed and they mapped. They took censuses, produced statistics. They made vast lists of birds. Then they shoved the data they had collected into a shifting series of classifications”. They created one of the most “data-intensive” empires in history, relying on “detail as the sign of truth”. The imperial archive to which Grey and his web contributed was much more than a collection of specimens in museums. “The archive was not a building, nor even a collection of facts, but the collectively imagined junction of all that was known or knowable, a fantastic representation of an epistemological master pattern, a virtual focal point for the heterogeneous local knowledge of metropolis and empire”. Scientific specimens and museums were visual symbols of a much more complicated and extensive process of gathering and interpreting information as a means of extending Britain’s cultural dominion.

While substantive control of the empire’s colonies was always an unattainable fantasy, it remained the manifest goal of colonial governors like Grey. The information gathered by scientists, missionaries and officials around the world and sent back to Britain was enormously valuable in a utilitarian as well as a cultural sense. The transformation of knowledge about other peoples into a commodity can be traced to the sixteenth century rise of mercantile capitalism in northern Europe. Accurate information became crucial “in the work of trading and fighting with
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unfamiliar people all over the world". In the nineteenth century it was crucial to the commercial and military aspects of empire building, as well as to colonisation, civilisation, and Christian conversion.

Information about the terrain, climate, resources and native inhabitants of alien lands was a vital prerequisite for assessing their suitability for British occupation. In the late 1830s Grey led a series of exploring expeditions in Australia, funded for just this purpose. He was commissioned to seek out suitable new sites for British settlement and to acquaint the natives with the prospect of British occupation. He was also to gather information of potential economic significance; to assess whether Australia boasted gold or mineral reserves or productive farmland that British settlers might exploit for the empire’s gain.

In Grey’s first governorship of New Zealand, information about Māori culture and their movements and intentions in war was crucial to establishing and exercising British control. Grey learnt the language and collected ethnographic material out of personal interest but also from political necessity. To establish effective British government he needed to understand Māori motivations and priorities and be able to communicate clearly and effectively the motivations and priorities of the British empire. As David Chidester argues, the human sciences were used around the empire to compose a “rhetoric of control”, a discourse about others that reinforced their colonial containment.

In war-time Grey gathered strategic information about Māori positions and movements from his web of missionary informants. CMS missionary Richard Taylor was a close friend and confidant who acted as mediator and interpreter for Grey during the Māori uprisings at Upper Hutt in 1846. Methodist missionary Benjamin Ashwell provided detailed information of inter-tribal disputes during 1849-1850. John Morgan, a Wesleyan missionary in the Waikato, wrote to Grey in 1851 describing increasing conflict between Māori and Pākehā and lamenting the
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negative influence of alcohol. He urged the appointment of a resident Justice of the Peace in the area. Reverend John Whitely kept Grey similarly informed about the region surrounding his mission at Kawhia. He too reported on inter-tribal disputes, encouraging Grey to intervene. During Grey’s second New Zealand governorship Whitely and other missionaries provided detailed reports of Māori movements and strategies in the lead up to war. Though missionaries were Grey’s most valuable informants they were not simply co-opted into the imperial war machine. Their humanitarian values and goals were closely aligned with Grey’s political objectives. During the Hutt disturbances in the late 1840s Richard Taylor spent a great deal of time with the Governor and Mrs Grey: “I was much pleased with both of them. The Governor was very unreserved in his conversation & appears to have the true welfare of the Natives at heart. I think the true way also of shewing it”. Taylor and his colleagues assisted Grey as part of their own agenda for establishing peace and promoting Christianity and civilisation.

Grey employed his web of information-gatherers to similar effect in South Africa. David Chidester uses Grey’s governorship of Cape Colony between 1854-1861 to demonstrate the entanglement of comparative religion and imperialism. He argues that governors and officials on the periphery enabled and extended the production of useful knowledge for empire through the power relations they maintained between colonisers and colonised. At the same time, the information they collected sustained and reinforced those relations. Before implementing his system of magisterial rule in the eastern Cape, for example, Grey commissioned a thorough investigation of native laws and customs. He used the resulting report, compiled from Resident Magistrates’ testimonies, to justify his imposition of British legal institutions on the native people. Grey also used his network of imperial connections to promote commercial growth in the Cape. In 1855, for example, he wrote to the Colonial Secretary in Melbourne requesting specimens of the ores and minerals found in South Australian copper mines. He intended the
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specimens to be displayed in the new museum in Cape Town where they would illustrate mineralogy and provide useful information for South African copper miners.\(^{105}\)

In his biography of Roderick Murchison, Robert Stafford discusses information as cultural capital, but emphasises its utilitarian purposes. Stafford argues that in the nineteenth century era of laissez faire, science had to demonstrate its usefulness in order to survive.\(^{106}\) Murchison was the quintessential scientist of empire, using institutional connections and utilitarian arguments to bind nineteenth century science and empire together in a mutually beneficial coalition. As the President of the Royal Geographical Society he played a crucial role in backing Grey’s 1836 Australian expedition. The society offered practical help and sent a statement of endorsement to the Colonial Office, claiming that Grey’s expedition would further the science of geography and produce “important and advantageous results, as regard the spread of civilisation in this great country and at the same time conduce to the benefit of the commercial interests of Great Britain and of India”.\(^{107}\) In a 1999 article on ‘Scientific Exploration and Empire’ Stafford identifies knowledge as a form of capital. He describes Western explorers as exploiters who “took hostages in the form of data”. Once concentrated in Europe, scientific and commercial data “helped tip the balance of power against the indigenous peoples of other continents, whose control over their destinies could be eroded as surely by map coordinates and museum specimens as by steamships, bullets and treaties of cession”.\(^{108}\)

Indigenous peoples often played a crucial role in collecting that data. Grey’s correspondence includes an enormous number of Māori letters that have yet to be transcribed. Māori friends and informants assisted him in scientific and political affairs. Wiremu Maihi Te Rangikaheke of Ngati Rangiwhewehi\(^ {109}\) was Grey’s main source of ethnographical information. During his first governorship of New Zealand Grey retained Te Rangikaheke on an annual salary, providing living quarters for himself and his family at Government House. Te Rangikaheke acted as language tutor, and collected and recorded a vast number of Māori legends and waiata on Grey’s behalf. Most of the traditions in Grey’s *Nga Moteatea* (1851), *Nga Mahinga A Nga Tupuna*

\(^{105}\) Colonial Secretary, Cape Town to Colonial Secretary, Melbourne, 1 October 1855, Papers relating to Grey in the Chief Secretary’s Office Archives up to 1855, Sir George Grey Papers 1840-1856, ATL.


\(^{107}\) J. Washington, Secretary, Royal Geographical Society to George Grey, 1 December 1836, GL.W9(2), APL.


\(^{109}\) An Arawa tribe from Lake Rotoiti. Te Rangikaheke was known to Europeans as William Marsh.
(1854) and *Polynesian Mythology* (1855) were recorded by Te Rangihauke. Te Rangihauke described their relationship as warm and collaborative. "We ate together every day of the week; we talked together, played together, were happy together. His kindness to me was like his kindness to his own child, his younger brother or relation". Like Grey, Te Rangihauke was keenly attuned to the political purposes of ethnographic collecting. Grey saw an understanding of Māori language and traditions as vital to his role in protecting Māori interests and extending Crown authority. Te Rangihauke believed it was his own role to aid the Governor in securing Māori their rights under the Treaty of Waitangi. In July 1850 he wrote to the Queen "explaining that the Governor had the double task of looking after Māori and Pākehā" and that "matters within the Māori realm had been neglected under the Queen's rule". Te Rangihauke suggested that Māori matters had been overlooked because "the Governor did not yet know the language and customs of the Māori; he was therefore living with the Governor to teach him". As a tribal leader and government official in the 1850s and 1860s he actively opposed the King movement, choosing to work for Māori interests within European structures of authority. For Te Rangihauke, the Treaty of Waitangi signified an end to tribal wars and cannibalism, arms sales and alcohol, the return of land wrongly acquired by Pākehā buyers, and the introduction of roads, commerce, and justice. He did, however, mourn the loss of Māori land, the double standard of missionaries and settlers, and the general upheaval of Māori society under British government. Te Rangihauke’s collaboration with Grey represented an attempt to further Māori political goals within the framework of British imperial expansion.

Grey’s other main sources of Māori tradition were Hohepa Paraone of Te Ngae, Matene Te Whiwhi, nephew of Te Rangihaeata of Ngati Toa, Hori Patara of Ngati Toa, and Wiremu Taiko and Piri Kawau of Atawau. Like Te Rangihauke, Piri Kawau became a close friend. He had been to England and Germany in the early 1840s, returning home to a position as Grey’s
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secretary and interpreter in 1847.\textsuperscript{119} When Grey left New Zealand in 1853 Kau became him to England, where he probably worked on the proofs of \textit{Nga Moteatea} and \textit{Nga Mahinga A Nga Tupuna}.\textsuperscript{120} When Grey travelled to South Africa, Kau went too. In the Cape Colony he offered himself as living proof of native civilisation, entreaty African audiences to listen to their new governor and “give up fighting and other evil and foolish practices”. “I would ask, when do you intend to adopt the ways of civilisation?” he queried at a meeting of the Fingoes of Beaufort.\textsuperscript{121} Kau offered explicit support for Grey’s imperial agenda in South Africa and in New Zealand. After fifteen months at the Cape, he returned home with Grey’s injunction “Go to the people, bearing my loving remembrances to my Māori friends, and see whether the good seed sown in New Zealand is growing”.\textsuperscript{122} Finding “all barren and old absurdities being revived”, Kau urged his people to attend to Governor Gore Brown and respect him as a parent.\textsuperscript{123}

During his first governorship of New Zealand Grey forged many close, personal relationships with Māori. Te Whero Whero of Waikato and Tamati Waka Nene of Ngā Puhi provided vital military and political support. Tamati Waka Nene and Te Puni were his esquires when he was knighted. Grey formulated native policy in the context of Māori information. In 1846, for example, he justified arresting Te Rauparaha with reference to Māori letters and testimony from Māori prisoners.\textsuperscript{124} Many Māori viewed him as a father figure.\textsuperscript{125} In July 1852 Hori Niana and Wiremu Tipuna wrote to Grey to tell him about William Colenso’s affair with his Māori maid Ripeka.\textsuperscript{126} They had accepted Grey within their own networks of moral and political authority. These relationships deserve much fuller attention, but even a brief analysis of English language sources shows that Grey’s Māori networks were vital to his science and his government. All around the empire, scientists and officials like Grey were profoundly dependent on indigenous agents for information and advice. Though dominated by Englishmen, the web of empire composed a rich depth of layered and inter-connected multi-racial networks.
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The information collected and classified by men like Murchison at the metropole and Te Rangikaheke on the periphery extended British control in fantasy and in fact. Cultural and economic capital were two sides of the same coin. Imperial exploration and domination of native peoples created the context for establishing intellectual authority over new regions. The symbolic process of collecting, classifying, preserving and displaying information about those regions was itself a means of legitimating Britain’s right to territorial control. The imperial archive was a force of cultural, political, military and commercial imperialism.

Networks of Improvement

Spread from England to the antipodes, Britain’s web of information-gatherers was much more than a mechanism of acquisition. In the post-Enlightenment era of industrialisation and capitalism, most Victorians subscribed to the popular cult of progress. Knowledge was ultimately a mechanism of improvement. Around the globe Englishmen and women collected information to further their own positions, advance abstract concepts of science, alter the natural environment, and elevate mankind. It was a project fractured by conflict and opposition. Towards the end of the century, for example, many Europeans believed that native peoples were incapable of improvement and should be left to die out. Others remained vehemently determined to civilise and Christianise native peoples.

As British citizens enjoying the benefits of industrial growth and rapid technological advances, the men and women in Grey’s web saw nineteenth century British civilisation as the highest point yet reached in the march of progress. Inevitably they imposed their cultural perspectives and values on the project of improvement. They assumed that importing British plants and animals and species defined as useful or aesthetically pleasing according to British priorities would improve colonial landscapes. They assumed that importing Christianity and British civilisation would improve native lives and advance God’s plan for global civilisation.

The notion of improvement was a key theme in the Victorian craze for acclimatisation. British explorers and settlers had always taken ‘useful’ plants and animals wherever they journeyed. In 1837 and 1838 Grey landed dogs, goats and sheep in north-west Australia, and planted a wide
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range of exotic seeds which he envisaged would benefit future colonists. In 1839 he sent fifty
two packets of Australian seeds to the Horticultural Society of London, and received in return a
huge variety of vegetables as well as cucumbers, melons, gourds, strawberries, plums, cherries,
peaches, raspberries, gooseberries, currants, pears, apples, asparagus, rhubarb, a scotch fir,
laburnum, a birch, ar ash and other trees. Ross Galbreath has connected acclimatisation with
the notion of native displacement. Fear of the unknown and nostalgia for English scenery were
also important motives for importing English plants and animals to the colonies. But the letters
that passed between those in Grey’s web of correspondents support Galbreath’s conclusion that
acclimatisation in New Zealand was driven “more by a positive urge towards progress and
civilisation than a negative one of fear of an alien nature”. To Grey and his colleagues,
anglicising the landscape was analogous to improving it, just as anglicising Māori was akin to
civilising them. English flora and fauna also made New Zealand more familiar and comfortable
for English colonists. In November 1849 Archbishop Whately sent Grey a packet of seeds,
including “things commonest here, because, if they succeed, nothing will so much remind people
of old England as hawthorns, hollies, etc.” Sir David Monro, a settler at Nelson, corresponded
with Grey on ornithological matters. He had managed to successfully establish skylarks,
chaffinches, greenfinches, goldfinches, blackbirds, sparrows and other English birds in his
province and offered Grey help in acclimatising English birds on Kawau. John Richardson
Selwyn, George Augustus’s son and the Bishop of Melanesia, asked Grey if it would be possible
to introduce quail on Norfolk Island. “They would be good fun to shoot and a capital addition to
a not very extensive landed”. Acclimatisation was thus a cultural as well as a biological
process; a means of improving life for English settlers by providing opportunities to pursue
traditional English sports. In the tellingly titled New Zealand, or Zealandia, The Britain of the
South, published in 1857, Charles Hursthouse advocated the introduction of British birds and
game. “We go to the ‘Britain of the South’ to create an estate”, he declared, “- to raise a ‘home’
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wherein to anchor fast and plant our household gods”. Hursthouse believed that English game
would beautify the colonial landscape, provide stimulating recreation for the colonists, and
improve shooting skills, preparing New Zealanders for the future possibility of war. Acclimatisation was part of the process of British colonisation, but its proponents did not restrict
themselves to British species. Grey, for example, introduced birds, animals and plants to Kawau Island from Asia, America, Africa and around the Pacific. As Governor of Cape Colony he introduced common Australian trees including eucalypts and wattles, which he believed would be “of inestimable value to South Africa”. Acclimatisation was a means of asserting imperial
authority over the periphery and of improving colonial resources and settlers’ lifestyles.

In this respect, it was part of the larger project of human improvement. Many of those involved in acclimatisation were also involved in collecting and dispersing ethnographical material. Most in Grey’s network of information-gatherers took the principle of human progress for granted. Many believed that God had ordained, and continued to direct, the process of civilisation. A minority of others believed that man controlled his own destiny. Both groups saw knowledge as the key to human development. The facts they collected and shared formed humanitarian narratives of compassion and progress that operated as “a moral imperative to undertake ameliorative action”.

At a personal, and an imperial level, the men and women in Grey’s web shared information to further the goal of human civilisation. Father Pere Maxime Petit, a Roman Catholic Priest in the Hokianga reported to Grey on the conduct of Māori in his area. In June 1849 he promised to distribute the government paper The Māori Messenger, and to “try to influence the natives to apply the information & advice given to their own better civilisation”. In 1852 Grey sent a package of Māori books to Father Jean Baptiste Comte at Otaki “for the instruction of the natives”. Comte responded with a letter praising the progress Māori had made under Grey’s governorship and thanking him for the books, which would be used to hasten Māori
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civilisation.141 This was the basis of Grey’s relationship with Catholic, Anglican and Methodist missionaries in New Zealand: the common goal of native conversion and civilisation. Grey’s correspondence with John Coleridge Patteson, Bishop of Melanesia, illustrates the deployment of philology as a tool of evangelisation. Grey and Patteson discussed native languages and exchanged vocabularies.142 Patteson believed that all Melanesian languages shared a similar structure. Once deduced, this basic structure would make it far easier for missionaries to learn the dialects of individual islands and so to convert their inhabitants. Using Grey as a source of philological information Patteson hoped to speed up “the machinery for evangelising” Melanesia.143 Sir William Martin, New Zealand’s first Chief Justice, helped Grey collect ethnographical material, and sent Grey the first draft of his book on Christianity in Europe. His object was “to show the growth of the Christian faith & its victory over Heathenism in Europe ... & also to exhibit the process by which the new Commonwealths of Christian Europe were raised up to take the place of the worn out pagan Empire”. Martin hoped to put “before the natives a connected sketch of the leading events in the history of the civilised world”, his narrative of Christian progress serving as example to Māori readers.144 In 1892 John Haslam wrote to Grey on behalf of the Anthropological Institute of Australasia requesting Grey’s patronage and expounding on the purpose of ethnographic research:

> It will cause errors to be corrected, truth to be established; consequently delusions will vanish. It will teach us how to build up a strong & healthy nation & enable those legislators who take the matter up to stamp out crime, beat back insanity, and mould our history into its true sources. As we teach the men to grow, so will the nation follow in the best & truest sense of Freedom, and a happy Kingdom will be able to live on to a greater average length of years.145

Grey himself believed that scientific knowledge could be used to elevate native cultures and to elevate western European culture. The divine law of human progress applied equally to both. Like many contemporaries Grey saw colonisation as the ultimate tool of human improvement. As an explorer in north-west Australia he hoped to find new sites for settlement to alleviate the poverty and over-crowding of Ireland. He also believed that the establishment of British settlements in Australia would improve the landscape through processes such as acclimatisation,
and elevate the natives. As Governor of New Zealand, Grey used applied knowledge in the form of schools, hospitals and industry to civilise Māori. He used politics, libraries, schools and scientific societies to elevate Pākehā. Grey believed that Māori culture was inferior to British culture, but that British culture had passed through the same state in an earlier time. Western Europeans were not innately superior; they simply had a head-start in the climb towards Christian civilisation.

The APS shared Grey’s goals. Though its founder, T. F. Buxton, initially opposed emigration, the APS quickly came to accept colonisation as inevitable. In their arguments for native protection they pushed the connection between capitalist and humanitarian interests:

"The native savage, whose destruction costs powder and ball and human life, is converted into a profitable customer as soon as he is induced to give the productions of his country for a red handkerchief to adorn his head, or a piece of calico to encircle his waist. And in proportion as his desires are raised to other objects, for use of ornament, his preservation becomes a desirable object to his present destroyer ..."  

But the main purpose of the APS was to promote the “preservation and improvement” of native peoples. In its annual report of 1845, the APS acknowledged the importance of scientific collecting and theory to the process of human advancement. “Yet how little has been done to obtain a knowledge of the mental peculiarities of the different races, or even to acquire a practically useful acquaintance with the prejudices and usages which obstruct the progress of those who have to deal with uncivilised tribes for the single and laudable purpose of promoting their welfare”. They hailed the burgeoning international science of ethnology as a remedy to this deficit in the “natural history of the human race." In 1865 Thomas Hodgkin, Secretary of the APS, wrote to George Grey in a tone of intimate friendship, recognising their shared agenda of improvement. He expressed support for Grey against his detractors and encouraged him to pursue his native policies with the utmost haste. Hodgkins agreed with Grey that Māori required “protection – & also preparation – for such advancement as they may be allowed to make” and discussed specific measures such as land regularisation, retaining Māori affairs under imperial control, and granting Māori electoral franchise, which might foster such goals.
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John Inglis was a Scottish missionary in the New Hebrides whose correspondence with Grey similarly reflects the crossovers between science, politics and religion in the cause of Christian civilisation. The pair met in 1850 through Colonial Secretary Dr Andrew Sinclair. Inglis was working as a missionary in the Manawatu and supplied the government with information about the movements of Māori rebels in the area. In later life he remarked that Grey had been his "steadfast friend ever since", supporting and encouraging his mission in the New Hebrides.\textsuperscript{152}

When Inglis moved to Aneiteum he sent Grey an array of scientific specimens including publications in the native language, a stone adze, stone idols and a specimen of plaited hair.\textsuperscript{153} He also sent him meteorological data and ethnographical observations.\textsuperscript{154} The dominant theme in Inglis’s letters was civilisation. He understood that the information he collected for Grey was not just abstract or academic, but part of the process of understanding and improving native peoples. In 1853 he wrote of the changes taking place in native life. Christian converts now dressed in European style instead of going naked. The islands were at peace. They had abandoned such customs as cannibalism, infanticide and the strangulation of widows, or at least concealed “the most revolting practices of the heathens”. Even commerce was thriving: “with the security of life & property the spirit of industry is being fast awakened, & food is becoming greatly more plentiful than in the days of heathenism”.\textsuperscript{155} Inglis was a fervent imperialist, and believed that British rule would extend and protect these concrete improvements in native life. With the threat of French occupation he urged Grey to induce the British government to take formal possession of the New Hebrides.\textsuperscript{156} It is unclear whether Grey petitioned Britain on Inglis’s behalf, but he certainly campaigned for imperial expansion in the Pacific. He and Inglis saw British control as a means of protecting, converting and civilising native peoples.

In New Zealand, CMS missionary Octavius Hadfield was one of Grey’s closest friends and supporters.\textsuperscript{157} Hadfield borrowed philological texts from the Governor, sent his own observations in return, offered advice on Māori policy, and kept Grey well informed of the state
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and mood of Māori in the Otaki region. Like Grey, he espoused liberal Anglican principles of religious tolerance, expressing sympathy to dissenters and enjoying their fellowship in bible study groups. Hadfield’s correspondence with Grey was based on a shared commitment to Māori conversion and civilisation. In 1847 he wrote to Grey “I see daily more & more clearly that any thing might be done with the natives, that is, towards their improvement, by unswervingly pursuing a course grounded on philosophical principles and a knowledge of human nature”. Reiterating the same themes in an 1849 letter, Hadfield also drew attention to the widespread apathy and hostility many Europeans maintained towards Māori. Though he and Grey shared a firm belief in “the improvability of man” and “a strong sense of duty” towards human civilisation, others focused on improving their own lot, and as the century progressed, more and more came to see native extirpation as a natural and inevitable process. Hadfield’s letter is a reminder that humanitarianism was only one expression of the Victorian passion for progress.

Relying on each other for practical and emotional support, the men and women in Grey’s web of information gatherers were all implicated in the Victorian project of imperial improvement. An oxymoron to many in the twenty-first century, ‘imperial improvement’ lay at the heart of Grey’s correspondence with other Englishmen and women around the globe. The process of acquiring cultural, political and military authority over foreign lands was crucial to dominating and exploiting the native inhabitants. It was also crucial to the humanitarian agenda of equality and aid. To men like Grey, imperial control was the necessary precursor for implementing God’s plan of human civilisation. However far-reaching and traumatic its consequences, nineteenth century British imperialism was underpinned and encouraged at personal and cultural levels by the concept of human improvement.

Centre and Periphery

Though the members of Grey’s web were unified by common cultural values and goals the web itself was predicated on distance. Explorers, missionaries, government officials and settlers on the edges of empire occupied a radically different physical and cultural space to their colleagues.
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in Britain. Distance from home and interaction with other environments and peoples altered their perspectives in subtle and dramatic ways. Some found themselves sympathising and identifying with indigenous peoples, while others reacted against the unfamiliar with nostalgia for England and contempt for all things native. The physical and cultural distance between England and her colonies opened up a contested space for debating the relationship between centre and periphery. Whether speaking of politics or science, historians have traditionally drawn lines of authority extending from Britain out to the edges of empire. This distorted image unhelpfully reflects imperial values and expectations. Information did not follow a simple route from discrete facts collected in the colonies to integrated and meaningful knowledge in Britain. The information collated in Britain was necessarily a mediated encounter with the alien Other. The mediators, men like Grey, wielded far more power than has hitherto been acknowledged.

In the nineteenth century, distance was a basic fact of empire. Many of the men and women with whom Grey corresponded were vast distances from Europe and from each other. Ship travel was slow, uncomfortable and expensive, so letters were their primary means of communication. During Grey’s first governorship of New Zealand it took about six months for letters to travel from New Zealand to England and another six months to receive a reply. Grey’s correspondence with the Colonial Office highlights the complications this time frame imposed on colonial rule. His correspondence with friends and family reveals a deep and sometimes overwhelming sense of personal loneliness. Yet Grey’s letters also reveal a profound sense of connection with those in his web. Physical distance did not entail cultural isolation. Grey saw himself as part of a close and cooperative community of like-minded men and women working together for the same goals. Living and working on the peripheries, Grey and his colleagues were representatives of empire; in Robert Stafford’s terms, they were “living projections of Europe”.\(^{62}\) It was their distance from Europe and their encounters with other societies that created the excitement and tensions in their lives and in their letters.

Distance also affected the power dynamics between those at the centre and those on the peripheries. Traditional representations depict explorers, missionaries, and colonial officials as subservient fact accumulators serving the needs of their metropolitan superiors. Imperial assumptions led British and colonial historians to see London as the hub of an information
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gathering wheel rather than a central intersection in a complicated web. They ascribed the metropole complete power in the process of directing research overseas, interpreting colonial data and producing theory. George Basalla’s influential model for describing the spread of western science identifies three overlapping phases to describe the shifting relationship between centre and periphery. First, the non-scientific society provides a source for European science; second, colonial science expands but remains dependent on European science; and third, scientists in the colony struggle to achieve an independent scientific culture. Recent criticisms suggest a much more complicated relationship between colonial and metropolitan science. Roy MacLeod compos an alternative model with five different stages, placing intellectual colonisation within the context of political and economic realities. He emphasises colonial deference and metropolitan manipulation, but also acknowledges the increasing influence of colonial science on scientific debates and theory. Barry Butcher takes the argument further, questioning the accepted model of colonial subservience with its assumption that “geographical peripherality implies intellectual peripherality”. Butcher analyses Charles Darwin’s correspondence with nineteenth century Australian scientists to build a more complicated model allowing for both deferential and collaborative relationships between centre and periphery. As David Miller argues for an earlier period, collectors and classifiers formed a spectrum of activity rather than a simplistic dichotomy. Whether in London or Australia, they were all engaged in the same fundamental endeavour.

Richard Owen, one of the most influential figures in nineteenth century British science, acknowledged this reality in an 1850 article published in the Quarterly Review. He argued that museum and field naturalists complemented each other. The field naturalist “goes forth to the far wilderness … or the trackless forest, the denizens of which he finds in the full exercise of their faculties, unchecked by the encroachment and unmodified by the influence of civilised man”. The museum naturalist “has a narrower walk of research, but his more finished labours, again, are
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essentially ancillary to the other’s rough drafts from living Nature”. Owen’s correspondence with Grey also illuminates the mutually beneficial contract between centre and periphery. Describing himself as a “great friend and admirer”, Owen esteemed George Grey “as a typical cosmopolitan Englishman”. In 1839 Grey wrote to Owen from Mauritius promising to collect specimens from Swan River, “and you shall make up for it by spending an hour or two in giving me explanations when I return to England”. Owen was enormously grateful for Grey’s specimens and promised that when he returned to England “you will find a large balance of time placed to your account to draw upon for explanation or corrobories on any point that may have interested you in physiology [sic]”. During Grey’s first governorship of New Zealand Owen wrote to congratulate him on his successful administration and to enlist his aid and advice in “completing the anatomical history of the Apteryx & Dinornis”. In 1875 Owen wrote to a metropolitan colleague that “[o]n general principles I think it desirable to encourage the local museums in our remote Colonies, and to meet liberally their propositions to exchange”. Owen understood that his own researches relied completely on those carried out at the periphery.

Power did not reside solely in institutional positions. In a study of Joseph Banks’ collecting, David Miller counterpoises the power of position with the power of activity. Power lay not only in official titles, but in the process of collecting, organising and deploying information. To the power of position and the power of activity, I would add the power of location. Metropolitan scientists enjoyed the advantages of learned societies, scientific clubs and museum resources purely by virtue of location. Colonial collectors, on the other hand, enjoyed the unique advantages of isolation. Their thin scattering around the edges of empire ensured a constant demand for their specimens and observations. Their power as collectors was further enhanced by interpretive power. For the information sent back to Europe was mediated through their personalities and priorities. Without the resources of museums and colleagues immediately available, collectors on the spot decided which specimens were worth collecting and what information was significant enough to mention. In the way they presented their material they
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often added a further element of interpretation, beginning the process of classification before their specimens and observations even left the peripheries.

Sometimes collectors on the periphery had an even more direct impact on European perceptions. Some scientists, missionaries and officials simply collected and conveyed information but others interpreted and applied it more explicitly, affecting not only perceptions, but sometimes even policy. George Grey’s ‘Report upon the best means of promoting the civilisation of the Aboriginal inhabitants of Australia’ is a prime example. Compiled from Grey’s observations as an imperial explorer in Australia, the report outlines specific policy recommendations for Australian race relations within a strong humanitarian framework. It was addressed to Lord John Russell, Secretary of State for the Colonies, who was so impressed with Grey’s suggestions that he sent copies to the Governors of all the Australasian colonies. It was also the basis on which Grey was granted the opportunity to implement his plan as Governor of South Australia.

Grey’s correspondence with scientists at the metropole similarly highlights the complicated relationship between centre and periphery. Though he kept collections for himself and for colonial museums, Grey sent all his new and significant discoveries back to England. Scientists such as Darwin, Lyell, Owen and the Hookers were more qualified and had more readily accessible resources than he or anyone else on the periphery to assess their importance and integrate them into the imperial archive. Yet Grey does not fit the traditional model of colonial deference.

Grey was highly respected at the metropole, viewed not only as a collector of important data, but also as a valued colleague. One of Grey’s friends in London in the 1830s was Charles Darwin. When Grey went overseas the pair maintained only a sporadic correspondence, but the dominant theme in their letters is mutual respect. In 1846 Grey opened a parcel of books from his London publisher and found to his great surprise a series of letters between Darwin and Captain John Lort Stokes, Commander of the Beagle during Grey’s voyage to Australia. The letters concerned Stoke’s disagreements with Grey over their Australian expeditions. Grey returned the letters to Darwin with a polite note of inquiry. In November Darwin wrote back “much mortified”,
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apologising for the incident and assuring Grey of his admiration; "... though I am not presumptuous enough to suppose that you can care much for my opinion of your work on Australia, it is a satisfaction to me to be enabled to name to myself many individuals to whom I have expressed my strong opinion of the many high qualities shown in your work". He described Grey’s account of the Australian Aborigines as “one of the most able ever written”.\(^\text{177}\)

Obviously satisfied, Grey wrote back offering any assistance he might give in Darwin’s natural history researches. Darwin responded with a long letter about two general subjects of scientific interest in New Zealand. First, the limestone caves near the Bay of Islands, and second, the presence of "erratic boulders" in New Zealand and their connection to world climate change.\(^\text{178}\)

Darwin wrote again to Grey as Governor of Cape Colony, this time requesting specimens. He specifically desired the skeletons of African breeds of domestic pigeons in his search for variation among domestic animals: "I have during many years, been collecting all the facts & reasoning which I could, in regard to the variation & origin of species, intending to give as far as lies in my power, the many difficulties surrounding the subject on all sides".\(^\text{179}\) Once again the tone is highly respectful. Darwin commends Grey’s papers on the natural history of Ceylon, applauds his “love and zeal” for science and begs forgiveness for his liberty in requesting Grey’s help. Even more significantly, this is one of the first occasions Darwin used the phrase “origin of species”. It was several more years until any but his closest friends were made aware of Darwin’s doubts about the fixity of species.\(^\text{180}\)

Mutual respect and reciprocity also characterised Grey’s relationship with William and Joseph Hooker of Kew Gardens. Specimens passed both ways, with Grey sending plants from the antipodes and the Hookers sending tobacco, grasses from the Falkland Islands, Indian seeds and iris roots to establish in New Zealand and South Africa.\(^\text{181}\) In April 1853 William thanked Grey for a “beautiful packet of mosses” accompanied by “truly excellent drawings” by Dr Knight, surgeon, botanist, and Auditor General during Grey’s first governorship of New Zealand. William wrote that even with the aid of microscopes no scientist in England could have produced such fine drawings: “They are the very perfection of Cryptogamic Botany & the young Colony
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may well be proud of such a man of science & such an artist”. In 1860, when Grey was Governor of South Africa, William acknowledged Grey’s role in promoting the progress of colonial and imperial science. Cape botany was progressing “most satisfactorily” under Grey’s “generous auspices”. “Collectors (who will bye & bye be Botanists) are springing up in all directions of the Colony from Cape Town to the northern boundary, Colesberg, & to the extreme east of Natal & are sending their contributions to me …” The Hookers also kept Grey up to date on scientific developments in England. In 1868 Joseph wrote “Science jogs on here much as usual, Darwinism still is the leading topic …. Now Darwin is at work on a book on man! which will I expect, turn the scientific and theological worlds upside down”. Joseph was also interested in ethnography, asking Grey to find information about “the tying of the naval cord” in savage cultures.

Grey’s correspondence with the pre-eminent Victorian geologist Charles Lyell followed similar lines. Grey provided Lyell with specimens and Lyell gave Grey the kinds of practical and spiritual support discussed above. Lyell’s letters indicate a high regard for Grey’s scientific acumen. In January 1843 he thanked Grey for a box of fossil shells and complemented him on the “very accurate opinion” he had formed on them. In the same letter he praised Grey’s Australian journals as the most interesting travel book he had ever read. The pair met to discuss science whenever Grey was in England.

When the contract of mutual support between centre and periphery was broken tension inevitably surfaced. In his letters to John Gould, eminent British ornithologist and Curator of the Zoological Society Museum, Grey expresses indignation and exasperation at being excluded from the processes of metropolitan science. After sending Gould a huge number of specimens and receiving no acknowledgement, Grey huffed “If you are so idle, you cannot expect me to send anything to you. I am just going off on an excursion when I have no doubt I shall get many new birds; but I will not write to you again until I hear from you”. Later he wrote again:
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I felt much disappointed at not having received the books from you before, as well as at
your not having written to me. I wrote you a long letter in August last informing you that
I had sent a large box of specimens to the British Museum - There were a good many
birds which I believe to be new amongst them, and I requested the Trustees to allow you
to describe them – By the Taglioni which sails in a month I will send you some specimens
direct – but if you expect anything from me you must keep up a constant correspondence
with me – let me know what is new – what is rare, that I may send home – what are the
names you give the new animals – and which are those whose habits, &c. you want
described. I like working, but I don’t like to work in the dark – Natural history is my only
recreation here, and I have now immense collections in every branch – all of which are at
the service of those I know in Europe – if they will only keep me au fait at what is going
on in the scientific world.189

Grey’s sense of grievance reflects his expectation of support from the metropolitan centre. When
his networks failed, as with Gould, Grey was left feeling stranded on the periphery, longing for
connection and recognition. Yet Gould was fully conscious of the debt he owed George Grey. In
the preface to his widely celebrated Birds of Australia Gould acknowledges Grey’s importance to
imperial science:

Much valuable information has been communicated to me by George Grey, Esq. ... whose exertions during his expedition along the north-western coasts of Australia were characterised by a degree of energy of character and perseverance but rarely equaled; whose ornithological collection made during this arduous enterprise, although small, was by no means destitute of interest; and who, upon succeeding Colonel Gawler in the Governorship of South Australia, found time amidst his multifarious occupations to devote considerable attention to Natural History ...190

Humanitarian and scientific societies at the metropole also recognised Grey’s status. The APS
listed Grey as an Honorary and corresponding member, and continually lauded his efforts on
behalf of native races even when they disagreed with specific policies.191 In 1854 the
Philological Society of London elected him as an honorary member, and the Royal Society of
Northern Antiquities of Copenhagen as a Fellow.192 In 1858 the Royal Society of Physicians of
Vienna and the Royal Geographical Society of Vienna both elected him an honorary member.193
Grey spoke at ‘The Great Zambezi Meeting’ at Oxford in 1859 to launch the Universities’
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Mission to Central Africa. He was among illustrious company. Prince Alfred was the mission’s patron, and the other two speakers were William Gladstone, an influential politician soon to be Prime Minister, and Samuel Wilberforce, Lord Bishop of Oxford. In 1860 he was awarded the London Zoological Society’s Silver Medal and elected a Fellow of the Ethnological Society of London. In 1869 the British Association for the Advancement of Science (BAAS) nominated him Vice President of the Geographical Section. In the same year he addressed a “meeting of the mechanics and labouring classes at Exeter Hall” on the topics of emigration and colonisation. In later life Grey was inundated with invitations to speak at scientific meetings in and around London. In 1869 he was invited to speak at the Ethnological Society, “the longer the better”, by President T. H. Huxley. In 1894 the Geographical Societies of Liverpool, Tyneside and Manchester all asked him to speak.

Grey exercised and displayed his power from the periphery in numerous publications. Though he sent information home for others to classify and describe, Grey retained control over specific areas of personal interest and established himself as an authority in ethnography. His list of publications includes *A Vocabulary of the Dialects of South Western Australia* (1840), *Journals of Two Expeditions of Discovery in North-West and Western Australia* (1841), *Polynesian Mythology and Ancient Traditional History of the New Zealand race* (1855), a paper on ‘Quartzite Implements from the Cape of Good Hope’ (1869), and a paper ‘On the Social Life of the Ancient Inhabitants of New Zealand, and on the National Character it was likely to form’ published in *The Journals of the Ethnological Society of London* (1869). Though all these publications were informed by humanitarian principles, other texts focused more overtly on human suffering and improvement, including *The Policy of the Future Not Class Against Class*
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Robert Stafford argues that “the lines of scientific authority in the empire ... paralleled those of political authority for much of the nineteenth century”. Stafford presents Roderick Murchison as the ultimate figure of metropolitan authority, maintaining dominance over the periphery through influence and patronage. His analysis depicts authority, both political and scientific, emanating from the centre out to the peripheries. In reality, political, scientific and humanitarian relationships were much more complicated. Colonial officials like Grey exerted huge influence on imperial policy, often developing it themselves as the need arose. Local missionaries also influenced imperial policy, providing information and advice through their parent committees in London. In the process of collecting and interpreting specimens and information, those on the peripheries similarly influenced the development of British science. Scientists and officials in London were utterly dependent on their colleagues in the peripheries. Even with the introduction of steam in the middle of the century, and the telegraph at the end of the century, “local knowledge remained indispensable”. Yet deference to the metropole remained a strong theme in nineteenth century imperial relationships. As Tony Ballantyne observes, it “is crucial to recognise the disparities of power inherent within the empire and that many imperial networks, as well as economic power and imperial authority, were concentrated in Britain itself”.

The relationship between centre and periphery was also complicated by the impact of the periphery on its observers. With Cape Colony in the later nineteenth century as his case study, D. M. Schreuder argues that local economic realities shaped the Victorian ‘civilising mission’ in action, into something “more purposeful and crudely energetic” than that contemplated by the
“official mind” in London. Michael Reilly stresses the hybrid state of colonial society, describing the ways in which Europeans were drawn into indigenous cultures. To understand the significance of the information sent back to Europe we must also understand that European travellers and their narratives were profoundly influenced by their interactions with the local environment and people. George Grey, for example, developed huge respect for Māori. He drew on Māori sources for his philological and ethnographical researches, depended initially on Māori interpreters, and sympathised with their aspirations. Ballantyne argues persuasively that colonial frontiers were not only “contact zones where new identities and social formations were fashioned”, but also “productive spaces of intellectual engagement and innovation”.

The periphery’s impact on its observers and their impact on the metropole complicate the traditional model of colonial deference. So too does the flow of information around the outside edges of the imperial web. Michael Hoare examines the inter-colonial science movement in Australia and New Zealand, tracing its roots right back to the 1840s. He argues for the development of a unique Australasian scientific culture well before Basalla’s model of colonial independence would allow. Hoare’s work also emphasises the early growth of a strong scientific tradition in Australasia. Grey’s correspondence supports Hoare’s argument. As Governor of South Australia he served as a gateway for specimens travelling to Europe, but also exchanged specimens with other explorers on his own account. As Governor of New Zealand he played a pivotal role in establishing and supporting colonial scientific societies, particularly the New Zealand Society (NZS), later to become the New Zealand Institute and then the Royal Society of New Zealand. Just as Grey used missionaries as sources, so did the NZS. In 1851, probably at Grey’s suggestion, it issued a circular to missionaries “with a view to obtaining such
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information as they may be in possession of, or may be able to collect in furtherance of the objects of the society". Several missionaries were also members, including William Colenso and Octavius Hadfield. In the late 1860s and 1870s when James Hector was President, Grey continued to support the New Zealand Institute with advice and donations to its museum. Hector wrote to Grey “It is a feeble attempt as far as I am concerned in it, to express how gratified I feel to you personally for: your great kindness and assistance for the great good you have always encouraged me with in the projects for the Museum”. Grey also supported the Wellington Athenaeum and Mechanics Institute, donating books, pamphlets, dried plants and fossils to their collections. He provided the Auckland Museum with cuttings from plants on Kauau and ethnographical specimens, and in 1875 presented a paper at the Auckland Institute on his theory of electricity. Colonial scientists also used Grey’s status to enhance their access to the metropole. In 1853 Charles Heaphy sent manuscript plans of the South Island’s coastline, suggesting that if Grey thought it of value he should transmit it to the Royal Geographical Society. Walter Lawry Buller was a colonial ornithologist based in New Zealand, but desperately eager to achieve renown in Britain. An important supporter, Grey provided introductions to leading scientists in England, critiqued his scientific papers and subscribed to his expensive publications. Grey also served as mentor to Professor A. W. Bickerton of Christchurch. Bickerton sent Grey drafts of his astronomical papers for correction and suggestion, and enlisted Grey’s help to publicise his theories. In 1890 he asked for Grey’s assistance in planning a lecture tour of America and England for publicity purposes, but also to enjoy the benefits of metropolitan scientific culture: “I feel my science to be getting rusty & so wish to polish it up by a sight of the most recent apparatus & by a little intellectual friction”. In 1893 Pastor William Birch wrote to Grey on Bickerton’s behalf, again requesting his support. He specifically wanted introductions to any literary or scientific leaders who would be interested in Bickerton’s theory of partial impact, believing that Grey’s “influence with literary men in
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England would be of the greatest importance to him”.222 Grey was not only part of an imperial web, but also a key driver in the production of local knowledge and the formation of complex information gathering webs within New Zealand.

Grey also exchanged specimens and support with collectors and officials from around the world. Over the course of his career he received information and honours from Australia, Hawaii, Singapore, San Francisco, California, Africa, Japan and the Pacific.223 The enormous range of these letters illustrates the complexity of scientific relations in the nineteenth century. Grey’s official position, his collecting, his publications and his location made him a powerful figure in imperial science, in colonial scientific institutions in New Zealand, and in the wider web of scientists spread around the imperial periphery. Though western science had undergone dramatic processes of professionalisation and institutionalisation in the nineteenth century, there still remained a place for cosmopolitan figures such as Grey.

Though my analysis here focuses more on the relationship between metropolitan and colonial science, I believe that nineteenth century humanitarian dialogues fit the same general pattern. In his study of comparative religion in southern Africa David Chidester explodes the myth of metropolitan dominance, showing that colonised peripheries also functioned as arenas of theory production.224 The links between humanitarianism and comparative religion are strikingly obvious in Grey’s web of correspondents. In 1841, for example, the APS appealed to missionaries to assist metropolitan scientists in the collection of information about native peoples:

The APS appeals, in the first instance, to Christianity, justice, and benevolence; and it also appeals to science for the investigation and preservation of much that is interesting and important in the knowledge of the feeble and scattered families of the human race, all record of which must irrevocably be lost, should they become extinct before this object be effected. And we would remind you how essentially this very knowledge is connected with the cause of religion, by exhibiting to the sceptic the proofs that God “hath made of one blood all nations of men, for to dwell on all the face of the earth”. The existence of these cannot be deduced from speculation; they can only be wrought by the most careful
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and patient collection of facts, of which the apparently trivial may become important as connecting links in the broken chain. In this work, you missionaries have done much, but much more remains to be done ...²²⁵

In light of these connections the relationship between missionary societies at the centre and their missionaries on the periphery, for example, needs much deeper analysis. So too does the relationship between missionaries of different denominations and the relationship between church and state in Britain’s nineteenth century colonies.

Conclusion

Grey and his colleagues on the periphery generally deferred to the metropole as the destination for their collections and the principal source of scientific theory and humanitarian policy. Yet they also engaged in relationships of mutual respect and benefit with each other, and with those at the metropole. Facts and specimens were not just information, but also a form of communication. Those on the periphery and the periphery itself mediated the information that flowed through the web to Britain. They communicated their priorities, judgements and values through the process of selecting and interpreting information, and in doing so helped to shape the dynamics of imperial and colonial power that made their collecting possible.

In Grey’s particular web of correspondents, scientific and humanitarian agendas overlapped significantly. Around the globe Englishmen and women provided each other with practical and spiritual support and enriched the material and cultural resources of the empire. The information they collected and classified was also a tool of improvement. Grey and most of his colleagues subscribed to a teleological view of history that envisaged humankind progressing ever onwards and upwards in the scale of civilisation. In the first half of the nineteenth century most Britons still saw native peoples as part of the wider human family, and British colonisation as the vehicle for incorporating them in the march of progress. It was not until later in the century, that theories of pre-destined native extinction gained ground. Even then, many in Grey’s circle of friends and colleagues continued to use their pool of shared information to further the project of human improvement. In his capacity as colonial governor and as a private individual Grey maximised the opportunities afforded by his postings together with his networks of information-gatherers to

improve the landscape, the settlers and the natives in New Zealand, Australia and South Africa. His ultimate goal was Christian civilisation.

Though they embraced a range of public and political purposes, nineteenth century webs of empire were based on personal relationships. At an individual level, Grey’s correspondents stimulated his thirst for knowledge, spurred his ambition, and reinforced his sense of British authority. They were fundamentally important to his personal sense of self, and to his identity as governor.

226 Grey’s sense of authority, and the role his correspondents played in supporting that authority, is discussed further in chapter six.
Chapter Two
Civilising Schemes: Ethnography and Empire

The quest for Christian civilisation formed the motivating focus of Grey’s career. As ethnographer and imperial official he sought to discern and implement God’s plan for advancing human progress. Like most Victorians, Grey believed that God had laid out natural laws governing the universe. Aided by an imperial web of information-gatherers, he used ethnography to uncover those laws. In Australia Grey developed a theoretical scheme for elevating native peoples. Based on liberal Anglican principles, it was formed in the context of nineteenth century humanitarian ideas about race and civilisation. Grey’s proposal included legal, educational, and industrial measures, together with a system of rewards, to protect native peoples and incorporate them into the socio-economic and cultural structures of Victorian Britain. It was premised on the notion of respect, not so much for aboriginal customs or laws, but for natives as fellow human beings. His official instructions as Governor of New Zealand were consistent with this plan. In the mid-1840s Colonial Office policy was dominated by humanitarian personnel and sentiment. It was also influenced by local information, and by theories like Grey’s, devised in colonial context.

Grey’s scheme for native civilisation and the instructions he received as colonial governor were based on humanitarian ideas about race. Those ideas were fluid and flexible, forming a loosely integrated pool of concepts that Grey deployed according to local circumstance and evolving political priorities. Informed by ethnological enquiry, his liberal Anglican cosmology centred on the monogenist assumption that God had created man, and that all humans shared a common ancestor. Though he believed in the innate equality of humankind, he thought that some races had developed more quickly than others. Grey placed the Anglo-Saxon race at the top of a carefully ordered but flexible hierarchy of cultural development. He believed that races could move up or down the scale of civilisation, and that his task as governor was to prevent degeneration and encourage progress. Grey believed that the best way of improving native peoples was amalgamation with European settlers to form a unified society of equals which would then progress together even further up the scale of civilisation.
This thesis understands Grey’s policies of racial amalgamation as the product of intellectual forces and imperial structures. Conversely, it acknowledges that ideas themselves have no power, and little meaning, in isolation. It seeks to integrate traditional political history with intellectual and religious history to illuminate a real historical actor rather than a stereotype projected on the past through the medium of modern cultural values. This chapter begins by discussing Grey’s ethnography in the framework of early nineteenth century scientific and political priorities. It proceeds with an overview of Grey’s ideas about race, focusing particularly on monogenism, racial hierarchies, cultural development, and amalgamation. Based on ethnographic investigation and liberal Anglican philosophy, Grey’s 1840 Australian report marks a turning point in his career. In this chapter I analyse the report in the context of other humanitarian and imperial schemes, concluding with a discussion of Grey’s official instructions as Governor of New Zealand.

**Ethnography**

George Grey was born in an age thoroughly preoccupied with debates about race. In the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries Europeans had voyaged further abroad than ever before, discovering other lands and peoples to incorporate into their understanding of the world and themselves. The eighteenth century saw an exponential increase in travel writing. Descriptions of foreign peoples became raw material for Enlightenment scientists and philosophers engaged in reasoned analyses of man and nature. Public interest in ideas about race continued to increase in the Victorian period. The growth of world trade, improvements in global communication, rising literacy, and debates over slavery brought distant cultures ever closer to Europe. At the same time, industrialisation and mechanisation focused increasing attention on the relationships between people and their environments. Open lectures, demonstrations, books, special exhibitions, and the newly formed BAAS served to popularise science and expose the early Victorians to an increasingly diverse range of ideas about race. Geologists, anatomists, biologists, geographers and historians all debated racial theory. From the early nineteenth century they were joined by an emerging class of scientists concerned solely with the study of
humankind. Growing out of humanitarian activity, ethnology was recognised as an independent discipline in 1837.¹

For the first half of the nineteenth century British ethnology was dominated by James Cowles Prichard’s Anglican view of the world. Prichard’s approach embraced physical and natural history and philology. Working within an Old Testament framework, he argued for common human origins, viewing human characteristics and diversity as elastic. God had “distributed the animated world into a number of distinct species, and ... ordered that each ... multiply according to its kind, and propagate the stock to perpetuity, none of them ever transgressing their own limits”.² Prichard had close links with the APS, and was firmly committed to the humanitarian project of native conversion and civilisation³. He advocated humanitarian principles on Christian and scientific grounds, explaining that the claims of “humanity and justice” were attended by the claims of ethnology, philosophy and philology.⁴ “How many questions of the most curious and interesting kind, will have been left unsolved, if the various races of mankind become diminished in number, and when the diversified tribes of America, Australia, and many parts of Asia, shall have ceased to exist?”⁵ Though Prichard was the pre-eminent scientist in his field, a wide range of other ethnological theories proliferated over the century. In 1863 James Hunt, President of the Anthropological Society, bemoaned the fact that “hardly two persons use such an important word as ‘race’ in the same sense”.⁶

George Stocking, twentieth century historian of anthropology, describes George Grey as “one of the most perceptive ethnographers of his day, and author of some of the most influential ethnographic work of the century”.⁷ Stocking particularly notes Grey’s empathy with indigenous

¹ ‘Ethnology’ is the comparative study of human peoples. ‘Ethnography’ refers to the production and recording of descriptive accounts of native peoples. The two disciplines were intimately related, with ethnology dependent on the narratives of ethnography.
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peoples and sensitivity to native customs. He cites Grey's *Polynesian Mythology* as an "exceptional collection".

Grey was interested in other peoples and foreign lands from an early age. As an officer cadet at the Royal Military College, Sandhurst, he showed a special interest in languages, and shone as a natural linguist. Imperial politics formed the crucial context for Grey's first interactions with indigenous peoples. Troubled by his experience of poverty and overcrowding in Ireland, in 1836 Grey put together a proposal with another young officer to explore north-west Australia in search of suitable sites for British colonisation. The Royal Geographical Society supported their proposal and Lord Glenelg, the evangelical Secretary of State for the Colonies, granted his approval and arranged government finance. Glenelg directed that the expedition's primary goal was to collect geographical information with a view to future British settlement. Though he did not envisage that the native people would be a major subject of inquiry, Glenelg did anticipate profitable interactions between Grey's party and the Aborigines. He encouraged them to learn the native language "in order to communicate with them, and obtain information". The explorers were also to familiarise "the natives with the British name and character" as further preparation for the possibility of colonisation. Glenelg was concerned that Aborigines formed a favourable impression of Englishmen, asking Grey to ensure that his party acted "in a gentle and forebearing manner toward them". In collecting objects of natural history, Glenelg instructed the explorers to "feel your way with caution, it being of the utmost importance to the views of this expedition, to avoid giving offence to the natives by acting in any way that might give a shock, to their prejudices or superstitions". While ethnography was not explicitly part of his brief, Glenelg's instructions thus encouraged Grey's interest in native languages and culture.
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As well as his official instructions, Grey probably perused a range of popular instructions for travellers. Since the seventeenth century, guidebooks had encouraged travellers to collect information and keep records of their explorations. In 1839 the BAAS published *Queries respecting the Human Race, to be addressed to Travellers and others*. Similar to a contemporaneous pamphlet produced by the Ethnological Society of Paris, *Queries* is an extensive list of questions relating to all aspects of foreign cultures. It contains 89 detailed questions relating to physical character, language, individual and family life, buildings and monuments, works of art, domestic animals, government and laws, geography and statistics, social relations, and religions and superstitions. *Queries* requests travellers to collect an extraordinary amount of detail. For example, when recording information on physical character they are urged to make anatomical measurements, draw sketches, and procure specimens where possible. “What”, asks Query 8, “is the character of the pelvis in both sexes, and what is the form of the foot?” Such detailed questions highlight the grand scope (and intrusive nature) of the Victorian information gathering project. They also help explain the detailed ethnographic information Grey collected throughout his career. In Australia, for example, he sought and cut a specimen of a Tasmanian Aboriginal female’s hair. It was curly and woolly rather than long and straight like the hair of Australian Aborigines, and Grey hoped it would “be valuable to posterity, as bearing upon the divergences of two races”.

As leader of the Australian expedition Grey composed his own list of rules. He instructed that all those attached to the expedition should view it as their “duty” to conduct themselves towards the natives in such a way as to “gain their confidence, and good will”. Warning of the Aborigines’ “treacherous disposition”, he laid out guidelines for protecting encampments and keeping the group together. Grey also detailed the best means of obtaining information from the natives. He advised his party to ask questions “in the most simple manner”, avoiding leading questions.
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Encouraging a scientific approach, he directed that his men refrain from questions that implied “a previous knowledge of the subject asked, or a desire, or expectation of its being answered in one way, rather than another”. They were to record the answers to their questions immediately, verbatim where possible. To ascertain if a native’s information came from personal knowledge they were to “examine him on particulars”. Grey also instructed that they examine natives separately. “By a strict attention to these rules information of a really valuable nature, may be obtained from the natives, whereas no reliance whatever can be placed upon that which is obtained in a loose or careless manner”. The instructions conclude with some general points on “communicating with savages”. Grey’s eagerness to make contact and obtain information from the Aborigines was underlain by anxieties stemming from their dangerous reputation. He advised his party never to “disappoint the Natives by breaking any promise made to them”, and to retire from all native interviews with caution. They should retreat as far as possible with their faces to the Aborigines; “the instant your back is turned these treacherous savages will throw their spears at you – numerous instances have confirmed the truth of this fact”.

Grey was also sensitive to the impact of his presence as explorer and ethnographer. In his journals he sought to understand how his party’s presence affected the local Aborigines. After one encounter he tried to imagine the “strange feelings in the breast of these two savages, who could never before have seen civilised man, thus to have sat spectators and overlookers of the every action of such incomprehensible beings as we must have appeared”.

In between expeditions Grey focused on ethnography even more closely. When offered the temporary position of Government Resident at King George Sound, he accepted “with a two-fold desire of rendering what public services I could, during my unavoidable period of inaction in the country, as well as of enlarging my opportunities of observation of the aboriginal race”.
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Grey's published *Journals of Two Expeditions of Discovery in North-West and Western Australia* (1841) are crammed with scientific detail. They contain magnetic, geographical, geological, astronomical, botanical, biological and ethnographical measurements and observations. Grey recorded his interactions with Australian Aborigines in particularly close detail, with careful consideration of their causes and implications. Judging from the information he collected on their language, bearing, paintings and work habits, he believed the Aborigines could easily be raised in the scale of civilisation.30

Grey continued his collecting and theorising in New Zealand. Ethnography was an ongoing interest, but also, he believed, a political necessity. Appointed as governor in late 1845, he arrived in the midst of a revolt. Discontented Māori were winning against struggling British troops. Grey described his response: "I soon perceived that I could neither successfully govern, nor hope to conciliate, a numerous and turbulent people, with whose language, manners, customs, religion, and modes of thought I was quite unacquainted".31 He quickly learnt the language and set about collecting the traditional poems, legends and proverbs which were also vital to understanding and communicating with Māori.32 Grey was motivated by a complicated combination of scientific interest, political opportunism and liberal Anglican humanitarianism.

In order to redress their grievances and apply remedies which would neither wound their feelings nor militate against their prejudices, it was necessary that I should be able thoroughly to understand their complaints; and to win their confidence and regard it was also requisite that I should be able at all times and in all times patiently to listen to the tales of their wrongs or sufferings, and, even if I could not assist them, to give then a kind reply, couched in such terms as should leave no doubt on their minds that I clearly understood and felt for them, and was really well disposed towards them.33

Understanding Māori language and culture was a means for the Governor to placate Māori anger and engender personal feelings of gratitude and loyalty, extend British sovereignty and advance
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Māori civilisation. Over the course of his first New Zealand governorship he “worked at this duty” in every spare moment “in every part of the county”. With the aid of Māori sources and interpreters, particularly Te Rangikaheke, Grey eventually published two Māori language collections of traditional mythology, followed by an English translation called *Polynesian Mythology and Ancient Traditional History of the Native Race*. Grey’s position as governor not only imposed the necessity, but also presented the opportunities for his ethnographic activities. First, he had the resources to retain Te Rangikaheke on an annual salary and provide living quarters for his family at Government House. Second, Grey’s journeys around the country to establish and maintain Crown authority provided countless opportunities to make new contacts and learn new stories. In his “many voyages from portion to portion of the Islands”, Grey was always accompanied by natives and pursued ethnographic inquiries “at every possible interval”.

G. S. Cooper’s *Journal of an Expedition Overland from Auckland to Taranaki* gives a clear sense of the Governor’s commitment to understanding Māori culture. On 11 December 1849 when their party was delayed by bad weather, Grey “amused himself all day in his tent surrounded by natives, learning their songs, proverbs, ceremonies &c”. A fortnight later they were delayed on Mokoia Island. Sitting by the side of the lake where the story was set, Grey requested and recorded the legend of Hinemoa and Tutanekai, later reproduced in *Polynesian Mythology*. The main purpose of this trip was political. Grey attended the tangi for Te Heu Heu Mananui, paramount chief of Tuwharetoa, he met and conferred with local tribes, settled boundary disputes, noted features of economic potential, and promised medical and spiritual care to the people of the area. In doing so he also fostered the relationships so crucial to his ethnographic research.
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Our Antipodes: or Residence and Rambles in the Australasian Colonies by G. C. Mundy provides further insights into Grey’s dual roles as Governor and ethnographer. Mundy describes a sea journey from Auckland to Wellington in 1848 with the Governor and his wife, Major-General Pitt, Taniwha, Te Whero Whero, Te Rauparaha and their wives. He describes Grey as “ever greedy of knowledge”, coaxing the chiefs into somewhat reluctant conversation about their customs.40 “Without the slightest show of compulsion, and treated with kindness, and indeed distinction, they are carried about at the chariot wheel of Te Kawana, and thus kept in sight and out of mischief, bound with invisible and insensible bonds, yet none the less bound”.41 Grey’s ethnography was heavily dependent on his status and powers as governor. Held at his bequest and expense, the chiefs were captive performers, but powerful in their own right as repositories of the knowledge Grey desired.

The published Parliamentary Papers from Grey’s first governorship of New Zealand are full of similar evidence of the governor collecting and disseminating ethnographic information. Nearly every dispatch is related to Māori or to their relations with Europeans. They include observations on culture, statistics about health and descriptions of warfare. Most importantly, Grey’s official dispatches include evidence of the changes he perceived in Māori as they interacted with British settlers. Won over by his personal encounters, the Parliamentary Papers record Grey’s generally positive experiences with Māori which heavily influenced his ideas about race.42 Grey also discussed ethnography in private dialogue with friends and colleagues. In chapter one I described the complicated web of scientists and humanitarians with whom Grey communicated on racial ideas. They swapped theories, exchanged artefacts and shared knowledge. Grey used these networks to collect an enormous amount of philological information. His catalogue of Bibles, hymnals and psalters included texts in Aneiteum, Eskimo, Gilbert Island, German, Hawaiian, Hottentot, Kaffir, Loyalty Islands, Malagasy, Marshall Islands, Marquesan, Savage Island, Raratonga, Lifu, Finnish, Cherokee, Bohemian and Zulu.43 These interchanges gave Grey new insights into New Zealand’s race relations and fostered his knowledge of other cultures. In turn, Grey stimulated others to engage in ethnographic research, requesting information from missionaries, settlers and officials around the world.
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Conducted in political context, Grey’s ethnographic activities were also motivated by principles of liberal Anglican humanitarianism. His ultimate goal was human progress. Though individual myths and legends formed discrete pieces of valuable information in themselves, Grey also saw them as a contribution to wider knowledge of the human race, capable of illuminating the natural laws governing mankind. In an 1851 speech to the New Zealand Society Grey urged his listeners to join in the task of collecting and recording information about the country’s flora, fauna and geology, and about the history and culture of its inhabitants. He described the “truths” they acquired as valuable in their own right, but also as possible clues to larger questions. “Combined with other facts previously observed and recorded, they may serve to fill up links which were the only ones wanting to furnish the true clue to some mystery of nature, or to establish some truth which may prove of the greatest usefulness to the human race”.

Grey’s approach reflects the influence of evangelical utilitarianism. Immersed in the practicalities of the industrial revolution, the growth of business, and evangelical concern for social action, Victorians respected common sense and pragmatism. William Fairburn’s 1861 Presidential Address to the BAAS emphasised the usefulness of science. Quoting Bacon he insisted that “the legitimate goal of the sciences is the endowment of human life with new inventions and riches”. The APS made a clear connection between the collection and diffusion of knowledge, and the elimination of human misery. In appealing to missionaries and scientists for aid, the society insisted that knowledge of “the feeble and scattered families of the human race” was essential to achieving their goals of protecting and elevating indigenous peoples.

Grey’s evangelical upbringing and personal faith convinced him likewise that knowledge should be used to further God’s work and reduce human suffering. Nearly all his published texts contain some allusion to the purpose he hoped they would serve. His first publication was *A Vocabulary of the Dialects of South Western Australia*. A precise and detailed academic work concerned
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with recording facts and making linguistic comparisons, it largely avoids analysis. Grey believed it had relevance to debates on human origins and migration, but focused more on its immediate usefulness.\textsuperscript{50} He hoped “to add something to the stock of knowledge, which may assist the settler on his arrival here”.\textsuperscript{51} It was this belief in its usefulness that gave Grey a typically liberal Anglican sense of mission in giving “this Vocabulary to the world”.\textsuperscript{52}

Ultimately, Grey saw ethnology as a tool for uncovering mankind’s unity and improvability, and for discovering God’s purpose in the world. In his speech to the New Zealand Society he elaborated specifically on his Christian motivation as ethnographer. By preserving a record of “the most fearful spectres which have ever stalked mankind, in the hideous shapes of idolatry, human sacrifices, and cannibalism”, ethnography would prevent mankind from once again forgetting God, and falling in the scale of civilisation.\textsuperscript{53} Looking forward to the future “when Christianity and peace have encompassed the globe”, Grey believed that research would show that even Māori, separated from civilisation for centuries, had a residual “knowledge of their Maker, and a desire for His divine laws”.\textsuperscript{54} Liberal Anglicans saw humankind as fundamentally religious.\textsuperscript{55} Grey believed that investigating Māori language and laws would “illustrate and clear up the history of the entire human race, and of all time, considered as one harmonious whole”.\textsuperscript{56}

\textbf{Human Unity}

Grey’s first hand observations and interactions combined with his liberal Anglican humanitarianism to form an integrated philosophy of human unity and improvability. Monogenism was the fundamental premise on which Grey’s other ideas about race were based. In essence, the idea stems from the traditional Christian belief that all people are descended from Adam and Eve. It was reinforced by the possibility of Christian conversion. Civilised and savage peoples could both “become partakers of the common salvation through faith in the Son of God, Jesus Christ”.\textsuperscript{57}

\textsuperscript{50}George Grey, \textit{A Vocabulary of the Dialects of South Western Australia}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} edition, London, 1840, pp.iii, vi.
\textsuperscript{51}Ibid., p.xviii.
\textsuperscript{52}Ibid., p.xx.
\textsuperscript{53}Grey, \textit{Address to the New Zealand Society}, pp.11-13.
\textsuperscript{54}Ibid., pp.13-14.
\textsuperscript{56}Grey, \textit{Address to the New Zealand Society}, p.15.
\textsuperscript{57}W. G. Broughton, \textit{Visit of the Bishop of Australia to the Church Missionary Society’s Mission in New Zealand: and Notices of its State and Progress}, London, 1840, p.36.
Over the course of the nineteenth century monogenetic assumptions were increasingly challenged by notions of polygenism. Polygenists believed that different human races had different origins, and that sexual relations between different races would ultimately prove barren. John Crawfurd, an eminente geographer, explorer and ethnologist, was the foremost Victorian proponent of polygenism. Though George Grey corresponded with Crawfurd and with other polygenists, and helped with their research by collecting skulls, he was a firm monogenist. The principle of human unity was implicit in the way he thought about race, and in the way he behaved towards native peoples. Grey’s understanding of innate racial equality came directly from the bible. He told James Milne that New Testament stories had inculcated in his heart “a love of one’s fellows, irrespective of colour”.

Grey’s early experiences in Australia undoubtedly heightened his sense of racial difference. He encountered a people radically different from himself, both physically and culturally, and those differences were the subject of detailed inquiry in his journals. Yet Grey never doubted that he and the Australian aborigines were part of the same human family. “They are as apt and intelligent as any other race of men I am acquainted with; they are subject to the same affections, appetites and passions as other men.”

Grey articulated his monogenism even more clearly in his 1851 speech to the New Zealand Society. Like Prichard, he worked from a Christian perspective, basing his concept of human unity on Old Testament theology. Referring to Adam and Eve and to Noah’s ark, Grey described the human race as twice increasing from a few individuals of a single family. He saw Māori and Pacific Islanders as “whole races of our fellow-men, sprung equally with ourselves from that one family.”
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The network of humanitarians within which Grey operated shared the same position. Prichard and Grey were both early honorary members of the APS. Dominated by Quakers and evangelical Anglicans, the APS proclaimed its monogenism in the motto “Ab Uno Sanguine” (“Of One Blood”). The society’s first annual report criticised the Victorian tendency to regard indigenous peoples as “irreclaimable ‘savages’”, and reiterated the importance of treating them as fellow men. In the *Extracts and Proceedings* of 1841 the APS referred to the “scattered families of the human race” quoting Acts 17:26 in support. Saxe Bannister, a member of the APS and author of *British Colonisation and the Coloured Tribes* affirmed that uncivilised peoples “are subject to the common infirmities of human nature, and gifted with our common faculties”, both varying according to circumstance.

The men with whom Grey worked most closely in New Zealand held similar views. Richard Taylor and Octavius Hadfield were both missionaries who exerted strong influence on Grey, contributing to the direction of policy and supporting his government. In 1846, the year he first met Grey, Hadfield wrote to his brother in England that he had always studied Māori language and customs “with this idea uppermost in my mind, that they belong to the genus man”. Taylor’s *Te Ika a Maui* opens in the style of the APS: “Civilised man is too apt to look down upon the more unenlightened portion of his race as belonging to an inferior order of beings”. He went on to argue that only knowledge could lead to recognition of their equality. “To raise a better and more correct view, of those commonly regarded as savages, we must have a more perfect acquaintance with them, and the more intimate this is, the more readily shall we allow their claims to brotherhood”.

### The Scale of Civilisation

Grey’s belief in the unity of all mankind did not translate to an easy equality of all mankind. Although he believed that God had created all men equal, Grey argued that some races were more advanced than others, ranking higher on an imagined scale of civilisation. He ranked the Anglo-
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Saxon race highest of all. But like other humanitarians, Grey was also keenly attuned to the negative aspects of western culture.

Though rejected by most twentieth century scholars, the idea that races could be ranked was widely accepted in early nineteenth century British society. Richard Whately drew an analogy between stages of civilisation and natural age, suggesting that the difference between the ancient Israelites and “enlightened Christians” could be compared with the difference between children of four or five years old, and those of eight or nine. In 1838 the APS’s first annual report referred to the “immense variety in the grades of civilisation, from absolute barbarism to comparative refinement, found in Aboriginal countries”. In 1843 they articulated the common belief that Māori were relatively high on the scale. Ernst Dieffenbach, a member of the APS and naturalist to the New Zealand Company, argued that Māori were “decidedly in a nearer relation” to Europeans than any other race. Australian Aborigines were invariably ranked at the bottom of the scale. Bishop Selwyn’s wife Sarah related an “amusing” incident on board ship with a mixed group of Europeans, Māori, Australian Aborigines and Melanesians in October 1852. The Māori were “holding their heads up above the Melanesians owning to their own lighter colour, while the Melanesians looked down on the Australian, ‘He no good, too black!’”. Indigenous peoples were quick to adapt European ideas to their own purposes, in this case employing racial hierarchies, just as Europeans did, as a referential means of positive self-identification.

Most Victorians placed themselves at the top of the hierarchy. The massive cultural changes of the early nineteenth century reinforced their sense of superiority. Christine Bolt suggests that “Anglo-Saxonism was in vogue, like civilisation, free trade and progress”. Houghton argues
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that the “national conceit” of the times was based on England’s economic power in the wake of industrialisation.\(^8\) He also draws attention to the English Constitution, asserting that the guarantee of political freedom was an important aspect of Britain’s self-image in the nineteenth century, and a major source of national pride. The industrial displays of the Great Exhibition presented English men and women with overwhelming evidence of their triumph over nature. The evangelicalism of early nineteenth century Britain also fostered an optimistic view of England and her people. Its doctrinal emphasis on assurance gave evangelicals a “bubbling confidence” in their spiritual lives.\(^8\) Victorian class consciousness also encouraged ideas of Anglo-Saxon superiority. Douglas Lorimer’s study of Negroes in nineteenth century Britain has shown that class thinking was intimately related to racial thinking.\(^8\) The hierarchy of social grades in English society, and the increasing delineation of class boundaries over the course of the nineteenth century reinforced a hierarchical approach to race. Industrialisation, constitutional developments, evangelicalism, and class consciousness contributed to an overwhelming sense of British optimism and superiority. Racial hierarchies also served a deeper cultural purpose, affirming and re-creating a sense of Victorian identity by defining British civilisation in relation to native savagery.\(^8\)

George Grey typified his contemporaries, placing Anglo-Saxons at the top of the scale of civilisation. At the opening of the Thames Valley railway in 1878 Grey expressed huge pride in his race. “He believed in his race; he believed in the Anglo-Saxon people; he believed in the British as a race and people who were destined to occupy the earth”.\(^8\) In 1875 he proposed federating the Anglo-Saxon race, one of the passions of his later years. “If such an end could be achieved mankind generally would reach to a state of prosperity and happiness such as had never yet been known on the earth”.\(^8\)
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Grey ranked native cultures lower on the scale of civilisation. When he discovered cave paintings in north-western Australia he refused to attribute them to Aborigines. "It is scarcely probable that they could have been executed by a self-taught savage … their origin, … I think, must still be open to conjecture". Grey acknowledged that the Australian Aborigines were "generally considered to occupy too low a position in the scale of humanity to be worthy of any peculiar regard", but he himself was keenly interested in their history and culture. In his speech to the New Zealand Society Grey referred to pre-European New Zealand as "a night of fearful gloom", in which "semibarbarous" Māori lived "unilluminated by the light of written records", dominated by "some of the most fearful spectres which have ever stalked mankind". Sentiments such as these have earned Grey the ire of many post-colonial historians. In the context of twentieth century political and social developments his statements are easily interpreted as evidence of arrogance and ethnocentrism. In the context of early nineteenth century intellectual history they reveal Grey as a man of his times.

Like other humanitarians, Grey ranked Māori higher than other native peoples. He believed they were "infinitely superior to the American Indians", and admired their military skill, their aptitude for learning, and their "agreeable" manners. "If ever there was a country in which man left to the unaided light of their own reason should have attained to a state of purity and happiness – New Zealand is that country".

Though he viewed the British empire as "the wonder of the nineteenth century", Grey was keenly attuned to its negative effects on native peoples. In Australia he observed the degeneration of Aborigines when exposed to an improperly conducted system of colonisation. In New Zealand he interpreted Māori rebellion as a consequence of the evils accompanying British settlement. Poverty and the unequal distribution of land, money and power were seen as
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“evils which are inseparably mingled with the blessings of civilisation”.93 Grey viewed native revolts against imperial authority as natural, not as evidence of an “absolute incapacity for civilisation in the barbarous race”.94 He understood Māori rebellion as a “temporary difficulty” in the inevitable advance of colonisation and Christianity.95 Even colonisation conducted on correct principles held dangers for indigenous peoples.

Grey’s ambivalence about the “mixed good” of civilising native peoples was shared by many contemporaries, particularly by British humanitarians.96 They were eager to raise natives in the scale of civilisation by exposure to British culture, but could not deny the appalling effects of colonisation in practice. Dandeson Coates spoke for the Church and Wesleyan Mission Societies in describing the colonisation of uncivilised countries as “written within and without, with lamentations, and mourning, and woe”.97 On these grounds he announced their total opposition to plans for the colonisation of New Zealand.98 In January 1836 the liberal Evangelical British philanthropist T. F. Buxton described himself as an enemy to colonisation.99 By 1837 his qualms had been overcome. As Chairman of the House of Commons Report on Aborigines Buxton deplored the devastation wrought on uncivilised nations in the course of British colonisation. But while still conscious of the potential for calamity, he now believed it possible to conduct the process of emigration along beneficial lines. Indeed, he saw it as a Christian duty to raise native peoples to British standards of civilisation.100 The APS, founded by Buxton shortly afterwars, believed the “national escutcheon of Great Britain had been deeply stained” by harmful intercourse with uncivilised races101 but were confident of the blessings colonisation might yet bestow.102 In New Zealand, Grey’s friend Richard Taylor recognised the evils of colonisation, but argued that they were “more than counter-balanced by the advantages of better food and
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clothing, and an altogether improved way of living". Like Grey, Taylor and other humanitarians recognised the problems attendant on the spread of British civilisation, but ultimately saw it as a natural and salutary process ordained by God. They believed that the superior Anglo-Saxon race was duty bound to help raise other peoples in the scale of civilisation.

Degeneration

To the modern western eye, Grey's monogenism does not sit easily side by side with notions of Anglo-Saxon superiority. But Grey's racial hierarchy was open and flexible. He believed in the original unity and potential equality of humankind. Beginning at the same starting point, he believed that some races had fallen in the scale of civilisation, and others had advanced.

Degeneration, the idea that a race can fall in the scale of civilisation, comes from the biblical account of history. When Adam and Eve ate from the tree of knowledge of good and evil they fell from grace. At a later point (many believed at Babel, where the world's one language divided into many), groups of their descendants migrated to foreign lands where they lost their knowledge of God and of civilised behaviour, and fell into barbarism.

In the eighteenth century scientists and philosophers trying to reconcile monogenism with human variation proposed a range of different theories involving the degenerative impact of climate, air, soil and bad food. In the nineteenth century scientists used the developing science of philology to support the degenerationist argument. Philology offered a model of branching development in time. Monogenist philologists like Grey imagined one trunk with some branches falling down, others growing up. Some languages were said to have degenerated from the original tongue, others to have advanced in complexity and form.

Grey's childhood mentor Richard Whately was a prominent degenerationist. Like Grey, he was passionately interested in the history of humankind and civilisation. He firmly believed that
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man had “not emerged from the savage state”.107 Rather, “various superstitions crept in little by little, and religion became gradually corrupted, as men lost more and more that knowledge of the one true God, which we suppose to have been originally revealed”.108

Though the prominent intellectual influence of Grey’s formative years was degenerationist, Grey’s first major publication rejected the idea that the Australian Aborigines had degenerated from a higher state.

We cannot argue that this race was originally in a state of civilisation, and that from the introduction of certain laws amongst them, the tendency of which was to reduce them to a state of barbarism, or from some other cause, they had gradually sunk to their present condition.109

Grey’s difficulty was not with degeneration but with the relationship between civilisation and law. He believed that each race’s state of civilisation was dependent on the legal system to which they were subject. Unable to see how such a primitive legal code as that of Aboriginal Australia could change over time, Grey concluded that they would remain in their state of savagery until subjected to “contact with a civilised community, whose presence might exercise a new influence, under which the ancient system would expire or be swept away”.110 In later life Grey’s view of Aboriginal society altered. He came to believe that a range of different customs, including marriage laws and circumcision, pointed to a more civilised past.111

Grey’s view of Māori was consistently degenerationist. In his 1851 speech to the New Zealand Society he suggested that the reason Māori had responded positively to the Christian gospel was their ancient memory of God. Even centuries of savagery had not completely wiped out a residual knowledge of their Maker and his laws.112 Grey was also conscious of the potential for degeneration among modern Europeans, cautioning “care that some of our own race do not suffer from their isolation amongst, and their intermixture with, that semibarbarous race” the Māori.113
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A few years later, comparing savage and civilised songs, Grey noted similarities between the Māori and Greek musical scales. He considered it quite possible that Māori "might have retained this character of song from a period of the highest state of civilisation, at an epoch of great antiquity". Grey believed that archaeological evidence also pointed to degeneration.

**Progressivism**

For Grey and other nineteenth century humanitarians, degenerationism was counterbalanced by an equally strong belief in the potential for human improvement. Deriving from Biblical and Enlightenment theses, the concept of cultures progressing up the scale of civilisation was strengthened in the Victorian period by industrialisation and the rise of science.

The Biblical seed of progressivism lies in Christ’s life and death interpreted as God’s gift of redemption to the fallen. In the eighteenth century Enlightenment thinkers proclaimed the doctrine of progress through reason. Early nineteenth century evangelical theology, with its emphasis on conversion, confirmed the concept of human improbability. The doctrine of progressive sanctification could likewise be assimilated to the concept of human progression from savagery to rational civilisation.

Early nineteenth century Britain was immersed in tangible evidence of humankind’s ability to improve their world. The rise of science and industrialisation ushered in a period of radical change and a general consciousness of human progress. Giving Europeans the ability to improve productive techniques and increase output, the industrial revolution amplified Enlightenment and evangelical optimism. In 1829 Carlyle expressed his nation’s faith in industrial progress. "We remove mountains and make seas our smooth highway; nothing can resist us. We war with rude Nature; and, by our resistless engines, come off always victorious, and loaded with spoils". The spoils were abundant. Dramatic advances in medicine gave doctors greater ability to ease
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physical suffering.\textsuperscript{121} Improvements were made in sanitation, water supplies, and street lighting for towns. In the countryside agricultural improvements brought better yields and an easier lifestyle.\textsuperscript{122} Improvement Acts were passed in England in 1785 and 1800 with local Improvement Commissioners appointed to oversee advances in town and country.\textsuperscript{123} For many, particularly in the middle classes, every day life improved in the early nineteenth century.

Optimism continued to grow as the century advanced. Business and free trade grew, stimulating pride in Britain’s achievements and influence.\textsuperscript{124} Improvements were implemented in central and local government and in industrial relations. An increasing number of voluntary organisations worked for change at national and local levels.\textsuperscript{125} Even the universities underwent positive reform.\textsuperscript{126} What emerged was far more solid and potent than popular faith in progress. The Victorians created a cult of progress, seeing human advancement as a natural law of the universe.\textsuperscript{127}

The Victorian self-help movement was an obvious and immediate upshot of the growing cult of progress. Lorimer asserts that even those unwilling to admit the improvability of groups of people accepted the creed of personal self-advancement.\textsuperscript{128} Individuals were expected to improve themselves through industry, self-help and education. Popular literature promoted the cause, offering encouragement and schooling readers in techniques for personal advancement.\textsuperscript{129} All might now aspire to raise themselves on the social scale.\textsuperscript{130} As Whately put it, “to improve one’s moral character is the business of every man”.\textsuperscript{131} Most early Victorians embraced the notion of individual improvement and extended that notion to larger groups of people.

Whately’s view of humankind, though strongly degenerationist, reflected Enlightenment and early Victorian optimism. He believed that “every one of our faculties is capable of cultivation
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and improvement”. His analysis of political economy was based on the idea that God directed social progress. Whately understood the material changes in his world to be progressive, all tending to a higher state of civilisation and contributing to the improvement of the human environment. He concurred with other liberal Anglicans that savages could be civilised, but only under God’s direction, by interactions with more civilised cultures. Once elevated to a certain point of civilisation, men were left to improve themselves, using their own faculties to investigate astronomy, geology and other sciences. In 1856 Whately wrote to Grey in South Africa, encouraging his plans for native conversion and civilisation. “They seem to be rather Barbarians than downright Savages & not unacceptable to useful instruction”.

Grey’s world view was equally optimistic. Born in an era engrossed with progress, he firmly believed that those who had fallen could also rise. With a reasoned Enlightenment approach to science, liberal Anglicans like Whately and Grey employed a Providential discourse in their discussion of ideas about race. Progress was a natural law set in place by God. In his Journals of Two Expeditions Grey argued that “under proper treatment” the Aborigines “might easily be raised very considerably in the scale of civilisation”. He followed up his assertions of human unity and potential equality with a practical plan for effecting racial improvement. In 1851 he exhorted the gentlemen of Wellington to see themselves as “mere stewards of the Most High” to whom it “is committed the glorious task of ushering into the world the mankind of the future” and “to aid in raising the numerous native race that surrounds us from barbarism to civilisation, from ignorance to knowledge”.
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The frequent cultural comparisons in Grey’s writing highlight his belief that all races, not just the savage, were subject to the laws of progress. In his Australian *Journals* he compared Aboriginal practices with similar ancient Jewish customs recorded in the Bible.\(^{143}\) In *Polynesian Mythology* he suggested that Māori traditions were “puerile” and their religious faith “absurd”, but went on to stress their importance to a large number of people and their probable similarity to ancient European mythology.\(^{144}\) His experience lead him to believe “that the Saxon, Celtic and Scandinavian systems of mythology, could we become intimately acquainted with them, would be found in no respects to surpass that” of the Māori.\(^{145}\) In a paper presented to the Ethnological Society of London Grey extended the comparison, suggesting that “scenes not much differing from one another were in remote ages occurring on the Thames in England and the Thames in New Zealand”.\(^{146}\) These comparisons reflect a strong theme in nineteenth century liberal Anglican historiography. Liberal Anglican philosophers argued that all nations went through similar stages of development governed by laws of nature.\(^{147}\) Thomas Arnold conceived the social progress of states in terms of human development from infancy to adulthood to old age.\(^{148}\) This approach emphasised not only human improvability, but also human unity, highlighting the consistencies in human experience and national development.\(^{149}\)

Grey’s farewell address to Māori in 1853 shows how first hand experiences continually affirmed his belief in progressivism. He saw New Zealand as a test case which would prove to doubters that native peoples could be improved.

For the first time, it has in this country been seen, that ignorant and heathen men may become good citizens and real brothers of the Europeans; for the first time it has been seen that a people instructed in christian knowledge and christian virtues may, however bad their previous state was, become a noble nation. Some yet doubt this; the time you have behaved well is yet too short to prove this truth; they are not certain you will even continue as you are, much less advance further in good works.

But oh, do you prove it to be the truth, for the sake of your children, for your own sakes, for the sake of those countless tribes of poor ignorant men whose fate, as I have told you, hangs upon you: prove this to be true, and every age will bless your
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race, and the names of many amongst you will become dear household words in all lands and in all ages.  

Amalgamation

Grey’s ideas about the innate equality and improvability of humankind remained fixed throughout his life. In the context of liberal Anglican imperialism they found expression in policies of racial amalgamation. Though politics, relationships and personal ambition all influenced Grey’s policies and their implementation, his beliefs must also be accounted for. So too, must Grey’s intentions. Nineteenth century historians presented him as a conquering hero, ignoring or misunderstanding the negative consequences of Grey’s actions. Modern historians who ignore Grey’s intentions for amalgamation depict him in equally powerful terms, as a villain who is personally responsible for ongoing racial discord. The retrospective utopianism warned against by W. H. Oliver can only be countered by detailed attention to Grey’s own understanding of amalgamation, and his intentions for its fulfilment in New Zealand.

Michael Banton conceptualises Victorian ideas like monogenesis, polygenesis, evolution, degenerationism, civilisation and progressivism as a vocabulary of race. In the nineteenth century, he argues, the vocabulary of race was “an idiom of exclusion used by the dominant social category”. Grey employed the vocabulary of race as an idiom of prescriptive inclusion. His ideas about monogenesis, Anglo-Saxon superiority, degeneration and progressivism came together in the belief that indigenous peoples could and should be elevated in the scale of civilisation and amalgamated with Europeans. From a monogenist perspective he believed that all human beings were essentially part of the same family already. His progressivism suggested a mechanism for those at the bottom of the scale of civilisation to reach the same level as those at the top, and degenerationism made him cautious about the possibility of reversion. Grey’s hierarchical understanding of racial difference meant that his ideal society was based on an improved version of Anglo-Saxon rather than indigenous culture. At the same time, he strove to
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protect native peoples from the negative aspects of Anglo-Saxon culture, and to elevate the settlers as well.

Grey's policy of native civilisation was part of a broader vision for advancing all peoples. He believed that all humankind was ascending the scale of civilisation, but that those at the lower levels deserved greater assistance, having further to climb. “The duty civilisation owed them, he affirmed, was the larger in proportion to their state of darkness. He held this to be the simple rule for the Christian”. Impelled by an evangelical sense of assurance and a commitment to advancing Christian civilisation, Grey applied his rule with total conviction.

Grey believed that the best means of elevating native peoples in the scale of civilisation was amalgamation. His job as governor was to direct and encourage native progress towards this end. Motivated by liberal Anglican principles of inclusion, Grey sought to incorporate native peoples within British settler society. He believed that direct exposure to the beneficial features of western culture was the most effective means of acquiring them. If Māori lived together with Europeans they would quickly come to appreciate the benefits of material and cultural civilisation, and adopt them for themselves. It was this understanding which lay at the heart of Grey’s passionate commitment to Victorian imperialism. His vision of imperialism focused on the natural laws of humanity rather than politics or economics. “Thus, impelled by unquenchable instincts, generation after generation went forth from many nations, yet in one brotherhood and in one triumphant march, and occupied the earth, and made it give forth fruit”. Colonisation offered relief to the old countries and hope to the new. “Thus nature, as in all other things, held her sway in this continuous pouring forth of emigrants from the old countries to a new and happier world”. The APS concurred that the “diffusion of mankind over the surface of the globe is a natural consequence of laws governing the human race, and imposed by the Author of Nature”.
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Amalgamation was not a joining of equals but of potential equals. Grey believed a range of military, legal, economic, social and personal measures could be used to raise natives in the scale of civilisation and equip them for amalgamation with their more advanced British neighbours. Joined together by a common understanding of Christianity and civilisation, this new society of true equals would advance even further up the scale of civilisation. Motivated by his liberal Anglican sense of mission, Grey believed God had ordained him to direct this process in New Zealand. He employed a Providential discourse on race to justify both his prescriptive policies and authoritarian style. In reality, Grey’s policy depended on a positive reception and active participation from both Māori and settlers. In practice, its long term consequences were often far from those he intended. Post-colonial scholarship has drawn attention to the failure of amalgamation and to Grey’s own role as an agent of racial conflict.

For Victorian humanitarians like Grey, Christianity was the foundation of civilisation. In his Australian Journals he asserted that “Christianity and civilisation are marching over the world with a rapidity not fully known or estimated by any one nation”.158 Their progress was governed by laws “as certain and definite as those which control the movements of the heavenly bodies” which had been “framed by Infinite wisdom”.159 The APS professed a similar view: “Christianity is the parent of civilisation; and true civilisation cannot be produced without it”.160 The CMS understood their mission as “the arduous work of elevating a barbarous aboriginal people to the privileges and enjoyments of Christian and civilised life, and preparing them to unite with their white neighbours, the British colonists, in one peaceful and well-ordered community”.161 Nineteenth century humanitarians viewed civilisation as a goal and a process. Native peoples needed to be civilised and converted to be amalgamated, and amalgamation in turn promoted the progress of conversion and civilisation.

Commerce also had a role in Grey’s policy of racial amalgamation. Like other humanitarians he believed that native interests were closely aligned with imperial interests. Colonisation and amalgamation would enhance the prosperity of the old and new countries. As an explorer in
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Australia he enthused over commerce as a force of progress "in the march of improvement among distant lands".\textsuperscript{162} Grey depicted the merchant in London as a hero.

With the wizard wand of commerce, he touches a lone and trackless forest, and at his bidding, cities rise, and the hum and dust of trade collect – away are swept ancient races; antique laws and customs moulder into oblivion. The strong-holds of murder and speculation are cleansed, and the Gospel is preached amongst ignorant and savage men. The ruder languages disappear successively, and the tongue of England alone is heard around.\textsuperscript{163}

Commerce was not only a "necessary adjunct of the Cross", but an elevating agent in itself.\textsuperscript{164} Christopher Bayly argues that economics were an important, though not critical element in defining early nineteenth century British imperialism.\textsuperscript{165} As governor, Grey worked within imperial financial constraints and imperatives. These did not, however, overshadow his mission of native civilisation and racial amalgamation. Grey believed that a stronger colonial economy could affect more good among native societies.

Grey believed amalgamation was the only real option for native peoples. Only two other prospects occurred to him. First, they "must disappear before advancing civilisation, successively dying off ere the truths of Christianity, or the benefits of civilisation have produced any effect on them".\textsuperscript{166} Second, they "must exist in the midst of a superior numerical population, a despised and inferior race".\textsuperscript{167} These melancholy alternatives reflect a distinctively nineteenth century liberal Anglican understanding of racial difference and potential.

In the wake of ongoing racial tension, post-colonial historians have damned Grey's policy of racial amalgamation. Without attending to intellectual or religious context they have failed to grasp Grey's vision of Christian civilisation. The Governor is reduced to a one dimensional caricature derived from modern political perspectives. Without ignoring or excusing the consequences of Grey's actions, I believe it is crucial to understand the ideas that informed them. Grey's humanitarian ethnography revealed amalgamation as the rational solution to racial discord and human progress. His liberal Anglicanism affirmed it as God's will.

\textsuperscript{163} Ibid., pp.200-1.
\textsuperscript{164} Sinclair, p.30.
\textsuperscript{167} Ibid.
1840 Report upon the best means of promoting the civilisation of the Aboriginal Inhabitants of Australia

Grey’s 1840 report on civilising Aborigines was his charter of amalgamation. Based on assumptions of human unity and improvability, the report proposed a range of legal, educational, industrial, and cultural measures to protect native peoples and amalgamate them with British settlers. Informed by colonial experience and shaped by humanitarian principles, it serves to highlight the dynamic entanglement of politics, ideas and religion in nineteenth century imperial history.

Grey’s exploring expedition first landed in Australia in December 1837. As they travelled the coastline, visited European settlements and made their perilous forays inland Grey recorded detailed observations of the aboriginal inhabitants. His self-imposed task was to uncover the natural laws governing their state of civilisation. Interpreting the concept of natural law through post-Enlightenment lenses, Grey believed the world to be governed by universal principles applicable across time and space, and able to be uncovered through scientific method. Politics, morals, history, economics, art, education, even Aboriginal civilisation – all were governed by laws. Further, all could be improved by properly applying those laws. Grey believed that the laws of nature were the laws of God. Unveiling them was a means of hastening human progress and glorifying God.168 Richard Whately understood “Nature” as “the course in which the Author and Governor of all things proceeds in his works”.169 In his Lessons on Morals Whately argued that those in public office were bound by Christian duty to learn what was best for their country, “and what are the best measures for promoting it”.170 In general, the liberal Anglicans sought “a science of society which would be applied effectively”.171 It was this intellectual framework that led Grey to devise his scheme of native civilisation.

In June 1840 Grey relayed his ‘Report upon the best means of promoting the civilisation of the Aboriginal Inhabitants of Australia’ to Lord John Russell, Secretary of State for the Colonies.

168 Houghton, p.145; Bebbington, p.57.
169 Richard Whately, Essays on Some of the Peculiarities, p.63.
171 Forbes, p.9.
The report contained a detailed plan. First, British law should supersede native law and custom; second, native schools and institutions should be used to instil European values; third, native labour should be encouraged; and fourth, rewards should be provided for proof of civilised behaviour. These four principles were based on Grey’s understanding that Aborigines were capable of improvement and eventual equality with Europeans. His report assumed that racial amalgamation was the most desirous result for Britain and for the countries she colonised.

The most important element of Grey’s Australian plan was his insistence on the hegemony of British law. More than half the report was devoted to legal issues. Grey began by criticising previous attempts to civilise the Australian Aborigines. He argued that their failure was caused by the “erroneous principle” of unequal justice. British law had only been applied to natives as far as European property and people were concerned.172 Grey believed that continuing to tolerate native customs, even within their own communities, was a sure means of reinforcing their savage state.173 Though confident of the innate equality of all mankind, Grey believed, like Whately, that a people’s state of civilisation was determined by their laws.174 His hierarchy of laws / civilisation was open and flexible. “It would be unfair to consider the laws of the natives of Australia as any indication of the real character of this people; for many races who were at one period subject to the most barbarous laws, have, since new institutions have been introduced amongst them, taken then rank among the civilised nations of the earth”.175 Grey believed that the British legal system held the key to Aboriginal regeneration. He argued “that it is necessary from the moment the aborigines of this country are declared British subjects, they should, as far as possible, be taught that British laws are to supersede their own”.176 Grey was particularly concerned for the underdogs in Aboriginal society: “any native who is suffering under their own customs may have the power of an appeal to those of Great Britain”.177

Yet Grey was also aware of the potential for natives to suffer under the British system. When Aborigines asked him to explain specific court processes and verdicts, Grey found himself unable to provide satisfactory explanations. He was particularly nervous of biased settler juries.

173 Ibid., p.374.
174 Richard Whately, Lessons on Morals, p.32.
176 Ibid., p.377.
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Though based on the British legal system, Grey’s civilising scheme also contained ameliorative measures to allay the human cost of implementing that system too rigidly.

First, he argued that transgressions against the law should always be punished. He believed that punishments should be fair, that first time perpetrators ignorant of their crimes should be treated less severely, and that all wrongdoers should have their crime and consequent punishment clearly explained to them.\(^\text{178}\) Second, Grey maintained the need for a mounted police force in order that outlying areas, as well as towns, might be subject to the law.\(^\text{179}\) Third, he argued for flexible court hearings. Legally, the court deemed Aborigines incompetent to give evidence because they were non-Christians unfamiliar with oaths. Grey viewed this as the “greatest obstacle” to extending British law.\(^\text{180}\) Two possibilities presented themselves to his mind: the court might hear evidence from unsworn natives when supported by circumstantial evidence, and the court might hear evidence from any native called to defend another. He suggested that such flexibility should only be exercised in cases relating solely to Aborigines.\(^\text{181}\) Fourth, Grey argued that the government should provide a lawyer to defend native prisoners. Emphasising the difficulty natives had understanding British laws and the inadequacy of incompetent interpreters, Grey believed the local government had a duty to provide legal counsel for all natives, or at least for those facing serious charges.\(^\text{182}\)

While Grey viewed civilised laws as the most important means of improving native peoples, he also believed in the elevating power of education. His liberal Anglican background gave Grey a faith in reason that reinforced the prevailing Victorian enthusiasm for improvement through learning. In Australia he saw that Aborigines suffered grave disabilities from their ignorance of British customs and values.\(^\text{183}\) Grey believed that the solution lay in native schools and training institutions. He considered them vital if natives were not always to be employed only in the lowest skilled and lowest paid manual jobs. Grey believed that education along British lines would elevate Aborigines to the same cultural level as Europeans. If Aborigines realised their innate potential with white men, the two cultures could amalgamate smoothly and quickly with positive rather than negative results.

\(^{178}\) Ibid., pp.377-8.
\(^{179}\) Ibid., pp.378-9.
\(^{180}\) Ibid.
\(^{181}\) Ibid., pp.379-80.
\(^{182}\) Ibid., pp.380-1.
\(^{183}\) Ibid., pp.381-2.
The third element of Grey’s civilising schema was work. Alongside British laws and education, he saw disciplined labour as a way of instilling natives with the values of British civilisation and incorporating them into the socio-economic structures of modern European industry. He believed that a native employed in European-style labour could be converted from “a useless and dangerous being” to “a serviceable member of the community”. To achieve such desirable ends Grey suggested incentives be offered to settlers who employed natives. Monetary rewards and grants of land would be offered to settlers with official documents that legitimated the settled habits and industrial progress of their native labourers. Grey also saw a place for the government to employ native labourers. He believed local governments should provide work useful both to the natives and to themselves. Road-building was perfect. Grey argued that native workers would be contributing to the development of a colonial infrastructure whilst enjoying variable and interesting employment that stimulated habits of industry and contributed to their cultural and financial improvement.

Grey’s legal, educational and industrial measures of improvement were to be complemented by a system of rewards for civilised behaviour. Natives who could prove their constant employment for a period of three years or more should be eligible for a grant of land and funds to purchase livestock. Natives who could produce a certificate of marriage and were married to only one woman should receive a financial reward. Natives who registered their children’s births in the European fashion should also receive a small reward. These rewards were an encouragement to native civilisation in themselves, but also a way of recognising the effects of British law, native schools and regular work on Aboriginal behaviour.

The whole plan was premised on an implied principle of respect. Grey’s Australian report reflects a deep regard for Aborigines as fellow humans and an expectation that all individuals

---

184 Ibid., p.383.  
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should be treated with consideration. He believed that the principal reason for the Aborigines' "present depressed condition" was prejudice. They had been "most unfairly represented as a very inferior race, in fact as one occupying a scale in the creation which places them on a level with the brutes, and some years must elapse, e're a prejudice so firmly rooted as this can be altogether eradicated, but certainly a more unfounded one never had possession of the public mind".188 Grey argued that prejudice was a major hindrance to the progress of racial amalgamation. He cited the case of Miago, a native successfully 'civilised' on board the 'Beagle'. When returned to Australia he quickly reverted to savagery.

Miago, when he was landed, had amongst the white people none who would be truly friends of his, - they would give him scraps from their table, but the very outcasts of the whites would not have treated him as an equal, - they had no sympathy with him, - he could not have married a white woman, - he had no certain means of subsistence open to him, - he never could have been either a husband or a father, if he had lived apart from his own people; - where, amongst the whites, was he to find one who would have filled for him the place of his black mother, who he is much attached to? - what white man would have been his brother? - what white woman his sister? He had two courses left open to him, - he could either have renounced all natural ties, and have led a hopeless, joyless life amongst the whites, - either a servant, - ever an inferior being, - or he could renounce civilisation, and return to the friends of his childhood, and of the habits of his youth. He chose the latter course, and I think that I should do the same.189

The emphasis on relationships in Grey's analysis reflects his understanding of amalgamation as a personal process, and foreshadows his policy of personal rule in New Zealand. Miago's story also emphasises amalgamation as a dual process of elevation and acceptance. Not only had the native people to be raised in the scale of civilisation; the settlers had also to accept them.

It seems that Grey himself had planned to take an Aboriginal child back to England. In 1894 Robert Dent, a retired Medical Officer, wrote to inform Grey of the boy's progress. The child was from a tribe based at King George's Sound, where Grey had served as Resident Magistrate. When the boy changed his mind at the last moment, Dent escorted him back from Adelaide to his family. Called 'Peter' by the Europeans, he was dressed in a sailor suit and laden with presents of money and sugar. Before returning to Adelaide, Dent visited 'Peter' and found him "reduced to nudity, and minus his goods, but in high spirits and evidently happy to get back - which might not have been, had he tasted civilisation a little longer".190
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Encounters such as this and his experience in court reinforced Grey’s subdued ambivalence about British civilisation. Yet he did not waver in his determination to bring its blessings to Australia. The policy of amalgamation laid out in Grey’s Australian report was conceived with positive intentions. He saw this new world as a chance to improve on the old. British settlers would civilise and convert the Aborigines, and also improve themselves. Reality was, of course, far more complicated.

**South Australia 1840-1845**

Grey’s theoretical plan for aboriginal civilisation had immediate practical effects. Even before Lord Russell received the report, local governments in Australia had implemented some of Grey’s suggestions. When the report did reach England, Russell was so impressed that he quickly fired it straight back into the colonial arena in which it was produced, sending copies to the governors of all the Australian colonies, and to Hobson in New Zealand. He also offered Grey the vacant governorship of South Australia. Here was the perfect opportunity to implement his civilising scheme in the very context in which it was formulated. As governor he had the moral authority and practical tools to enforce his policy of racial amalgamation.

Prior to Grey’s appointment the South Australian settlers had treated Aborigines as a nuisance to the colony’s progress. Their attitude was mirrored and reinforced by the official British stance. When Grey took up the governorship European settlers and overlanders were pushing ever further into Aboriginal territory, causing increasing disturbance to traditional lifestyles.

Before he could implement his plan of native civilisation and amalgamation, the young governor had to quell the conflict between settler and Aborigine. To do so he used military and police force to protect both settlers and natives. As a soldier in Ireland Grey had been horrified to observe force used against peasant families. In an era when most British officers employed
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flogging routinely, Grey adopted a non-violent approach to punishing his wayward subordinates.\(^{196}\) As an explorer he did all he could to avoid physical conflict with native peoples. When confronted by Aborigines in northern Australia he protected himself and his party with guns as a last resort. Having killed an Aborigine in self-defence he was grief-stricken, but felt sure there had been no other option available.\(^{197}\) Grey insisted on complete obedience from his men. His maxim was “Certainty of punishment when it is deserved without severity”.\(^{198}\) As governor Grey saw force as a last resort.

Inter-racial violence continued to trouble South Australia intermittently through the 1840s, but Grey created a sufficient measure of calm to enforce the other aspects of his civilising plan. First, he attempted to apply British law equally to European and native alike.\(^ {199}\) In 1844 he passed an ordinance allowing Aboriginal evidence to be heard in court.\(^{200}\) The APS had first designed such a Bill in 1839 and the Imperial Government eventually passed the Colonial Evidence Act in 1843.\(^{201}\) Individual colonies had to pass enabling legislation to bring the law into effect, and South Australia and New Zealand were two of the first to do so. Though Grey anticipated long term civilising effects, the law did little to advance Aboriginal equality in the short or long term.\(^{202}\)

Second, he promoted Aboriginal education in the hope of instilling European values in their children. He supported mission schools and in 1844 opened a free Government school for native children.\(^ {203}\) The school was very close to Government House and Grey went every day to check on the progress of its pupils who quickly rose in number to nearly one hundred children by 1845.\(^{204}\) Grey also contributed to education from his private funds, instituting a system of pocket

\(^ {196}\) Ibid., p.32. In later life as a Member of Parliament in New Zealand Grey spoke against flogging again, denouncing all forms of corporal punishment, whether for soldiers, sailors, vagrants or natives. George Grey, 28 June 1882, NZPD, 42, p.75.
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\(^ {202}\) Summers, p.303.
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money for native school children.\textsuperscript{205} He also tried, unsuccessfully, to obtain free land grants for native institutions.\textsuperscript{206} In 1844 Grey passed an ordinance for the maintenance and protection of orphaned aboriginal children.\textsuperscript{207} It made the Protector of Aborigines the legal guardian of all part-Aboriginal children and all other Aboriginal children considered ‘unprotected’.\textsuperscript{208} The effects of this legislation on its intended beneficiaries were undoubtedly awful. But to Grey the legislation was a perfect example of British law being used to protect natives from the degrading influence of their own culture and laws. Along with European education he hoped it would help them rise in the scale of civilisation.

Third, Grey attempted to encourage Europeans to employ Aborigines. In September 1844 he passed an ordinance to facilitate the employment and instruction of aboriginal prisoners held in South Australian goals.\textsuperscript{209} In practice only a few settlers employed a small number of Aborigines on an occasional basis, while government funds were too low to allow for major expenditure on public works.\textsuperscript{210}

Grey’s most important supporters in his crusade for Aboriginal civilisation were the Protectors of Aborigines, who also acted as Resident Magistrates. His correspondence with Edward Eyre, Protector at Moorunde, and J. Macdonald, Protector at Port Lincoln, reveals the frustrations and successes of his plan in effect. With limited opportunities for influencing the transitory Aborigines, Eyre and Macdonald focused on Grey’s scheme of rewards for civilised behaviour.\textsuperscript{211}

Grey’s governorship of South Australia was modelled on the natural laws uncovered by his ethnographic investigations and the systematic plan expounded in his 1840 report. Colonial reality inevitably impacted on its implementation. He was faced with ongoing inter-racial violence and major financial constraints. Most significantly, the unsympathetic settler population
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did not want to be amalgamated with natives they saw as inferior, and the natives themselves were largely unresponsive to Grey’s civilising efforts.

**Imperial Instructions: New Zealand**

On the strength of his performance in South Australia Grey was awarded the governorship of New Zealand. Though he had failed in his plan for racial amalgamation, he had alleviated interracial violence and reduced the colony’s debt. The Colonial Office hoped he would achieve the same in New Zealand, where land disagreements and armed uprisings were threatening British settlers and draining the British purse. Lord Stanley’s instructions to Grey as Lieutenant-Governor of New Zealand are brief and vague. So far removed from the site of conflict, he and his staff had little real insight into New Zealand’s problems. Their general approach, however, was closely aligned with Grey’s plan for racial amalgamation. Stanley’s instructions were primarily concerned to protect and elevate Māori. They reflect the strong humanitarian influence on Colonial Office policy in the 1840s. Grey’s native policy in New Zealand was directed by official instructions that were in turn influenced by schemes such as his own plan for Aboriginal civilisation. His instructions from Stanley represent an ongoing dialogue between local knowledge and imperial power.

The final instructions issued to Grey in June 1845 were based on a series of drafts. The drafts are documents of process, showing the way policies developed. Writing from a distance, their authors were painfully conscious how ignorant they were of New Zealand’s changing situation. The first surviving record recommending Grey for the governorship of New Zealand is a memo that passed between two staff members in the Colonial Office, G. W. Hope and James Stephen. Hope was concerned at their lack of information about New Zealand. Knowing the new governor would have to be entrusted with wide discretionary powers he suggested somebody already serving as a colonial governor would be most suitable. Since Grey was already serving in the area, and had proved himself a success in South Australia, Hope saw him “as the fittest person to be applied to”. He enclosed with the memo a draft of general instructions, a separate draft on finances, and a third draft relating to the temporary administration of South Australia. The three
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drafts are long, detailed and repetitious. James Stephen, permanent Under-Secretary at the Colonial Office, was uncomfortable with their apologetic tone and the wide powers they granted Grey. He set out to write new instructions, but acknowledged that even he could say little more than “go and do the best you can to give effect to the views of the Government”. Stephen’s instructions follow the same lines of policy as Hope’s but adopt a more authoritative tone and concise style. He wrote to Hope that he had convinced himself, “after many attempts that it is impossible to write much more than this on the present occasion to any good purpose”. Hope and Lord Stanley both concurred. Stephen’s draft then, is very close to the actual instructions issued to Grey under Stanley’s name on 13 June 1845.

The instructions begin with flattery. Stanley praised Grey’s abilities, his public spirit, and his attention to affairs in New Zealand. He left the option open for Grey to return to South Australia, but assumed he would accept the move to New Zealand at least for the short term. In light of New Zealand’s turbulence Grey was appointed with even more powers than an ordinary governor. Stanley described Grey’s role as that of “temporary special commissioner for the adjustment of the difficulties in which the colony is at present involved”. He promised that Grey’s salary would reflect such heavy responsibilities and leave him free from concern over his private finances. In a separate dispatch issued on 28 June, Stanley laid out the details of Grey’s salary and of the increased parliamentary vote for New Zealand. Grey was to receive £2,500 per annum, an increase of £1,300 on FitzRoy’s salary. In addition to the £7,565 parliament had already granted for New Zealand, the Colonial Office was seeking a further £15,000 to help Grey resolve the colony’s financial woes. They had also arranged to send a “sufficient military force” to settle the Māori rebellion. Stanley’s flattering words and financial and military arrangements reflect the Colonial Office’s high esteem for Grey and their increasing desperation to sort out New Zealand’s problems once and for all.
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216 Mr. Hope to Mr. Stephen, 14 June 1845, CO209/38, p.327; Lord Stanley to Mr. Stephen, 14 June 1845, CO209/38, p.327.
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Stanley’s instructions draw overtly on humanitarian rhetoric and principles. While economy looms in the subtext, the instructions themselves focus on native rights and welfare. In a general outline of New Zealand’s history, Stanley describes British colonisation as a humanitarian intervention and emphasises the British government’s efforts to avoid conflict with Māori. He vehemently repudiates the idea that the Treaty of Waitangi was “a mere blind to amuse and deceive ignorant savages” and instructs Grey to “honourably and scrupulously fulfil” its conditions. With rather loose references, he directs Grey to find a balance between respecting native rights and incorporating them in the structures of British society. Protecting and elevating Māori go hand in hand: “... omit no measure ... for securing to the aborigines the personal freedom and safety to which they are entitled, and the most unrestricted access to all the means of religious knowledge and of civilisation ...” Like Grey, Stanley and the Colonial Office staff saw British law as a key to civilising native peoples. It was Grey’s duty to show “every possible respect ... both in the structure of the law and in the administration of it, for the opinions, the feelings and the prejudices by which they may be possessed, and from which they cannot be rudely or abruptly divorced”. Such liberal instructions seem directly opposed to Grey’s Australian plan, in which British law was applied to settler and native firmly and completely. But Stanley was referring only “to opinions, feelings and prejudices not in themselves opposed to the fundamental laws of morality, nor inconsistent with the peace and welfare of the colonists of European descent”. He expected that Grey “require from these people an implicit submission to the law”, and authorised the governor to “enforce that submission by the use of all the powers, civil and military, at your command”. In essence, Stanley left Grey with free reign to interpret and apply the principles of humanitarian intervention as he saw fit.

Throughout the instructions Stanley frequently criticised Governor FitzRoy. He had just fired FitzRoy for incompetence and was appointing Grey to repair his mistakes. It was crucial then, that Grey understood what specific aspects of FitzRoy’s policy and behaviour had led to his dismissal. The Colonial Office was particularly dismayed by his illegal financial arrangements and a perceived weakness in the face of native hostility. They were frustrated by his infrequent
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and incomplete communications, and strongly urged Grey to report more regularly.\textsuperscript{228} The open criticisms of FitzRoy in these instructions form the crucial context for Grey’s attitude toward his predecessor. They also help explain Grey’s vehement attacks on FitzRoy’s policies (even when closely aligned with his own), and his determination to distance himself from FitzRoy’s favourites.

Though Stanley warned Grey from following in FitzRoy’s steps, he urged the new governor to refer to FitzRoy and Hobsons’ instructions. On several different issues, Stanley “found no reason to retract the instructions … which have already been addressed to your predecessors.”\textsuperscript{229} Along with his instructions, he sent Grey copies of the parliamentary papers relating to New Zealand, including Lord Normanby’s instructions to Hobson and Lord John Russell’s instructions to FitzRoy.

William Hobson was sent to New Zealand in 1840 to secure the Treaty of Waitangi, and bring New Zealand under British governance. Like Grey, he came to the Colonial Office’s attention through his enthusiasm for colonial affairs. After a brief visit on H.M.S. Rattlesnake in 1837 he had submitted a plan for implementing the factory system in New Zealand to Governor Bourke of New South Wales.\textsuperscript{230} Bourke forwarded the plan to the Colonial Office.\textsuperscript{231} A few years later they appointed Hobson to represent Britain in New Zealand. James Stephen drafted his instructions. Naturally, they follow the same humanitarian lines as Stanley’s to Grey. Normanby informed Hobson that the purpose of British intervention was to save the Māori people from the evils being currently perpetrated by European settlers; “to mitigate, and, if possible, to avert these disasters, and to rescue the emigrants themselves from the evils of a lawless society.”\textsuperscript{232} Referring to the 1837 Buxton report, Normanby instructed Hobson to support Christian missions, appoint a Protector of Aborigines, and establish native schools. He should respect Māori customs until they could be “brought into the pale of civilised life and trained to the adoption of its habits”, but should not tolerate savage practices such as cannibalism and human sacrifice that

\textsuperscript{228} Ibid., p.72.
\textsuperscript{229} Ibid. See also pp.70, 71.
\textsuperscript{230} William Hobson to R. Bourke, 8 August 1837, GBPP 1837-38/40, pp.3-5.
were incompatible with “the universal maxims of humanity and morals”. In December 1840 Lord John Russell wrote to Hobson insisting that of all the native peoples included in the empire, Māori deserved most attention. “They are not mere wanderers ... nor tribes of hunters, or of herdsmen”. In the Victorian scale of civilisation Māori ranked more highly than other natives as “a people among whom the arts of government have made some progress”.

Robert FitzRoy, a Tory evangelical, had also visited New Zealand before his appointment as governor, captaining the Beagle on its visit to the Bay of Islands in 1835. His published Narrative reveals a deep fascination with indigenous peoples. In evidence to the Committee on New Zealand, FitzRoy suggested that the missionaries be left to Christianise and civilise Māori under the auspices of a British Protectorate. As early as 1840 Dandeson Coates, secretary of the CMS, had recommended FitzRoy for the governorship of New Zealand. On his appointment in 1843, FitzRoy’s instructions were nothing more than brief answers to his own questions. Russell directed him to follow the same policy as Hobson and refused any extra military support.

The instructions issued to Hobson, FitzRoy and Grey were all drafted by James Stephen. Stephen was a devout Anglican of evangelical sympathies, committed to the humanitarian agenda. He was closely connected to the CMS, WMS and APS. Stephen is a crucial figure in nineteenth century imperialism. As Undersecretary at the Colonial Office he institutionalised

233 Ibid., p.735. Hobson was not actually made Governor until after the proclamation of sovereignty over New Zealand. As Governor he received a new set of instructions following the same lines. Russell instructed him to promote “the protection of the aborigines from injustice, cruelty and wrong; the establishment and maintenance of friendly relations with them; the diversion into useful channels of the capacities for labour, which have hitherto been lying dormant; the avoidance of every practice towards them tending to the destruction of their health or the diminution of their numbers; the education of their youth; and the diffusion amongst the whole native population of the blessings of Christianity”. Lord John Russell to William Hobson, 9 December 1840, GBPP 1841 (311), p.29.
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the Victorian imperial conscience in the routines of daily decision-making. It is unsurprising then, that Stephen’s instructions to the three governors should bear such strong resemblances to Grey’s own ideas for civilising natives. Nor is it surprising that Grey, FitzRoy and Hobson should have won their appointments by demonstrating an interest in native civilisation.

The other crucial imperial document informing Grey’s policy in New Zealand between 1845 and 1853 was the report of the 1844 Parliamentary Select Committee on New Zealand. Its recommendations reinforced his humanitarian ideas about civilising native peoples. It also boosted his sense of self-importance. In open acknowledgement of their reliance on colonial perspectives the Committee stated “that efforts should be made gradually to wean the Natives from their ancient customs, and to induce them to adopt those of civilised life, upon the principle recommended by Captain Grey, in his Report on the mode of introducing Civilisation amongst the Natives of Australia”. Grey’s policies for civilising native peoples contributed significantly to the British humanitarian dialogue on race, which in turn formed the context in which his official instructions as governor were produced.

**Conclusion**

Though Grey had strong personal views on civilising natives, he was not sent to South Australia or to New Zealand as a private individual. He was paid to do a particular job and to follow a particular policy. For the most part, that policy was closely aligned with his own ideas about race. The similarities between Grey’s Australian plan and Stanley’s instructions are not coincidental. Grey’s 1840 report on methods for improving the Australian aborigines was written from first hand experience, but moulded by the same context of early nineteenth century humanitarianism which influenced the Colonial Office. Grey’s plan for elevating and amalgamating aborigines was based on his firm belief in the innate equality and improvability of all humankind. It embraced political, cultural and economic measures, and particularly
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emphasised British law, native education and native industry. Like Colonial Office staff, Grey saw Christianity as a necessary precursor to true civilisation and contact with European colonists as the key to demonstrating and spreading the benefits of civilised life. Based on scientific principles and natural laws, Grey’s plan represents a distinctively post-Enlightenment humanitarianism dedicated to improving mankind.

The similarities between Grey’s Australian plan and Stanley’s instructions suggest that imperial centre and colonial periphery were far from independent. Despite the time lag caused by physical distance, colonial governors and imperial officials in the Colonial Office were part of the same machine. In his role as Governor of South Australia and then of New Zealand, Grey followed the principles of his plan and his instructions from the Colonial Office.

Grey’s policy of racial amalgamation was embedded in colonial context, imperial humanitarianism and ethnographic encounters. Ethnology and political experience confirmed his faith in the unity and improvability of mankind. Impelled by a liberal Anglican sense of duty, he sought to fulfil God’s plan for human progress by elevating natives in the scale of civilisation and joining them with British settlers to form a unified society of equals who could then proceed together even further up the scale.
Chapter Three
War and Law: the Politics of Humanitarian Control

At the end of 1845 George Grey arrived in New Zealand with a detailed plan of racial amalgamation all laid out. Far away in England, Colonial Office officials empowered him with unfettered discretion and strengthened his arm with money and military might. Grey’s plan for unifying and improving Māori and settler societies in New Zealand was based on the liberal Anglican humanitarianism espoused in his 1840 Australian plan and developed in response to the specific complexities at hand. Arriving in the midst of a war, Grey’s first priority was to establish political control. He saw the Treaty of Waitangi, as agreed to by representatives of the British Crown and by Māori chiefs, as fundamentally important to restoring peace and achieving racial amalgamation in New Zealand. In the English version of the first article of the Treaty, Māori chiefs ceded sovereignty to the Queen. Grey followed a two-stranded policy to secure that sovereignty. First, he used all the available military force at his disposal to subdue any natives who challenged British authority. Second, he enforced British law firmly and immediately, among natives and settlers. He abolished the Native Trust and Aboriginal Protectorate and created an infrastructure of Resident Magistrates, Native Assessors, Native Police and military pensioners. Claiming widespread success, Grey believed he was extending to Māori the rights of British citizenship, and compelling them to recognise their corresponding obligations under the third article of the Treaty.

In reality, Grey operated in the context of Māori and settler expectations and reactions. Some Māori welcomed British authority and played an active part in developing and enforcing Grey’s various military and legal measures. To them, Grey became father and best friend, beloved as Queen Victoria’s representative in New Zealand. Some responded by taking what they saw as beneficial from the Europeans and adapting accordingly. Some Māori rejected his attempts outright, and many more in the remote parts of the country remained untroubled by European authority.

Grey’s commitment to amalgamation was based on liberal Anglican ideas of human unity and improvability. Understanding these ideas as the crucial context for his policies of political control, this chapter also acknowledges the powerful conflicting pressures affecting his
governorship and constraining his implementation of amalgamation. Some modern New Zealand historians have interpreted Grey’s use of force as evidence of insincere if not hypocritical humanitarianism. McLintock writes that he was “[i]mpatient of control and greedy for power ... driven by ambition to unscrupulous methods in order to gain the advantage of the moment”.1 Ian Wards argues that Grey’s “lack of sincerity ... was to be a major factor in political and military affairs for a quarter century, in racial relations for a great deal longer”.2 The economic and social policies discussed in chapters four and five of this thesis make such interpretations untenable. Grey’s strategies for maintaining political control were highly controversial, sometimes even illegal. But ultimately, they were consistent with nineteenth century liberal Anglican principles. They formed a crucial part of his broader plan for promoting native civilisation. Motivated by a liberal Anglican sense of mission, Grey saw both law and war as powerful tools of racial amalgamation to be deployed at his own discretion in pursuit of a ‘higher good’. This chapter seeks to integrate military and political history with intellectual and religious history to show that Governor Grey’s politics can only be fully understood with reference to his ideas about race and civilisation. It begins with an analysis of military force, and then discusses legal measures.

Establishing Political Control: Military Force

Grey arrived in New Zealand on 14 November 1845 in the midst of a slight lull in the Northern war. Māori troops were considering Governor FitzRoy’s peace proposals and gathering their crops. A week later Grey wrote to the Colonial Office anticipating further violence and insisting that more troops were vital to prevent the “general insurrection and tumult” threatened both by disaffected Europeans and rebellious natives.3 Securing a stable peace was vital for promoting his reputation in England, establishing his authority in New Zealand, and implementing his plan for native civilisation and racial amalgamation.

Generations of historians have described and analysed the New Zealand wars from a range of perspectives. In this section I will not reiterate the details of individual engagements, but explore Grey’s use of military force as part of his humanitarian plan for racial amalgamation. As in

3 George Grey to Lord Stanley, 22 November 1845, *GBPP 1846 (712)*, p.3. The Colonial Office had already sent all available forces to New Zealand, and were apparently bemused by Grey’s request for even more aid. W. E. Gladstone to Mr Smith, 19 March 1846, CO209/38, p.21.
Australia, force was a last resort. Once deemed necessary, however, Grey committed himself whole-heartedly to force as a means of breaking Māori resistance and asserting British sovereignty. He believed that finishing the war in New Zealand was absolutely essential to establishing a lasting peace and advancing Māori civilisation. To this end he insisted that neutral Māori declare themselves for or against the government, established a native police force, banned the sale of arms and ammunition to Māori and led the government’s combined European and Māori force in person. In some cases, such as his arrest of Te Rauparaha, Grey used force illegally, convinced of his primary duty to establish British authority. Peace was proclaimed in the north on the 22 January 1846, but unrest continued in the southern parts of the North Island, where Grey’s missionary friend Richard Taylor played a pivotal part in negotiating between the Governor and Māori. By the late 1840s New Zealand was relatively settled, but Grey still believed a military presence was necessary as a visible representation of the power of British authority. He introduced a scheme of military pensioners, both European and Māori, more as a safety net than an active force. His inclusion of Māori in the scheme was a significant indicator of the high regard Grey had developed for their military ability. His experience of fighting with and against Māori affected Grey profoundly, reinforcing his belief that they could swiftly be raised in the scale of civilisation to be amalgamated with their European neighbours.

On principle, Grey was opposed to the unnecessary use of force. Some historians, including Ian Wards and Tania Thompson, depict Grey as a warmonger.4 Thompson writes that “during the first three years of his governorship, he preferred to use force rather than negotiation as a means to extend sovereignty”.5 In fairness, Grey arrived in the middle of an existing war. As an officer in Ireland he had opposed excessive force and in South Australia he had struggled to curb settler aggression towards Aborigines. Joseph Bristow argues in Empire Boys that it “practically goes without saying that dominant, or hegemonic, masculinity is endorsed by a longstanding genealogy of violence”.6 Though opposed to unnecessary violence, Grey saw force as an appropriate response to those who resisted the model of European sovereignty he sought to impose. Violence was transformed into noble necessity and justified by the peace it promised to secure for the future. Other humanitarians, like Richard Taylor, saw war in the same light. In an
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1846 memorandum to Grey, Taylor argued that the British government had badly overlooked the need for a strong military presence in New Zealand. Māori had little respect, wrote Taylor, for a local government that could not even produce a display of force on which to establish a moral position. Grey similarly had little compunction about using force when he believed it was necessary to establish the peace required for implementing his policies of racial amalgamation.

The Colonial Office also saw war as a last resort. So far removed from local events they put Grey in total control. Post-colonial historians have emphasised imperial aggression toward indigenous societies. But in the 1840s humanitarians dominated the Colonial Office, intent on protecting and elevating native peoples. Britain had had her fill of expensive colonial wars, and military expenditure was highly unpopular. Grey’s repeated requests for more money and troops in New Zealand were certainly not calculated to increase his popularity in Britain. Yet at this stage in his career the Colonial Office was entirely compliant. They had little choice. Grey’s dispatches warned of an even higher long-term cost if New Zealand was not dealt with quickly and efficiently. Successive colonial secretaries and officials acquiesced with his demands and ineffectually approved military operations planned and carried out months earlier. Britain might have been the centre of the empire, but out on the periphery, governors waged wars and created colonial policy on a day to day basis.

Within days of taking up office Grey travelled north to investigate the causes and progress of the war for himself. On 25 November he addressed an assembly of chiefs at Kororareka. First, the Governor declared his intentions. If Kawiti and Heke had not fully accepted FitzRoy’s existing peace terms (which Grey privately thought unjust and unmanageable) by 2 December he would consider hostilities resumed. Second, he asserted that the government would brook no neutrality. Māori must declare themselves either for or against the Crown. Third, Grey reassured Māori of his intention to fulfil the terms of the Treaty of Waitangi “most punctually and scrupulously”. He promised to protect their lives, land and possessions and to secure them “happiness, freedom
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and safety” through religious instruction and the application of British law. “It is the desire of the Queen”, he proclaimed, “that the chiefs of this country should become as wise and wealthy as the chiefs of England”. The assembled Māori responded positively. As Pukututu said “Although I am of a different nation, and speak a different language, and my face is of a different aspect, yet I have heard your words and have digested them”. Most promised to support Grey, but asserted their own authority alongside the Queen’s. Macquarie emphasised his independence, explaining that he had helped the government not because he was asked to, but because of his own desire to put “down evil”. Moses Tawai warned that as “long as the Government is just to me, I will be just to it also … I care not whether it is a stranger or a native who does me an injury, I will, in either case, defend myself; I love justice”.

Heke and Kawiti responded to Grey’s demands with evasion and delay. By 4 December Grey was certain they were “making every preparation for a determined contest”. He responded in kind. Grey sent Macquarie to guard Heke’s pa, while Tamati Waka Nene scouted out Kawiti’s pa in preparation for attack.

Back in Auckland, Grey called the Legislative Council where once again he publicly affirmed his commitment to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, promising to protect Māori as well as to bring them the benefits of civilisation and British citizenship. The practical purpose of convening the Council was to pass an ordinance restricting the sale of arms and ammunition to Māori. FitzRoy had issued several ineffectual proclamations warning settlers not to trade in arms with Māori, but never legislated or applied penalties. In March 1848 Grey reported that his regulations had been quite successful. The number of Māori owning guns had decreased and they were “becoming quite unaccustomed to war”. Arms and ammunition were symbolic and
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actual repositories of power and authority. Grey’s principal goal in his first few months of governorship was to secure that authority to himself.

His other purpose in Auckland was to establish a native police corps. In 1840 the Colonial Office had instructed Hobson to raise a militia partially composed of Māori, but neither Hobson, nor Shortland, nor FitzRoy had done so. Grey planned that the corps would be based on the successful Cape and Ceylon Rifle Corps and would gradually increase from an initial force of sixty men. They were to be drilled as ‘regular troops’, working alongside European police under European leadership. Grey insisted there be no distinction whatever between the Māori and European constables.

Grey presented the native police as evidence of amalgamation in action. In September 1846 he notified the Colonial Office of “numerous applications” from natives wanting to join the corps. He enclosed a letter from the chief Te Ruigna Kahukoti: “My young men are desirous to become policemen – men for you ... They will be taken away into your presence to be friends and protectors of you”. As agents of the government, these men became intimately acquainted with British law and European standards of discipline. Under the eye of the Governor they were offered “every encouragement to break through their old customs, and to rest satisfied of the enduring and lasting support of the government if they identified themselves with British institutions”. Operating within the structures of British law enforcement, Māori police became active participants in the process of extending Crown authority among their tribes.

In contrast to Grey’s enthusiasm, many settlers objected to the force. Felton Mathew questioned the need for extra police at all, warning “what dangerous enemies they would become should they, after acquiring our notions of discipline, turn their arms against us”. Worse still, Mathew argued, the debauched native police force was demoralising rather than civilising Māori. “Indeed so infamous a notoriety has this Police Force acquired, that notwithstanding the temptation
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presented by so high a rate of pay, no well conducted native will enter it'. He attributed their womanising and drunkenness to unduly high rates of pay (the same as European police). Mathew shared Grey’s ambivalent attitude to the impact of European culture on native peoples. Like other nineteenth century Britons, he thought about race in the context of class. He believed that employing Māori as police “has given them an insight into the habits of the very worst class of Europeans, and they have engrained the worst of our vices on the natural imperfections of their own character”. Mathew called for the police to be disbanded immediately:

The whole thing is a crying evil, and all who really desire to promote the civilisation of the Māori, and still more his moral and religious welfare, will use all possible means to induce the Government to break up and abandon this Native Police Force, which as far as the Natives themselves are concerned, is a measure of unmixed, unmitigated evil, as regards ourselves, is a matter of perfect moonshine.

Mathew’s account highlights the conflicting forces that limited Grey’s power in his first governorship of New Zealand. Measures such as the Māori police force depended both on Māori reaction and European response.

In early January 1846 Grey led his troops against Kawiti’s pa, Ruapekapeka. On January 11 they captured the pa, claiming a brilliant victory for the Crown. But Kawiti had been following a military strategy unfamiliar to British commanders. The British had not captured a fortified village but a fighting pa, built specifically for war, and designed to be abandoned at the right time. Victory at Ruapekapeka was truly hollow, for when Grey and his men stormed the pa it was empty. Nevertheless, Heke and Kawiti were ready for peace. With Tamati Waka Nene as intermediary they submitted to the Governor’s authority. Grey granted all who had fought against the Crown a full and free pardon.

With the north now calm, hostilities intensified in the Hutt Valley, Porirua and Wanganui. Much of the discontent centred on land issues. In a long series of skirmishes, attacks and reprisals Māori asserted their sovereignty over tracts of land that European settlers believed they had
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bought, and indeed, had started to farm. Richard Taylor was crucial to Grey’s success in settling these southern conflicts. In the north, Henry Williams and other missionaries had interpreted for the government and assisted with negotiations, but Grey was strongly aware of their loyalty to FitzRoy. In Taylor he found a personal friend and trusted advisor.

In February 1846 Grey arrived in Wellington with ships and troops to “settle the Hutt question”.38 Taylor was optimistic:

The Governor’s movements are quick and decided very unlike those of his predecessor his conduct is evidently causing him to be viewed by both Europeans & Māoris as a man who is not to be trifled with if the war terminates now it will have been beneficial to both races shewing them one must not despise & underrate the other & thus by causing mutual respect guarantee the continuance of peace in the Island & the permanent welfare of all.39

Even before meeting Grey in person, Taylor was providing him with active political support and the mantle of God’s blessing. On 16 February 1846 he spent the night in a village in Waikanae. In the morning he saw a letter from the Governor urging the chiefs to give up the contested land at the Hutt peacefully. Taylor preached from the New Testament “on the duty of yielding obedience to Governors”.40 He argued that although the Queen appeared to have appointed Grey, he was really sent by God.41 Taylor made a direct link between obedience to Grey, obedience to God and the blessings of God. Like Grey, with whom he shared strong humanitarian principles, Taylor believed it was God’s will for New Zealand to be civilised so that “its inhabitants should enjoy the same temporal blessings which his Servants did in England & other parts & therefore that his will might be fulfilled in their favour they must love & obey the Governor God had given them”.42 The next day Taylor met Grey himself, and the following week acted as interpreter and negotiator between the Governor and natives occupying land at the Hutt.43 Though he found himself in strife with Māori for his involvement with the government, and resolved to avoid interpreting again, Taylor also aided Grey in Wanganui.44
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Later in his governorship, missionaries were critical in implementing Grey's plans for integrating Māori in the settler economy and raising their social standing. In war, their local knowledge, existing relationships and privileged status made them powerful tools in the campaign to establish British sovereignty. Grey cited the example of John Whitely, a Wesleyan missionary, who had prevented a conflict erupting at Kawhia. Whitely was but one example of "the mode in which missionaries scattered amongst a barbarous population, at no cost to the Government, are often more efficient than any force which a Government could maintain". Financial constraints limited the number of troops posted in outlying areas, while missionaries already stationed throughout the country kept the peace in a "most efficient although unobtrusive manner" without offending Māori pride.

The most controversial episode in the southern wars was Grey's arrest of Te Rauparaha. In an examination of Grey's capacity as a military leader, Ian Wards describes the arrest as "totally unprincipled, illegal and reprehensible". Seventy seven year old Te Rauparaha had only once attacked Europeans, in self-defence at the Wairau. In the mid 1840s, Te Rauparaha's nephew Te Rangihaeata was the main focus of Māori discontent in the south. Te Rauparaha was in the difficult position of having committed to support both his kin and the government. Already suspicious of Te Rauparaha, Grey was increasingly concerned about reports of rising optimism among the government's opponents, and declining confidence among their allies. On 23 July 1846 he kidnapped Te Rauparaha, denying him both the privileges of British citizenship and the process of British law. The chief was never charged or brought to trial.

Justifying his actions to the Colonial Office, Grey referred vaguely to Māori evidence showing there could be "no doubt that a very dangerous and extensive conspiracy had been formed" with
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Te Rauparaha at the centre. Patricia Burn’s definitive biography of Te Rauparaha argues that the evidence and reasoning in this dispatch is ludicrous and irrelevant. She sees Grey’s mistreatment of the chief as a political ploy for stamping the Governor’s authority on Cook Strait. The ploy worked. Ranginui Walker writes that “by acting decisively, albeit illegally, Grey demonstrated there was a new power in the land” and effectively destroyed Te Rauparaha’s mana. In arresting Te Rauparaha, Grey’s insistence on the full and fair application of British law was over-ridden by an even stronger belief that British authority must be established in New Zealand at almost any cost. The episode also echoes Grey’s intolerance of neutral or “deceitful” chiefs in the north. Te Rauparaha had committed no overt acts of aggression, but nor had he come down squarely on the government’s side.

The colonial government held Te Rauparaha captive for a year. When Grey announced his release to the Colonial Office he referred obliquely to the difficulty of gathering evidence for a trial and emphasised the goodwill gained from treating the old man so generously. Felton Mathew described the arrest as “absurd and injudicious”, and warned that it had “been a means of producing in the natives generally a want of faith and confidence in the British Government”. Patricia Burns writes that Māori were saddened at the blow to the mana of Māori chieftianship in general. Alan Ward represents most modern historical commentary in his argument that Grey’s arrest of Te Rauparaha was an act of treachery, forming part of the context for ongoing Māori resentment and resistance. Yet Grey’s treatment of Te Rauparaha (and his use of force in general) was not inconsistent with his Christian humanitarianism. Grey saw military power as a complement to courts, schools and hospitals – together they formed a comprehensive programme of racial amalgamation. Impelled by a liberal Anglican sense of duty and authority, Grey
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focussed on this ‘higher good’ in destroying Te Rauparaha’s mana, as in dismantling the Protectorate of Aborigines and pursuing the CMS land claimants.  

By mid 1846 Māori and Pākehā had reached a fragile peace. Over the next few years Grey stationed military pensioners around Auckland to help solidify that peace. In May 1846 he wrote to Lord Stanley arguing that New Zealand needed an extra 1400 troops to boost its military force to 2500 men for the next four or five years, as well as a substantial local native and European police force.  

Grey framed his request in typically alarmist fashion. Warning of potentially dire consequences were the country left undefended, he simultaneously reassured Stanley that he himself was committed to the task at hand and eminently capable of securing a lasting and financially viable peace given the required support.

I will do my utmost to conduct the service in such a way as to merit Her Majesty’s approbation; but my fear is, that if a sufficient force is not at once stationed in the country, sanguinary and expensive, yet petty, wars may take place, which will entail on Great Britain a large and useless expenditure of blood and money, and retard the advancement of this country almost indefinitely; whilst on the other hand, should a sufficient force be at once sent here, I feel satisfied that no further disturbance of any consequence will take place, and that in a few years the country will be able to defray the expense of its own establishments.

Earl Grey, the new Secretary of State for the Colonies, notified Grey that 900 regular troops would be dispatched to New Zealand from regiments serving in New South Wales, and 500 pensioners and their families would depart from England to form the Royal New Zealand Fencibles.

The pensioners were essentially discharged British soldiers who would live and work in New Zealand as labourers, but be available for military service when necessary. The first arrived in New Zealand in August 1847. Over the next year 434 men accompanied by 366 wives and 753 children settled on grants of Crown land at Onehunga, Panmure, Otahuhu and Howick. Only once did the government call them out on active service. On 17 April 1851 they settled a
disturbance at Auckland, but otherwise lived quiet lives as new emigrants. Grey presented the pensioners as a cost effective means of securing empire. They were cheaper than regular troops and as land holders and farmers their labour increased the value of land and encouraged emigrants from Britain.

In April 1849 Grey extended the pensioner system to apply to eighty two Māori warriors. As part of the military establishment these men contributed to Grey’s plan for asserting British sovereignty over New Zealand, but also represented the progress of amalgamation in action. The men were all from Ngati Mahuta in the Waikato. They agreed to twelve days unpaid military service a year and any further military service at the rate of 1s 6d per day. The government agreed to call them only for the purpose of military exercise or the defence of the colony and to treat them in all respects exactly the same as Her Majesty’s regular forces. Like the British pensioners they were promised free title to their rent-free houses and land after seven years of service. All eighty two men were settled in the same village, adjacent to the British pensioners’ village at Onehunga.

Grey saw the Māori pensioners as a valuable addition to New Zealand’s defence force. In the event of renewed unrest the British pensioners would have

the cooperation and assistance of a body of natives accustomed to be drilled with them, and attached to them from inhabiting the same locality and serving under the same officers, whose activity and knowledge of the country, and of the native mode of warfare, will in some degree compensate for the age and unfitness of the [British] pensioners for rapid movements. In fact, the two combined ought to compose a force of a very useful description.

In line with his over-arching native policy Grey also believed that Māori would gain from the arrangement. Settled in a fertile district with easy access to ready markets for their produce and labour, they would steadily be integrated in the settler economy. Under the supervision of a British officer and in the company of British soldiers they would learn British values and habits. Guidance from a military chaplain would increase their understanding of Christianity and enhance their “rapid progress in civilisation”. The improvements they made on the land they occupied would steadily increase its value. This process, “together with the intimacies which

---
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will spring up between them and their European neighbours” would attach them more and more securely to British interests.\textsuperscript{70}

The Waikato pensioners responded enthusiastically to Grey’s vision for advancing their state of civilisation and joining them with the settler population. In May 1849 Surveyor General C. W. Ligar wrote to inform Grey that the Māori were “much pleased with the arrangements made for them, and are sanguine of succeeding in their new location”.\textsuperscript{71} They were “delighted to find that in every particular” their village “resembled those which have been lately laid out for the New Zealand Fencibles”. In appearance it was a completely European settlement. On the provisional map, Ligar had named the village Mangare after the peninsula on which it was situated. The pensioners objected to this name, which meant “lazy” in Māori. After discussing and rejecting several other Māori names, “they unanimously agreed that it should have a European name, and that the name should be ‘Queen’s Town’, in honour, as they said, of our most gracious Sovereign”.\textsuperscript{72} The perceived need for supplementary Māori pensioners reflects the fact that many tribes continued to resist Crown authority, even if tacitly. But the image of these Ngati Mahuta warriors settling on ‘Queen’s Town’ for the name of their new military village reflects a commitment by these particular men to partnership with the Europeans.

Grey’s Māori pensioner plan was based on liberal Anglican ideas about race and on the Governor’s observations and experiences during the wars. James Belich has lumped Grey with the vaguely amorphous ‘British military’, which he characterises as arrogant and racist, unwilling and unable to recognise Māori military ability.\textsuperscript{73} Grey initially viewed the northern war somewhat dismissively. On 8 December 1845 he wrote to Stanley:

I cannot discover that the rebels have any single grievance to complain of which could in any degree extenuate their personal conduct ... I believe it arises solely from an irrational contempt of the power of Great Britain, accompanied by a desire upon the part of many of their chiefs to gain influence and renown, and of a wish upon the part of their followers to share in the excitement and plunder which would result from successful rebellion upon their part.\textsuperscript{74}
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Interpreting Māori actions in a framework of Anglo-Saxon superiority, Grey did not understand their grievances. His report typified the natives as unreasonable, irascible, greedy and vain, characteristics typically associated with the 'lower' races. Over the coming weeks and months his experience of Māori as negotiators, tacticians and soldiers altered this perspective.

Almost immediately, in fact, Grey realised the importance of native allies in establishing political control. On 25 November 1845 in his address to the chiefs at Kororareka he publicly thanked Tamati Waka Nene, Macquarie, Moses, Broughton “and other great and good chiefs”, promising that their “noble conduct” would never be forgotten. 75 One of Grey’s first dispatches to the Colonial office concerned Waka Nene’s brother Timotei, who had lost both eyes fighting for the British. Grey recommended awarding the chief a government pension. 76 In early December he directed that natives fighting for the government should receive a daily ration. The measure showed a degree of respect for Māori, but also served a practical political purpose. Rations would secure stronger loyalty to the Crown and give the British an advantage over their opponents. 77 When the British prepared to attack Ruapekapeka Grey used Māori scouts in advance of British troops. More significantly, he posted Māori forces to guard Heke’s pa, placing total trust in the chief Macquarie to carry out this crucial task. 78 On 5 January Grey wrote to Stanley emphasising the part native allies were playing in individual skirmishes. 79 For example, “on the morning of the 29th a party of our native allies penetrated the wood immediately on our front, in a most praiseworthy manner, and took possession of an open piece of ground on the opposite side, sending me immediate intelligence of what they had done”. Grey quickly moved his British troops forward and together they secured the position. Later the enemy made a strong sally from the pa “but they were most gallantly opposed by our Native Allies under the direction of the Chiefs Tamata Waka Noble (or Nopera) Mohi Tawhai and others who instantly dashed out and attacked them driving them back with some loss”. 80 On 2 January the European troops stayed back, acting only as a reserve “at the particular desire of the native Chiefs who
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were fearful that their own people might be mistaken for the enemy and fired upon”. Grey acknowledges and praises individual chiefs for their initiative and courage in leadership.

In December 1845 Grey composed a ‘Memorandum upon the mode in which Military operations can be most advantageously conducted in New Zealand’. This was a general outline for waging war against Māori and for working together with Māori allies. The memo is a powerful testimony to Māori military ability.

The enemy encountered in New Zealand are as brave as any people in the world; trained in arms from early youth, acquainted with the thickly wooded and mountainous country they occupy, and skilled in turning to advantage the numerously strong and almost impregnable pavilions with which it abounds.

Adopting a highly respectful tone, the memo goes on to describe fortified native pas in considerable detail. Grey argued that Māori forces were superior with muskets and in fighting of this nature should always be deployed before European forces, who were better with bayonets and cutlasses. It is in the memo’s final section, which discusses loyal natives, that Grey’s respect for Māori warriors and leaders is most pronounced. He believed the government would gain most success if British troops were attached to “a body of loyal natives, led by their own chiefs, allowed to fight in their own way, yet ready to make any movement that may be required, and always to act in cooperation with the troops”. Before expecting Māori “to act in closest cooperation with British troops”, however, it was necessary that “their Chiefs should be treated with more consideration than heretofore”. Grey directed that the chiefs “should be consulted upon the movements to be made, that they should in all instances be employed in operations of that kind which they are fitted successfully to perform, and that they should be regularly rationed by the Government”. Grey not only recognised Māori capacity for military leadership, but intended to strengthen chiefly authority in the field as a measure for hastening victory. The Duke of Wellington, Commander in Chief of British forces, greatly resented Grey’s memo.
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Wellington fits comfortably in Belich’s “dominant interpretation of racial conflict”, resenting and refusing to accept the possibility that Māori were superior to British forces in any aspect of battle. But Grey does not fit Belich’s theory at all. His liberal Anglican humanitarian background certainly gave him strong expectations of British victory, but also helped him see the potential in other peoples. Experience only served to cement his belief in their innate equality with the Anglo-Saxon race.

When the war was over Stanley instructed Grey to grant annuities to the government’s Māori allies. Grey provided an annual allowance of £100 for Tamati Waka Nene for the rest of his life, and £100 per year to be divided amongst the other chiefs who had aided the government. Richard Taylor believed the awards were well deserved, commenting of Nene that “without him every one knows the British troops could not have penetrated half-a-dozen miles inland”. Other humanitarians shared the same high regard for Māori fighting ability. In his Remarks on New Zealand Robert Fitzroy echoed Grey’s view of Māori military ability: “Almost naked, without shoes, and independent of a commissariat, the hardy native in his own forest is more than a match for the white man”.

In a general sense, the war strengthened and personalised Grey’s humanitarian commitment to elevating Māori in the scale of civilisation: “they are in many respects a noble race ... they have shewn at times as much devotion to me as if I was one of their most highly prized chiefs – indeed they have won all my feelings and sympathies in their favour by their conduct to me.” Grey expressed these sentiments in a public statement of gratefulness in August 1846.

To the numerous native chiefs who so nobly came forward on this occasion, the Lieutenant Governor returns his thanks for their services. The intercourse he has had with many of them will make him take a lasting interest in their welfare – and for the future he will watch over, and endeavour to promote the progress of themselves and their families in prosperity and the conveniences of civilised life, not only as Governor of the Colony, but as one who is personally interested in the welfare of men who have established such just and strong claims upon his esteem.

---
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He believed that involving loyal Māori in the war had hastened the process of racial amalgamation. Maori had fought for the government with “alacrity and zeal”, showing “by every means in their power their respect for the British government”.93 Their loyalty convinced Grey that these Māori “regarded themselves to all intents and purposes as British citizens”.94 In August 1846 Grey issued a government order congratulating the troops, settlers and Māori on their victory over rebellion. “Nothing could be more gratifying than the kind and friendly feeling evinced for each other by the settlers and large force of native allies when serving side by side, a feeling which clearly showed that they are mutually attached to each other, that they felt they were one people, bound together by common interests”.95

If war reinforced Grey’s faith in Māori capacity for civilisation, it shook his faith in Anglo-Saxon culture. During the Hutt conflict he discussed his position with Richard Taylor.96 The governor was “very unwilling to shed blood although fearful it must be done”. He was “disgusted” by the settler’s hostility to Māori and “remarked he was more like a bailiff turning the poor Natives from off their pretty little cultivations than a British Govr”.97 Humanitarians like Grey and Taylor found themselves identifying more and more with the natives as they saw the worst of British behaviour. When Taylor found out that British soldiers had mixed arsenic with flour and sugar given to hostile natives at Wanganui he “felt quite depressed in spirit”, questioning if it was “possible Christian professors could be guilty of such a deed of darkness and still glory in what they have done. What fellowship can we have such monsters, and yet these talk of native excesses forsooth”.98

When he left New Zealand in 1853 Grey believed his deployment and display of force against Māori opponents had successfully secured a permanent peace, and that co-opting friendly Māori as fighters had hastened their civilisation. As early as October 1846 he wrote to friends in Adelaide that “every portion of these Islands is in a state of complete peace and tranquillity and although I have plenty to do in the way of Legislation and of Civil business, I am still free from those war starts and alarms”.99 Two years later he remained confident that every “cause of
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dispute between the two races … has now been removed … whilst the native race are making advances in civilisation which surpass the expectations of their most sanguine friends”\(^\text{100}\). Historians working in the Whig tradition of steadily improving race relations confirmed Grey’s use of force as a success. Rees’ biography asserts that “[s]avage warriors, who had till then shown themselves rebellious and implacable, became as little children in their simple reverence and loving obedience to their ‘father’, ‘Kawana Kerei’”.\(^\text{101}\) Post colonial historians have been far more critical. Alan Ward argues that in imposing British authority by military methods “Grey had brushed aside moral and legal principles”, and that such demonstrations of power were remembered and resented by Māori.\(^\text{102}\) Tania Thompson contends that “British sovereignty was no more extended in the Far North, Wellington and Whanganui than it had been in the years prior to Grey’s arrival in New Zealand”. Worse still, his “actions during the campaigns served mainly to reduce the trust necessary for harmonious Māori-European relations. Britain’s desire to attain sovereignty over New Zealand failed when tied to a policy of force”.\(^\text{103}\)

In reality, Māori responded to Grey’s “policy of force” in many different complicated ways. Even before he arrived in New Zealand, Grey was known to Māori as the “fighting” governor.\(^\text{104}\) His use of force increased Grey’s mana in a culture that valued strong warriors highly, but it also caused resentment. Some submitted to Crown sovereignty while others continued to resist, even if more subtly than before. Others engaged actively in Grey’s military measures by fighting for the government and joining the native police and pensioner forces. The Governor’s plan to force the progress of Māori civilisation by military measures affected the tribes closest to European settlement profoundly, even if not always in the manner intended. However far-reaching and damaging its consequences, Grey’s use of military force was intended as a precursor to economic and social progress, for Māori, and for settlers. Grey was neither a military hero, nor a violent criminal. Viewed in light of his ideas about race, Grey’s war record reflects a leader who was subject to complicated political and personal pressures, constrained by practical limitations, and motivated by an over-riding commitment to racial amalgamation.

\(^{100}\) George Grey to Earl Grey, 21 December 1848, GBPP 1850 (1136), p.20.
\(^{102}\) Ward, Show of Justice, p.73.
\(^{104}\) Mathew, p.225.
Grey was ever conscious that the peace secured by force had to be cemented. In April 1846 he laid out plans for maintaining tranquillity in the southern district (referring to the greater Wellington region), where land disputes continued to prove “a constant source of discord between the two races”. He was adamant that it was “not sufficient that the Government should merely conquer and remain in military possession of certain portions” of the country. The naval and military authorities had to be supported by an infrastructure of civil authority to enforce the law. As always Grey’s policy had multiple underlying objectives. The measures he laid out for building up the civil establishment were vital for protecting the settlers and securing possession of their lands, and for extending British civilisation to the surrounding Māori tribes. If Grey was to prevent ongoing racial tension from “breaking out into acts of open violence”, he had to impress both Māori and European with the power of British law.

Interpreting the Treaty of Waitangi as a document of amalgamation, Grey dismantled the local government’s existing native administration and composed a new system to bring Māori and Europeans under the control of the same law. He was strongly opposed to the policy of exceptionalism favoured by FitzRoy and sought to distance himself from previous administrations. First, Grey disbanded the Native Protectorate. His motives were personal and political, but also humanitarian. Grey believed, with others, that the Protectorate was an abject failure based on unsound principles and staffed by inappropriate men, which was delaying Māori civilisation. Second, he created a new infrastructure with himself at the head. He appointed a Native Secretary, boosted the power of the courts, and most importantly, set up a network of Resident Magistrates and Native Assessors dispersed through the country to make British justice more accessible to Māori. The Resident Magistrate scheme drew on a number of precedents, but Grey was particularly influenced by the Anglican missionary Octavius Hadfield. Missionaries also played a vital role in extending the reach of the law to Māori communities. Grey saw the Resident Magistrate scheme as a resounding success illustrating civilisation and amalgamation in progress.
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Grey’s legal measures, like his use of force, can only be fully understood with reference to his vision of the civilising process. British law was a potent force of civilisation in Grey’s liberal Anglican view of the world. He believed British laws were better than Māori laws “as affording more perfect security for life and property, and a much more ready means of adjusting differences which might arise either between natives and Europeans or amongst natives themselves”.107 This view reflected wider humanitarian sentiment.108 In the APS’s programme of native civilisation, legislation was the key to protecting native rights and extending British authority.109 Legislation represented the power of reason to uncover God’s natural laws and reform the world according to His plan.

The Treaty of Waitangi lay at the heart of Grey’s new system. In his official instructions Lord Stanley told Grey to “honourably and scrupulously fulfil the conditions of the Treaty of Waitangi”.110 As a strong humanitarian Grey himself believed that treaties with native peoples should be respected and enforced. He described the Treaty of Waitangi as “a fundamental law of the country” bequeathing both Māori and European with privileges and obligations.111 In his first few weeks as Governor he emphasised this point repeatedly, assuring Māori that he would honour the Treaty “strenuously”.112 In his speech at Kororareka on 28 November 1845 he committed himself to fulfilling the specific terms of the Treaty according to his own interpretation:

I have heard that some persons, evil disposed, both towards the Queen of England, and the chiefs of this country, have told you that by your signing that paper, you lost your lands. This I deny. By that treaty you have the protection of the Queen, and your possessions are made sure to you. Your lands shall certainly not be taken from you without your own consent. You can sell your lands to the Crown, or not sell them, just as you think proper; but, remember, that when once you do sell them, they must be promptly and justly given up.

You may all of you rely, that I will omit no means of securing the happiness, freedom and safety of all the natives of this country. If any European should kill or molest any native, he shall most assuredly be punished, and I shall, in like manner, expect the chiefs to use their authority in delivering to the Government any of their
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own people who may injure a European. Every effort shall be made to promote
your religious instruction, and to enable you to obtain those comforts of civilised life
which become so necessary to you, for it is the desire of the Queen, that the chiefs
of this country should become as wise and wealthy as the chiefs of England.113

Grey saw the Treaty as a document of amalgamation. Subject to the same laws and offered the
same rights as British citizens, Māori would gradually move up the scale of civilisation and
merge with the settlers.

For practical and ideological reasons, early nineteenth century colonial governments tolerated
some native laws and customs. A policy of exceptionalism was practiced in New Zealand from
the start. Normanby’s instructions to Hobson in 1839 ordered that Māori “must be carefully
defended in the observance of their own customs, so far as these are compatible with the
universal maxims of humanity and morals. But the savage practices of human sacrifice and
 cannibalism must be promptly and decisively interdicted”.114 In his instructions to Shortland,
Lord Stanley saw “no apparent reason why the aborigines should not be exempt from any
responsibility to English law or to English courts of justice as far as respects their relations and
dealings with each other”.115 The evangelical humanitarian Governor FitzRoy extended
exceptionalism still further.116 Like Grey in South Australia, he modified the law to allow for
unsworn Māori evidence to be heard in court. He also passed a Jurors Ordinance and Cattle
Trespass Ordinance modifying the law to accommodate Māori culture.117 In 1844 FitzRoy
framed the Native Exemption Ordinance, exempting Māori from the ordinary processes of British
law. He believed British laws should be introduced gradually, only when Māori were prepared to
submit to them willingly.118 The Exemption Ordinance had little real purpose, serving merely to
legalise existing practice, but it was a significant development in policy. Officially exempting
Māori from British law was very different from turning a blind eye due to insufficient resources.

In September 1845 FitzRoy went further. He advised Lord Stanley “that many, if not all, of our
difficulties would have been prevented had we legalised those native customs which are not
repugnant to the fundamental principles of morality”, and advocated re-establishing the power of
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the chiefs.\textsuperscript{119} James Stephen, Permanent Undersecretary at the Colonial Office agreed, but recommended that the government wait to see what the newly appointed Grey would make of the situation.\textsuperscript{120}

Though similarly impelled by a humanitarian desire to protect and elevate native peoples, Grey believed Māori could be civilised quite quickly, and that establishing British sovereignty in New Zealand depended on a strict imposition of law on both races. Stanley’s instructions to Grey urged respect for Māori culture, but also endorsed the use of civil and military measures to enforce submission to British law.\textsuperscript{121} In a later dispatch Stanley dubbed the Native Exemption Ordinance “an experiment of a difficult and doubtful nature”. He agreed with its basic principles, but asked Grey to revise the law and restrict its operation to cases between natives.\textsuperscript{122} With the advantages of distance and fait accompli, Grey ignored Stanley’s instructions and disallowed the Ordinance. Opposed to the mixed laws that might develop under exceptionalism, Grey ordered the New Zealand courts not “in any way to recognise the barbarous customs of the native race”.\textsuperscript{123} At the same time he tried to make the administration of the law among Māori “as little obtrusive as possible”.\textsuperscript{124} The political, social and economic elements of Grey’s plan for civilising Māori were all closely interwoven; “by encouraging commerce and agriculture amongst the natives, and by awakening in them a taste for luxuries, and for articles of convenience, I have striven to create an indirect necessity for their resorting to our Courts, and recognising our laws”.\textsuperscript{125}

When Earl Grey, Lord Stanley’s successor as Secretary of State for the Colonies, tried to push the policy of exceptionalism, Grey resisted. Not convinced that Māori institutions should be totally replaced, Earl Grey conceived a plan for re-establishing the authority of the Chiefs. The Governor simply ignored it.\textsuperscript{126} In December 1846 Earl Grey issued a Charter for New Zealand allowing for temporary native districts to be governed by the chiefs according to Māori law.\textsuperscript{127}
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Grey resisted again, and in July 1848 Earl Grey repealed the natives district clause of the charter. The 1852 Constitution Act also allowed for native districts, but Grey chose not to enforce it.\textsuperscript{128}

Grey’s basic policy was one law for all, now. In an 1847 dispatch he reviewed his policy on “the subject of legislation for the mixed races inhabiting this country”.\textsuperscript{129} He had sought to persuade Māori that their own laws were “obsolete and useless” for “their own present state, and that of the country generally”, and that “it would be to their own advantage to adopt our laws, and to resort to our tribunals”.\textsuperscript{130}

In New Zealand there was strong support for Grey’s new policies. Octavius Hadfield agreed on the principle of immediate amalgamation. He believed that separating the races was an “absurd and highly dangerous” strategy that would lead to war, and argued that all distinctions between Māori and European should be removed “as soon as possible”.\textsuperscript{131} Many settlers agreed with Hadfield. In his \textit{Remarks on the Past and Present State of New Zealand, its Government, Capabilities, and Prospects} published in 1845, William Brodie argued that FitzRoy’s policy was weakly ineffectual and that British laws should be applied to Māori as well as European.\textsuperscript{132} In a petition calling for FitzRoy’s dismissal Alfred Domett fumed against the Governor’s exceptionalism - “all this concession and reward for outrage”.\textsuperscript{133} Quoting from Grey’s 1840 report on civilising Australian Aborigines, Domett argued that Māori should be forced to submit to British laws according to the “incontestable principles laid down by Captain Grey”.\textsuperscript{134} With the European population of New Zealand largely behind him, and his instructions from the Colonial Office open to interpretation, Grey used the law to control and civilise Māori.

His first step in imposing the law equally on Māori and European was to dismantle the colonial government’s existing native administration. William Hobson had established the Aborigines’ Protectorate Department in 1840 with CMS missionary George Clarke as Chief Protector. The Protectorate occupied a crucial role in colonial government, and under FitzRoy, Clarke had come
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to be regarded as a “quasi Prime Minister”. With a team of sub-Protectors and translators he managed all aspects of Māori policy, initially including native land purchase. The Protectorate was assisted by a Native Trust composed of Governor, Chief Protector, Chief Justice and the Anglican Bishop, set up to manage the New Zealand Company’s native reserves and administer the funds arising from land sales. Bishop Selwyn had visions of the trust creating native educational institutions that would radiate out through the land spreading civilisation as they went. The trust passed through a range of forms between 1842 and 1845 but seems to have had little impact.

When Grey arrived in November 1845 a new bill setting out the Native Trust’s role and re-establishing its authority was still in progress. Though Selwyn’s vision was closely allied with his own, Grey annulled the bill by failing to gazette it. His approach to the Protectorate was similarly low-key. In February 1846 he wrote to Clarke of his decision to “remodel the Protectorate Department and to expend such portion as the Colony can afford of the large sum that Establishment has hitherto cost annually, upon schools hospitals and other institutions for the natives”. In reality the department was entirely abolished.

A. H. McLintock describes Grey’s abolition of the Protectorate as a radical break with the humanitarianism of FitzRoy’s administration. He argues that the purpose of Grey’s native policy was to “supplant the hazardous makeshifts of misguided sentimentality” in order to bolster his own reputation and further his career. Politics and personality certainly played a part. In his first year as governor, Grey worked strenuously to distance himself from FitzRoy’s unpopular administration and establish his authority among the Māori tribes and the settlers. But his actions were also motivated by humanitarianism. Grey believed the Protectorate to be inefficient and expensive, an ineffectual means of native improvement.
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Like others, Grey saw the Protectorate as an impediment rather than an aid to racial amalgamation. He argued that the New Zealand Protectorate was “an utterly useless establishment”, and that the Chief Protector and his two sons, also protectors, were not “fitted by either energy of character, or by their industry, to watch over and promote the interests of the natives”.141 In New Zealand and its Aborigines published in 1845, William Brown lamented that the Protectorate had done “nothing whatever … for the purpose of improving the natives”, and that the Chief Protector and his six sub-protectors “are quite incompetent to discharge the duties of such an office with any prospect of advantage to the natives”.142 In July 1844 Chief Justice Martin noted objections in the Legislative Council to the cost of Protectors – “[a]s far as the natives were concerned, the money spent on Protectors might as well have been thrown into the fire”.143 Domett’s 1845 petition also opposed the cost of maintaining Protectors and objected to their influence on government.144 Even Hadfield, one of Clarke’s missionary colleagues, believed the Protectorate had done nothing for Māori.145

Objections to the Protectorate and to the whole style of FitzRoy’s governorship made Grey eager to distance himself from his predecessor. Felton Mathew represented common opinion among the settlers in his opposition to the “well meant but mistaken kindness lavished upon [Māori], and the leniency shown to their open, glaring and palpable offences against the Europeans”.146 FitzRoy’s style was as unpopular as his native policy. Mathew reports “general indignation” among the settlers “at the absurdity of many of his acts, and the vacillation and imbecility of nearly all”.147 Constantine Dillon reported to his mother in February 1844 that after only six weeks in New Zealand FitzRoy had “managed to disgust and sicken every lady at Auckland, Wellington and Nelson by his bad taste, injurious manner and extraordinary language”. While humanitarians like Hadfield and Grey objected to FitzRoy’s failure in promoting Māori civilisation, the settlers saw his native policy as a threat to their own rights and privileges as British citizens.
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Initially, Grey’s official dispatches spoke highly of his predecessor. He assured the Colonial Office that FitzRoy “has, in the friendliest manner, afforded me detailed information on the state of affairs in this colony, and has rendered me every assistance in his power.” But Grey understood that the sacked governor commanded as little respect in Britain as in New Zealand, and quickly sought to distance himself from FitzRoy in style and policy. Where FitzRoy had first disembarked in New Zealand to fanfare and pomp, Grey’s silent sombre arrival marked a conscious change of style. Only a week after describing his helpfulness, Grey wrote to Stanley that FitzRoy’s “injudicious” negotiations in the north had “inspired the natives with contempt for our authority, and have made many of them desire a pretext for revolt”. Over the next few months he lost no opportunity to criticise FitzRoy’s governance.

Grey’s abolition of the Protectorate and the Native Trust fitted with his humanitarian goals, and with his political purposes and personal ambition. As a significant symbol of FitzRoy’s policy of exceptionalism, Grey saw the Protectorate as a hindrance to Māori civilisation and amalgamation. He was highly conscious of FitzRoy’s extreme unpopularity among the settlers and understood that dismantling the unpopular Protectorate would boost his esteem with this difficult constituency. Grey also understood that his own appointment was a direct consequence of FitzRoy’s declining favour in London. Abolishing the Protectorate was a radical move he hoped would cement his reputation as a dynamic young governor destined for great things.

Grey’s arrival in New Zealand marked a shift in humanitarianism rather than a complete break. Protecting and elevating Māori remained high priorities. But with a different background, personality and priorities to FitzRoy, Grey shifted the emphasis to rapid rather than gradual amalgamation and created a new administration to meet his ends. Grey himself lay at the heart of this new administration. He appointed a Native Secretary directly answerable to the Governor but with no department of his own. Essentially operating as “Colonial Secretary of Native Affairs”, the secretary was to “carefully watch over the interests of the natives” and to deal with
all correspondence on Māori issues. In reality, Grey managed general policy as well as many of the finer details of native affairs.

The courts played a central role in Grey’s policy. By strengthening their powers he sought to impose British authority on Māori and European, and to offer Māori the justice they were entitled to as British citizens. First, he ordered the Attorney-General to resume Crown prosecution for criminal offences, a matter of law in Britain which had been abandoned in New Zealand. Second, he boosted the power of Justices of the Peace by repealing a local ordinance preventing them from detaining people for trial. Third, he engaged a lawyer to act as standing counsel for natives wishing to bring civil cases. Fourth, he ordered the Supreme Court to hear civil cases four times rather than twice a year. Fifth, Grey created Resident Magistrate Courts for determining civil cases involving less than one hundred pounds.

The Resident Magistrate Courts were fundamental to Grey’s plan for racial amalgamation. The courts were established by Ordinance on 7 November 1846. When they were threatened by Earl Grey’s 1846 Charter, the Governor wrote to persuade Grey of the Magistracy’s importance:

> the whole of the measures I have adopted in the hope of finally adjusting the difficulties which prevailed in this country, formed portions of a general plan, the whole of the parts of which are in a great degree dependent one upon the other; perhaps the most important principles of the whole scheme are embodied in the resident magistrate’s ordinance, and I fear that if it were disallowed, serious inconveniences might again arise.

Each Court was composed of a European Justice of the Peace, or Resident Magistrate, and two Native Assessors. To negate the previous necessity of long expensive trips to Auckland, Resident Magistrate Courts were established in the most populous Māori areas. The Resident Magistrate was expected to act as a general government agent in his district, collecting revenue, supervising hospitals, administering ordinances and reporting on the disposition of the natives. In cases between natives and Europeans the Magistrate exercised his own judgement and imposed penalties without a jury. In cases between natives, the Magistrate was aided by two Native Assessors; local men chosen for their mana and appointed and paid by the government. 

---
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Assessors were vital to Māori acceptance of British law. By becoming part of the system themselves, they made Resident Magistrate Courts part of their own communities.

Grey made Resident Magistrate Courts a distinctive element of his plan for protecting and civilising Māori and claimed huge credit for their success. But the scheme’s development is a good example of ideas and policy in local and intellectual context. The week after Grey’s arrival in New Zealand he proposed establishing Māori Magistrates, as “the only means by which I can hope to secure the allegiance of the chiefs, who have naturally no abstract sentiments of loyalty, is to attach them to the Crown by permanent benefits”. He proposed that some chiefs should be appointed magistrates and paid an annual salary of about £20 “to control their own people, and to deliver up to justice an offender of their own tribe who may have injured the person or property of a European”, and to report to the government on the state of their tribes. Grey recognised, however, that “until I have had an opportunity of satisfying myself by personal inquiries … it is quite impossible for me to determine upon any definite line of policy”. Experience of fighting with and against Māori altered Grey’s perspective on their capacity for loyalty. In his covering dispatch explaining the purpose of the Resident Magistrates Ordinance Grey wrote that no other race he had encountered had “a stronger natural sense of justice than the natives of New Zealand”. In practical terms, Grey quickly realised that even the most loyal chiefs did not have an adequate understanding of British law to serve as magistrates. In the interim Grey decided on European magistrates aided by native assessors. Based on Australian models, Grey’s scheme also drew from the Native Exemption Ordinance it replaced. The basic humanitarian principles of protection and improvement were the same, but the two laws represent quite different native policies. FitzRoy’s sought to give Māori the freedom to embrace British law of their own accord, whereas Grey’s sought to impose acceptance of the law immediately. The Resident Magistrate Courts were also shaped by missionary influence. Phillipson writes that the Magistracy system “owed much to the role which missionaries had created for the white man of mana in the settlement of frontier disputes”.
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One missionary in particular had a profound influence on Grey’s ideas about local justice. In October 1845 Octavius Hadfield wrote to his brother of a plan on which he was engaged, “to be recommended to the Governor for making the natives understand and submit to our laws”.163 Early in the next year he submitted two long essays to Grey on the ‘System of government among the New Zealand tribes’, and ‘Relations between the British Government and native tribes of New Zealand’.164 In the first document, Hadfield explained the existing Māori system of government and advocated a new system that recognised Māori principles of justice and appointed the chiefs as magistrates. In the second document, he argued strongly that “all attempts at permanent civilisation must prove abortive, until [Māori] are plainly made to understand that they are british subjects – both amenable to & under it’s protection [sic]”.165 He advocated replacing the Native Protectorate with a new native department headed by one man, whose ultimate goal was to elevate Māori sufficiently that they could be treated “in every respect like the white population”.166 Under the charge of this leader, twelve or more European magistrates should be appointed to reside near native settlements to settle disputes between natives and Europeans, encourage Māori in European habits of industry and culture, report to the government, and dispense medical aid (being preferably medical men). Hadfield also suggested that the European magistrates should recommend suitable local chiefs to be made salaried magistrates “to assist in adjudicating in cases where natives were concerned”.167 Hadfield wrote to his father in August 1846 that Grey visited almost daily when in Wellington “to ask my advice in some matter concerning the Māoris, and as he almost invariably acts upon advice which I give him I feel a degree of responsibility”.168 The strong similarities between Hadfield’s recommendations and Grey’s Resident Magistrates Ordinance bear out this testimony. It was advice from men like Hadfield, as well as local circumstance, which led Grey to the particular form of the Resident Magistrate Courts.

Missionaries and churchmen were also vital to implementing the Resident Magistrates Ordinance. Already embedded in Māori communities, they acted as a network for imposing
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British values and encouraging Māori to conform to British laws. Bishop Selwyn himself wrote to Gladstone in July 1848

I often tell them [natives] that Mr Martin, the chief Justice is the strongest man in New Zealand, which, as he is of weakly body, and lives a very quiet and retired life a mile from the town, at once impresses them with the idea of the majesty of the Law, superior ever to the visible force of the governor and his soldiers.\textsuperscript{169}

Richard Taylor’s journal provides evidence of a complicated relationship between missionary, government and law. On 30 March 1847 he went to the pa at Wanganui “and had a long conversation with the natives who seemed much pleased with the plan of native magistrates”.\textsuperscript{170} On 13 August 1849 he noted that the governor had requested his advice “as to what Natives I might think suitable to be appointed Assessors”.\textsuperscript{171} Missionaries were usually the only trusted Europeans with enough local knowledge to make such recommendations. In effect they often occupied the role Grey envisaged for Resident Magistrates. Taylor encouraged Māori in his district to form Komitis and appointed chiefs as voluntary magistrates in their own communities. Like other missionaries he acted as a circuit judge.\textsuperscript{172} On 3 September 1849 he visited Wai Totara where the natives all gathered and “made me decide all the quarrels and disputes which had arisen amongst them since my last visit”.\textsuperscript{173} In the same visit he answered scriptural questions, baptized four infants, married a couple and distributed medicine.\textsuperscript{174} Despite fulfilling many of their functions, Taylor did not see himself as competition for the Magistrates. On 26 November 1849 he observed that the Native Assessor system was working well:

Several natives from Pipiriki arrived. They were sent by Pehi to ask George King and the other Kai-whakawa – Native Assessors – to go up to Pipiriki, seventy miles, to try a case relative to a dispute between him and another, about the possession of a piece of land. They immediately agreed to go, and at once made their preparations and left. In former days this quarrel would in all probability have caused bloodshed; but now, the principal chief of the river is content to submit the case to a court of Native judges. I see every day reasons to be satisfied with the good results of this new system.\textsuperscript{175}

Taylor’s journal reveals the typical entanglement of missionaries with the law. Sharing the same humanitarian principles as Grey, they believed civilisation and Christianity went hand in hand. It
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was impossible for them to dispense one without the other. They supported Crown institutions wherever they reached, and otherwise filled the void. Sometimes the void was too great, as in John Morgan’s case. Morgan repeatedly entreated the government for a Resident Magistrate in the Waikato to mitigate the evil effect of debased European settlers on local Māori.176 Right throughout Grey’s first governorship missionaires continued to engage with the governor on the most effective means of implementing British law. In June 1852, for example, WMS missionary William Woon wrote to Grey debating the pros and cons of appointing native chiefs as paid magistrates. He surmised that the decline in chiefly authority meant Māori would actually prefer to obey European magistrates.177 Missionaries were both vital sources of local knowledge and invaluable tools for asserting Crown authority.

With encouragement from missionaires and the threat of viable enforcement by a proven military and police force, Māori and European in the most populous districts responded enthusiastically to Grey’s Resident Magistrate Courts. In January 1847 only two months after the Ordinance was passed Grey was already claiming great success: “the working of this measure has proved more gratifying to the native race that I had even ventured to hope, ... as it has led them to resort freely to our Courts of Justice”.178 The return of the Auckland Resident Magistrate’s Court for December 1846 shows twelve Māori bringing civil cases against settlers and recovering a combined amount of £128, 17s 4d and costs.179 By February 1847 Grey reported that “the facility and certainty with which the injured can now obtain justice has induced the chiefs to evince the greatest regard for and attachment to the Government”.180 The returns for Auckland for January 1847 reveal a pattern that became typical of the courts’ operation. Most of the complainants in civil cases were Māori recovering debts from Europeans, while most of the criminal cases were also against Europeans.181 The law was a means of asserting British authority over Māori, but even more significantly in Grey’s view, British law offered Māori justice in their grievances against Europeans and other natives. In accord with the Treaty, Māori and European had equal rights and responsibilities as British citizens.
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In September 1849 Lieutenant Governor Eyre reported to Grey that the infamous Te Rauparaha had brought a case before the Resident Magistrate at Waikanae. Te Rauparaha’s youngest wife Etara had committed adultery and instead of killing the offender according to native laws, the Chief had seen the offender off to jail in Wellington.\footnote{Edward Eyre to George Grey, 11 September 1849, enclosed in George Grey to Earl Grey, 24 September 1849, \textit{GBPP} 1850 (1280), p.39.} In January 1851 Henry St Hill, Resident Magistrate at Wellington, reported that Māori in his district entertained “undiminished confidence in the equitable administration of the law, not only in cases where their assessors have been the joint instruments of such administration, but where the magistrate singly has to adjudicate between the two races”.\footnote{Henry St Hill, Resident Magistrate’s Report, 30 January 1851, enclosed in George Grey to Earl Grey, 6 February 1851, \textit{GBPP} 1851 (1420), pp.134-5.} Previous to the establishment of Resident Magistrate Courts, wrote St Hill, “it was an experiment the most hazardous to attempt the execution of process of any description whatever upon a Māori”, but “the improvement that has been accomplished among the natives of this district within the last four or five years”, made him confident that “in 99 cases out of 100, any mandate issuing from the Resident Magistrate’s Court at Wellington against a native, residing within a radius of 50 miles, would be treated with respect”.\footnote{Ibid., p.135.} Dr Rees at Wanganui was similarly confident of the esteem in which Māori held Grey’s system of Māori assessors; “it is a well ascertained fact, that the decision of their officers is never disputed”.\footnote{Dr Rees Report, 29 July 1851, enclosed in George Grey to Earl Grey, 14 August 1851, \textit{GBPP} 1854 (1779), p.30.}

Grey claimed the Courts’ success as vindication of his general native policy. In an 1847 despatch enclosing four months of court returns natives appeared as plaintiffs against Europeans in forty nine civil actions and as defendants in sixteen civil actions. Grey boasted that

\begin{quote}
before the establishment of these Courts, the natives rarely (I believe in only three instances), during a period of several years, resorted to our courts of justice, it must, I think, be admitted, not only that these Courts have now been fully shown to be well suited to the circumstance of this country, but also that there is every disposition on the part of the natives to resort, for the redress of their grievances, to legally constituted tribunals. Indeed I think nothing could show more strikingly than the enclosed return the aptitude of the natives for civilisation, and the readiness with which they appreciate, and avail themselves of, institutions which are suited to their wants.\footnote{George Grey to Earl Grey, 29 March 1847, \textit{GBPP} 1847 (892), p.11.}
\end{quote}
Resident Magistrate Courts were based on the premise of Māori improvability and their successful operation both confirmed and strengthened Grey’s faith in native races’ capacity for civilisation. They also impressed the Colonial Office. James Stephen believed the courts had been “very satisfactory”, reflecting positively on George Grey’s governorship.  

Though Māori certainly resorted to the structures of British law as Grey had adapted them, they continued to rely on their own customs for settling disputes between themselves. The Resident Magistrate scheme was also limited in reach, never extending its authority far beyond the main areas of European settlement. By the late 1850s the system was starting to break down, even in those areas it had been most successful. Tania Thompson praises the Resident Magistracy as “perhaps the closest New Zealand has ever come to a truly bicultural justice system”, but dismisses it as part of Grey’s policy of assimilation. Grey certainly saw the Courts as a tool for imposing British authority on Māori, but he also believed they would secure Māori rights as guaranteed under the Treaty of Waitangi. Control and protection were inextricably bound together in his liberal Anglican humanitarian mission of native civilisation and racial amalgamation.

Māori participation in Resident Magistrate Courts was mirrored by increasing acceptance of British law and Crown authority over the course of Grey’s governorship. Grey’s new Native Secretary was kept busy with a constant stream of correspondence from Māori seeking to understand and exercise their legal rights as British citizens. In February 1846 Grey forwarded a letter to the Colonial Office from Ngati Toa, Ati Awa and Ngati Raukawa chiefs around Wellington, that he was convinced they had written at their own instigation and without European aid. Octavius Hadfield had lived amongst them until recently, providing constant guidance and reassurance about the government’s intentions. With Hadfield gone, the chiefs requested Grey “to provide for us some friendly adviser who shall be able to understand both our customs and those of the white people, that he may constantly explain to us the laws of the Queen”. Like Grey and Hadfield, these Māori saw Christianity and British law as complementary facets of civilisation; “we are anxious that the laws of the Queen should be firmly and permanently
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established among us; that by that means we may be raised to a more enlightened state, for we have already ministers of God teaching us the laws of God".192 Grey responded by affirming his commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi and reassuring them that "Māoris and Europeans shall be equally protected, and live under equal laws; both of them are alike subjects of the Queen, and entitled to her favour and care".193

In February 1848 Tamati Ngaporawrote similarly, urging the Governor to establish the authority of British law in the Waikato: "O sire, the Governor, what is it that will cause good feeling to continue between the Europeans and natives? Nothing but a law regarding disputes of Europeans and natives, lest evil should grow in our hearts".194 But Ngapora placed full blame for his district’s lawlessness on Europeans. "Formerly, O father the Governor, when we adhered to our native customs, we had light on this subject; but now this land is mixed up with the customs of the Europeans; new thoughts or habits have been imbibed, and darkness has ensued in consequence".195 The chief particularly hoped that British law could be used to reassert his authority over recalcitrant slaves. "It is for you, the prop of this people, to lay down certain laws to meet these cases", he urged Grey. "O father, do you reflect upon my words, and make a law for the native chiefs, that their slaves may be induced to obey them, and do you strengthen then our hands, so that the many slaves of this land may be kept in awe, and the chiefs be enabled to love and protect you".196 Ngapora’s request illustrates a strong theme in Māori acceptance of Crown authority. His tone is proud, and though he acknowledges the Governor’s authority, he also asserts his own mana. Like other chiefs around the country, Ngapora saw British law as a potential tool for increasing that mana. Grey’s response to Ngapora’s letter was to focus on extending the operation of the Resident Magistrates Ordinance into the interior.

A letter to Grey from Ngati Kereru in September 1849 shows Māori again accepting British law for their own purposes. Ngati Kereru hoped that allegiance to the Crown would boost their standing in the existing network of inter-tribal relationships.

Friend the Governor. Salutation to you. We write to urge you to make your consent public to us, that we should live altogether under the law, under the flag of England.
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151
under the Queen’s authority. Friend, the Governor, we have taken an oath – a great oath, for each of the laws, because we are a tribe who have no friends. We are like the owl in the solitary place. We are rejoiced at your good customs concerning the lands, and concerning us if we are attacked; for everything also connected with secular matters. These are the reasons why our chiefs gave their consent.197

While they quickly grasped its potential to protect their interests, Māori also understood and accepted the law as a cultural force. In a letter to the Governor in September 1851 Tamati Wiremu, the Wesleyan teacher at Te Aro pa, makes clear connections between God’s law and the Governor’s law and embraces Grey’s policy of native elevation.

When you first came to this country you found us buried in the depths of confusion and wrong, involved in wars with each other, brought on by evil causes too numerous to mention; you came and interposed between us, and, instead of our bad customs, directed us to follow the example of the white man, their habits, their food, their clothing, their dwellings, to adopt these, and to forsake our old or native customs; you also advised us to place ourselves under the protection of the Queen’s Government, that is to say, under her wings; this recommendation is moreover borne out by Scripture, which says, “Hide me under the shadow of thy wings”. You further advised us to live as freemen; this also is borne out by Scripture, “Stand fast in the liberty with which Christ has made you free”, thus have we become identified, or united, together with you.198

Wiremu goes on to request that Grey make the details of British law more accessible to Māori. In August 1847 the local government had passed an ordinance to prevent the sale of spirits to Māori.199 Unaware of this law, members of the pa at Te Aro had purchased a cask of spirits that the local Resident Magistrate, Henry St Hill, had subsequently destroyed. Wiremu asks that the law in reference to spirits should be printed and circulated in the same way as the laws relating to firearms had been. Grey complied immediately.

Repeated requests for the Governor to implement British law in Māori districts illustrate the limited reach of Crown authority, even towards the end of Grey’s governorship, but also show how eagerly some Māori sought to embrace that authority. A letter from three Turanga chiefs in 1851 is strikingly representative, and again, makes explicit the connection between God’s law and the Governor’s.
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Friend, the Governor,

This is a further speech we have to make to you; these words to you we earnestly wish you to agree to. We want a law at our place to look into our faults, and into those of the Europeans. When we, the natives, are in fault to have us judged according to your law, and when the Europeans are in the wrong to judge them also according to law, that your law may divide the evils of our place, that we may also see what is correct and just as we are unacquainted with the wrong trading or dealings of the Europeans of selling rum, of taking our food without payment, of cursing us. The Europeans are also displeased at our taking these things for nothing, taking their horses and property without payment.

Your laws are like those brought by the Almighty into the world, which show the evils of the heart, adultery, anger, theft, preaching to idols, when the blood of Christ has been spilt for sins; to the Holy Spirit that enlightens the heart, that teaches the heart to know the way of its maker, that leads the sinner to repentance. Now, your law and judgement resembles the Almighty's at the end of the world, when the good go to heaven and the evil to hell.200

Petitions to the Crown reveal further evidence of Māori actively engaging with British law. Grey cited the number of congratulatory addresses and memorials against proposed measures received from Māori as evidence of "their increasing confidence in our institutions, and their knowledge of the rights they have gained by their incorporation into the British Empire".201 In November 1847, for example, Te Whero Whero and other Waikato Chiefs petitioned the Queen with regard to New Zealand's new Charter. They objected to a representative government in which they would have no control and begged the Queen to honour the Treaty of Waitangi.202

In a general sense, British law impacted on mid-nineteenth century Māori within limited parameters. First, location dictated which tribes were exposed to British authority and legal processes and which areas the government could hope to control. Māori living close to large European settlements were far more likely to understand, accept and make use of the law. Māori in isolated areas had no call for the new law whatsoever. In Te Ika a Maui or New Zealand and its Inhabitants, published in 1855 Richard Taylor gives examples showing that "English law in New Zealand is confined to English towns, and that outside of them, Māori law still prevails."203
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Second, native customs restricted British legal authority over particular issues. Grey had difficulty, for example, getting Māori to accept Crown jurisdiction over matters involving adultery and witchcraft. Towards the end of 1847 he received a letter from Dr Logan Campbell stating that some natives in the Bay of Islands had “reverted to their former barbarous customs” and murdered six people found guilty of witchcraft.204 Grey authorised Captain Nugent to investigate.205 The Colonial Secretary’s covering instructions to Nugent discuss Tamati Waka Nene’s attitude to British law. Waka Nene was not involved directly, but had heard recent instances of people put to death for adultery under aggravated circumstances, and for causing death by witchcraft. He believed that British laws relating to adultery were neither “applicable nor available to natives living in the distant parts of the country”, and that Māori still felt so strongly about this type of crime that they would resist the imposition of those laws vehemently.206 Other chiefs reported that “the prejudices of the heathen natives upon the subject of witchcraft are yet so strong, that they would not assist in apprehending or bringing to trial any person who, acting in accordance with their customs, had put to death a witch or sorcerer”.207 Nugent’s visit north confirmed this perception. He visited Pakani where two slaves found guilty of causing the deaths of several chiefs by witchcraft were murdered with tomahawks. Nugent spoke with the murderer, “but all our argument seemed to have little weight with one who, no doubt, considered that he was doing an act of justice”.208 He asserted that “the prejudices of the whole native population on the subject of witchcraft are so strong, that no arguments which we could adduce would avail to eradicate them from their minds”. Any attempt to punish the murders, he advised, “would cause both considerable resistance and bloodshed”, and “would still fail to persuade them of the fallacy of their ideas on the subject; on the contrary, might tend even more to strengthen their belief in the existence of such a crime”.209 In general, Nugent reported favourably on the progress of civilisation among Māori in the Bay of Islands. He was “received with civility and respect” everywhere, “and instead of resistance to Government, from various applications which have been made to us, there seems to be a growing desire to refer their disputes to the arbitration of the magistrate, instead of appealing to arms as formerly”.210 But
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though these tribes actively sought British law for their communities, they resisted its imposition in matters like adultery and witchcraft. As in all aspects of cultural contact, Māori accepted and adapted British laws and legal processes to suit their own needs.

Third, Māori resistance sometimes distorted the intended effect of the law completely. A series of murders and executions in Wellington in 1849 provide a compelling example. On 19 April 1849 the Crown executed a Ngati Kahungunu man named Maroro for the murder of four Europeans. Maroro’s tribe exacted utu for his death by murdering three Ngati Toa men. Ngati Toa put the matter in Grey’s hands. Rawiri Paaha, half brother of one of the men killed in utu, wrote to the Governor accepting Crown authority over the case and impressing on Grey his responsibility to mete out justice. He expressed particular concern that the utu was carried out in response to “the carrying out of our new system of law”. In following due British legal process, the government had incited a further spate of killings. Paaha reminded the Governor that had his half-brother’s death “been in connexion with our own usages, the sun would scarcely set ere our revenge would be obtained; as the case stands now everything remains with you”. Grey interpreted the utu killings as a political manoeuvre by Ngati Kahungunu to incite Ngati Toa against the Europeans. Even when he learned that the murders might not have actually occurred, he attributed reports of utu to “those old chiefs who are hostile to the introduction of English laws into this country, for the purpose of prejudicing the minds of the natives against these laws, and of availing themselves of such prejudice for the purpose of formenting discontent”. Alongside his triumphant accounts of Māori seeking British justice and returns showing Māori involvement in Resident Magistrate’s Courts, Grey had to acknowledge “that strong prejudices have to be overcome in inducing the natives to submit to our laws, and that great caution must be used in bringing this result about, in order to avoid plunging the country into difficulties of a serious kind”.

Grey saw the Resident Magistrate scheme as a mechanism for controlling, protecting and civilising Māori. It was also a means to prepare them for larger political rights and responsibilities. Earl Grey’s 1846 New Zealand Charter had laid out a plan for responsible
government that enfranchised all males over the age of twenty one who could read and write English. Many Māori could read and write, but often only in Māori. Convinced that Māori would suffer at the hands of a settler government greedy for land, Governor Grey postponed and delayed the introduction of representative government until the very end of his governorship. In 1848 he presented Earl Grey with his own outline of representative government. It was based on Earl Grey’s 1846 plan, but was simpler in structure, with more complicated franchise qualifications. All male European adults who could read and write, and either owned property worth £30 or occupied a town house worth £10 a year or a country house worth £5 a year, were entitled to vote in Provincial and General elections. Māori males could also vote, but only those who owned property worth £200, or whom the Governor certified as fit to vote. Grey’s proposals formed the basis of the Imperial government’s 1852 New Zealand Constitution Act. In the end, the franchise was simplified, covering all adult males, both Māori and Pākehā, with a freehold estate worth £50 or a leasehold worth £10, or who occupied a town house worth £10 or a country house worth £5. These terms made manhood suffrage almost universal, though they did discriminate against Māori, who still usually held land in common. In principle, however, the act sought to offer those Māori who had “made progress in civilisation” the same constitutional privileges as “their fellow subjects of British race”. Elevated by force and law, Grey believed Māori were capable of exercising the full political rights promised to them under the Treaty of Waitangi.

**Conclusion**

Negotiating political authority with force and law was a complicated affair in mid-nineteenth century New Zealand. In 1851, for example, the police arrested a native for theft. When members of his tribe tried to rescue the prisoner, a native constable prevented him from escaping. The thief was found guilty and sentenced to prison. His tribe prepared to attack Auckland in protest, but Grey commanded them to lay down arms and return to their homes. The Governor’s stand was successful, and the insurgents dispersed, laying their green stone meres before Grey in “a sign of submission to our laws”. Over the course of Grey’s first governorship Māori
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accepted and resisted British authority, undermined and participated in the Governor’s civilising schemes.

Their positive responses affirmed Grey’s faith in human unity and improvability. He believed Māori deserved the protection of British law, and that they would be most swiftly civilised under submission to that law. In accordance with his policy of racial amalgamation, Grey sought to impose British law equally on Māori and European, using force where necessary, and co-opting Māori as enforcers. He ignored any Colonial Office instructions tending towards exceptionalism and abolished FitzRoy’s Protectorate Department, centralising authority to himself. Most significantly, he created a network of Resident Magistrates and Native Assessors to extend the law as far as possible into Māori communities.

An integrated approach to Governor Grey’s political leadership must account for racial ideas and religious faith as well as the traditional perspectives of political and military history. Governor Grey sought to impose British authority on Māori by military might and legal processes in order to protect and improve them according to his understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi. Political and personal motives were involved, but Grey was also motivated by a liberal Anglican humanitarian desire to advance God’s plan for civilisation. By and large the Colonial Office shared his ideas about race and his native policies, but Grey was also subject to the pressures of imperial authority. In New Zealand, Grey’s network of humanitarians extended to missionaries like Hadfield and Taylor who were crucial to the Crown’s imposition of political authority. They engaged with the governor on racial ideas and policy, and played an active part in establishing military control and introducing British legal processes in Māori communities. Though post-colonial scholarship has emphasised the negative effects of Grey’s political policies, he himself saw force and law as precursors and adjuncts to economic growth and social elevation. They formed the vital first steps in a comprehensive programme of racial amalgamation based on Grey’s liberal Anglican vision of advancing civilisation.
Economics were crucial to George Grey’s policy of racial amalgamation. His goal as governor of New Zealand between 1845 and 1853 was to make the colony self-supporting. Encouraged by the Colonial Office and the British Treasury he pursued a dual approach, reducing government expenditure and developing alternative sources of income to shift the cost of running New Zealand from the British government to the colonists, and Māori. As part of the same economy, Grey hoped the two peoples would become one. Economic integration was a matter of fiscal policy, but also a means of protecting, elevating, and controlling native peoples. Like other liberal Anglican humanitarians, Grey acknowledged the negative aspects of industrialisation, but ultimately saw commerce as a coadjutor of civilisation.

Grey’s firm belief in the unity and improvability of humankind, and his observations of Māori made him confident that they “could be easily incorporated into any British settlement with mutual advantages to both races”.1 In his 1849 annual report to the Colonial Office he envisaged New Zealand’s European settlers merging with a Māori people “softened by Christianity, civilisation, and a taste for previously unknown luxuries”. Together, Grey believed, they would grow into “prosperous communities”.2 He identified two major difficulties impeding this process – Māori opposition and insufficient resources. Grey had “to induce the native race cordially to assist in the attempt to create so desirable a state of things”, and “to provide the funds requisite for governing” these idyllic bi-racial communities.3 During his first governorship of New Zealand Grey employed a range of political, social and economic measures towards these ends. Economic measures included resuming the Crown’s pre-emptive right to purchase Māori land, employing Māori on public works, and fostering Māori industry and capital accumulation.

Native land purchase was central to Grey’s policy of Māori civilisation and racial amalgamation. He was determined to enforce the Treaty of Waitangi, both by guaranteeing Māori ownership of their lands, and by exercising the Crown’s pre-emptive right to purchase those lands. Assisted by a vigorous team of Crown agents and informed by local missionaries, Grey purchased millions of

2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
acres of Māori land in his first governorship of New Zealand. He bought cheaply and re-sold to European settlers at a profit, furthering both fiscal and humanitarian objectives. Grey believed that the purchase money would be a civilising force among Māori communities, giving them purchasing power and drawing them into the European economic system. He saw the Europeans who settled on Māori land as a further force of civilisation, schooling their native neighbours in European commerce, culture and Christianity. Political objectives also played a part in Grey’s native lands policy. The Colonial Office could only be pleased to see the colonial revenue rise, while opening new lands for purchase at a relatively cheap price would secure him settler support.

Grey’s native labour policy complemented his lands policy. Building on his 1840 Australian plan, he believed that employing Māori on public works would further open the country to European civilisation. The roads built by Māori workers under Grey’s government helped establish the Crown’s military authority, minimised Crown expenditure on labour, provided the infrastructure vital for European settlement, and gave farmers access to markets for their produce. The workers themselves were exposed to European habits of industry and brought into closer contact with European civilisation and Christianity. Wages, meanwhile, increased their power and participation in the settler economy.

Grey was continually searching for additional ways of increasing Māori participation in the settler economy. He set up a savings bank for both Māori and Europeans, fostered Māori trade, and in partnership with the missionaries, provided extensive loans and practical support for Māori communities to develop mills, farms and shipping businesses.

Māori responded to Grey’s economic measures with varying degrees of enthusiasm. In his reports to the Colonial Office Grey emphasised their willingness to sell land, their capacity for hard work and organisation, and their success as farmers and traders. For Grey, this was proof of civilisation progressing before his very eyes.

**Native Land Policy**

Immediately upon his arrival in New Zealand Grey publicly reassured Māori of his intention to honour the Treaty of Waitangi. Specifically, he promised that their lands would not be taken
without their consent. In accordance with instructions from Colonial Secretary Lord Stanley, Grey also resumed the Treaty’s condition of Crown pre-emption. Governor FitzRoy had abandoned pre-emption in October 1844. Restrictions on Māori land sales had been fuelling discontent among Māori and settlers, and in practical terms, the colonial government had little money to spend on land. With access to additional parliamentary aid, Grey ignored these difficulties, pronouncing FitzRoy’s waiver of pre-emption “unjust to the natives” and “oppressive to the settlers”. He appointed a commission to report on all purchases made under the waiver, warning that war could well result from unsettled claims. At the same time he issued a notice in the Government Gazette prohibiting any further waivers. Grey informed the Colonial Office that he had taken this “decisive step ... rather than to allow individuals to go on sowing the seeds of future irremedial disaster for both races”. Never shy of self-promotion, Grey understood that FitzRoy and his policies were firmly out of favour in Britain. Personal and political agendas certainly coloured Grey’s rhetoric, but his attitude to pre-emption also reflected Grey’s liberal Anglican humanitarianism. He believed that the waiver of pre-emption was “contrary to the Treaty of Waitangi”, and that the large purchases made under FitzRoy’s governance were “injurious to the interests of the natives”. Grey determined “to prevent the possibility of the native race being ever hereafter subjected to such a violation of their rights and privileges” as guaranteed under the Treaty. European settlers in New Zealand were outraged at the re-imposition of pre-emption. But Grey’s approach found approval at the Colonial Office. “The Governor has had to content against a list of abuses upon this subject”, wrote Mr Elliot to Mr Merivale, “and has discharged the duty with great courage and fidelity”.

The next serious threat to native rights and privileges arose in the form of Earl Grey’s Instructions on Waste Lands. In this case political self-interest and principles were not so neatly aligned. Colonial Office papers show Governor Grey negotiating his own veritable waste land as
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he sought to secure Māori property rights under the Treaty without offending his superiors. In December 1846 Colonial Secretary Earl Grey laid out a new Charter for New Zealand, with accompanying Instructions on Waste Lands. Subscribing to Dr Arnold’s theory of land ownership, Earl Grey argued that the right to own property was dependent on active occupation and cultivation. He regarded it “a vain and unfounded scruple” which had acknowledged Māori ownership of land “unsubdued to the uses of man”, and urged Grey to establish the Crown’s right of ownership over New Zealand’s remaining ‘waste’ lands.14

British politicians and Colonial Office bureaucrats had little comprehension of nineteenth century Māori land tenure. Particular tribes exercised authority over portions of land according to occupation, exploitation of resources, and conquest. Within the tribe, land was owned communally. In effect the entire country was divided between various iwi and hapu, with geographical and botanical features as boundary markers. Draft instructions to Governor Grey show that officials in the Colonial Office had failed to grasp the essential differences between nineteenth century Māori and European land ownership. G. W. Hope prepared a series of long draft dispatches for Lord Stanley to send to Grey as the new governor of New Zealand. Hope’s draft on land directed Grey to re-impose pre-emption and set about registering all Māori and European titles to land. He considered this an important step in honouring the land rights granted by the Treaty of Waitangi. He also believed that the process of land registration would expose large districts where no valid title could be proven. Such lands would automatically revert to the Crown. Income from the sale of these lands would render further purchases unnecessary.15

Stanley’s actual instructions to Grey were based on a draft by evangelical Anglican James Stephen. Stephen’s draft avoids the issue of land appropriation and affirms the strongest commitment possible to the Treaty of Waitangi.16 Colonial Office records reveal that Stephen would eventually put pressure on his superior to alter the wording of the Instructions on Waste Lands. He accepted that Māori who had signed the Treaty of Waitangi had a broader understanding of land ownership than Europeans, and emphasised that the Treaty should be honoured above all else.17

15 Mr Hope to George Grey, draft dispatch, Land Question, May 1845, CO209/38, pp.325-6.
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Other British humanitarians voiced their concerns more strongly. Grey’s friends in the APS were fiercely opposed to the Charter and Waste Lands Instructions. On 2 February 1847 Thomas Hodgkin led a deputation to meet with Earl Grey. The APS saw the Charter as a threat to Māori rights as citizens and as property owners. They argued that the Treaty of Waitangi provided “a most explicit bar” to the application of Dr Arnold’s waste lands principle in New Zealand. In contrast with Earl Grey and Mr Hope, members of the APS understood that there was no untitled land in New Zealand. They submitted that although New Zealand’s colonial officials were “actuated by humanity and kindness towards natives”, Māori would not permit the enforcement of this charter. Their “confidence in the government and in Christianity” would be “greatly shaken”. The British office of the WMS similarly opposed Earl Grey’s Charter. They too believed that the Waste Lands Instructions were entirely incompatible with the Treaty of Waitangi.

Māori were already familiar with British debates on indigenous peoples and waste lands when Grey first arrived in New Zealand. Specifically, he reported “great distrust regarding the intentions of the British government upon the subject of claiming all lands of the natives not actually in occupation and cultivation”. Operating on the assumption that the Treaty referred to all Māori land, and not just those areas occupied according to European expectations, Grey sought to alleviate Māori fears by affirming his commitment to the Treaty. In a dispatch to the Colonial Office written on 7 April 1847, a month before he received the Instructions on Waste Lands, Grey reiterated his own position on native lands. He argued that any attempt to assert Crown ownership of unoccupied Māori land would be both unjust and impracticable. He was convinced that Māori would never submit to such a process, and adamantly that pursuing it would lead to war.

Grey must have been horrified shortly thereafter to receive Earl Grey’s Instructions. His response was based on the same humanitarian principles as the APS, but differed in approach.
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Loathe to offend his superiors, Grey employed all his powers of manipulation and obfuscation to undermine Earl Grey’s Instructions without endangering his career. He acknowledged receipt of the Charter and Instructions and promised vaguely to “make every exertion to render your Lordship’s views in reference to New Zealand as productive of prosperity and happiness to this country as your Lordship desires them to be”.24 In private he conferred with Bishop Selwyn and Chief Justice Martin, but distanced himself from their official protests.25 The British administration was convinced. In an internal Colonial Office memo Mr Merivale noted it “very satisfactory to find that the Governor has not himself been influenced … by the same view of the land instructions which produced the Bishop’s protest and [Chief Justice’s] petition”.26 With seemingly calm abstraction Grey forwarded a series of other protests from missionaries and from Māori.27 He also enclosed military reports of rising disquiet among Māori.28 Grey continued to fudge his own opposition by deliberately misunderstanding the Waste Lands Instructions. In May 1848 he reassured Earl Grey that the vociferous protest to his Instructions was based on a mere misapprehension, and that he himself understood that the Earl had never intended to violate the Treaty of Waitangi. Outlining a new interpretation of the Instructions, Grey emphasised his own responsibility for determining how far their principles could actually be applied. He would enforce pre-emption but not compulsory registration. Nor would he presume ownership of Māori lands, whether occupied or unoccupied, without purchase or consent from their rightful owners.29 Grey’s oblique approach preserved Earl Grey’s dignity and maintained his own credibility with Māori and with the Crown. The British government would continue to recognise Māori land ownership, even where it differed from customary British forms.

Grey’s native lands policy reflects liberal Anglican humanitarian principles. He believed that Māori were innately equal to Europeans, and that this equality entitled them to fair treatment
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from the Crown. In upholding their rights to land he was pursuing God’s plan for elevating Māori in the scale of civilisation. Grey’s commitment to honouring native land rights also reflects fiscal imperatives and imperial objectives. He believed that Māori would readily sell their lands to the Crown at a nominal rate, but only once convinced of the Crown’s respect for the Treaty and for Māori land rights. Motivated by a vision of European colonists settled cheaply on the land alongside civilised Māori, Grey worked hard to convince them.

His subtle machinations masked underlying resolve. Governor FitzRoy had urged Māori not to sell, encouraging them to look to long term profits. In doing so he had raised the ire of the colonists and the Colonial Office. Grey firmly believed that Māori interests could be reconciled with European colorisation. At Wanganui in March 1846 he responded to Māori concerns by assuring them that “he was equally a Govr [sic] to both” Māori and settler, and determined to “do justice to all”. He told them he had not come to buy their land, disingenuously claiming that land purchases fell outside his province as governor. Rather, Grey claimed, his “object was to learn what were their wishes”. If they did not wish to sell he would protect them in their property rights under the Treaty. If they did wish to sell he would ensure they were fairly paid. If they all agreed “he would attend to their wishes & send persons to work out what was to be sold & what reserved & then pay for the whole [sic]”. Richard Taylor, who was present at the meeting, recorded that “the natives when requested to give their assent readily did so”.

This approach served Grey well. His paternal manner and calm reassurance earned him Māori trust. In the eight years of his first New Zealand governorship, Grey’s land purchase agents, ably led by chief purchasing officer Donald McLean, bought 32,000,000 acres of Māori land for £50,000. In the Oxford History of New Zealand W. J. Gardner writes that their “shrewd, hard bargaining ... laid the foundations of a dominant European economy”.

However he might try to distance himself in rhetoric, Grey’s personal involvement was crucial to his government’s success in purchasing so much Māori land, so cheaply. In early 1848 he visited the South Island and initiated negotiations with Ngai Tahu for the huge extent of land on the east
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coast between Nelson and Otago known as the Canterbury block. Having discussed the general terms of purchase Grey sent land purchase officer H. Tacy Kemp to complete the deal. Kemp concluded the purchase according to Grey’s instructions and carried out the details of payment and surveying. From his “personal knowledge of the natives concerned, and ... acquaintance with their views and wishes”, Grey reported to the Colonial Office his full confidence that Māori claims to the Canterbury block had been “conclusively set to rest”.

In August 1853 Grey used his imminent departure from New Zealand to pressure a deal with Ngati Toa for the west coast and northern regions of the South Island. The principal chiefs of Ngati Toa and its allies had previously declined to sell their lands. Before Grey vacated the governorship they assembled to see him in Wellington. When they “stated their desire in every way in their power” to meet Grey’s wishes before he departed, the Governor “pressed upon them the advisability” of selling to the Crown. After a couple of days the chiefs acceded. The Crown paid £5000 for about one fourth of the South Island, including the West Coast, Queen Charlotte’s Sound and Cloudy Bay. Grey boasted to the colonial office that these lands could “now be thrown open to the energy, enterprise and industry of all races”. The purchase was formally concluded by McLean, but carried out under the Governor’s “immediate directions”. McLean wrote ingratiatingly that nothing but Grey’s “anxious desire” to secure the land for European settlement, “and an equal desire on the part of the natives to meet his Excellency’s wishes, and take advantage of his presence before his departure for England, would have induced them to have ceded the more available and valuable parts of these districts”.

As in all areas of native policy Grey’s personal relationships with Māori were fundamentally important. And as in other areas of native policy, he was assisted not only by government officials, but also by missionaries. Shortly after his arrival, Grey had abolished the mission-dominated Protectorate of Aborigines, and reduced a widespread impression of government reliance on missionary advice. Yet missionaries were among his closest friends and allies. Living within Māori communities they were inevitably his best sources of information regarding all aspects of native affairs. When Grey stayed with Richard Taylor at Wanganui in January
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1848, he used the missionary’s home as a venue for land purchase negotiations. Later in the year Taylor wrote to advise Grey on the proposed Rangitikei purchase. “I believe I am the only European who has seen any thing of the interior of that part, and I do not hesitate to say there is not a finer district in this Island”, wrote Taylor, “the land is either perfectly level or undulating and extends a long way inland it is covered with grass and well wooded and as there are scarcely any natives residing on it, I can on that account recommend it to your Excellency [sic]”. in 1850 Rev John Whitely wrote to update Grey on an inter-tribal land dispute at Waingaroa. Whitely had tried to intercede between the original inhabitants and invaders from the Waikato to no avail. He supported Grey’s proposal to purchase the land and pay both tribes “according to the merit of their respective claims”. Whitely was concerned that government land purchases might have actually precipitated the invasion. He asked Grey to write to Te Wherowhero of Waikato and explain that the chief could not obtain land by force for the specified purpose of selling to the Crown.

Though some Māori were obviously cognizant of the profits to be made from selling their land (and others’ land), Grey always paid a minimal price. He believed that the dual purpose of pre-emption was to protect Māori from land sharks, and to build up the colonial coffers by purchasing cheaply and selling at a profit. According to this policy Grey authorised Kemp to pay a paltry £2000 for the enormous Canterbury block, arguing that this sum was “as large an amount as [Ngai Tahu] could profitably spend, or as was likely to be of any real benefit to them”. In fact, the tribe had originally asked for £10,000. During the course of negotiations they lowered their asking price to £5000 and only settled for £2000 under pressure. In his instructions to Walter Mantell regarding purchase negotiations for the Murihuku block south of Otago, Colonial Secretary Alfred Domett made the Crown’s policy of minimal expenditure quite clear. Because the locals had “never expressed any expectation of receiving for [their land] a larger sum than £2000”, Mantell was to “consider that sum to be the extreme limit” which he was authorised to pay. As the Māori population inhabiting the region was quite small, Domett conveyed the Governor’s hope that he might pay even less. McLean’s reflections upon concluding purchase
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of the western and northern regions of the South Island reveal a degree of deceit in the minimal price policy. He suggests that the £5000 paid to Ngati Toa and their allies would have been considerably higher had they been aware of the mineral wealth “abounding” in some of their lands.45

Grey also dictated a policy of gradual payment for Māori lands. As Rutherford notes, Grey believed that “easy wealth” would demoralise Māori and thwart his plans for promoting hard work as a force of civilisation.46 He also believed that gradual payment would encourage Māori to spend their profits wisely. Further, he understood that drip-feeding purchase profits forced Māori into a dependent relationship on the Crown and encouraged loyalty to their source of income. In March 1847 he wrote to inform Earl Grey of the successful purchase of several significant blocks from Ngati Toa in the North Island. He had paid £2000 for a large area of land surrounding Porirua, with £1000 to be paid on 1 April 1847, £500 on 1 April 1848 and £500 on 1 April 1849. The £3000 paid for the Wairau district was to be meted out in five annual instalments of £600, likewise to be paid on 1 April of each succeeding year. Grey believed that the principle of “annual money-payments, instead of giving at once large quantities of merchandise, will ... have a powerful influence of the future advancement of the natives in civilisation”.47 He argued that “the experience of each year will render it probable that every successive annual payment will be more judiciously expended”. Moreover, he assured Earl Grey, there was no doubt that the annual payments to Ngati Toa would give the government “an almost unlimited influence over a powerful and, hitherto, a very treacherous and dangerous tribe”.48 Kemp’s Canterbury purchase was concluded according to the same principle. Ngai Tahu received four half-yearly instalments of £500 to make up the total purchase price of £2000.49 Grey bound up his gradual purchase policy in the rhetoric of Māori civilisation without acknowledging the fiscal objectives it also served. Smaller payments spaced over a period of years ultimately reduced the pressure on New Zealand’s struggling colonial treasury. Grey’s native land purchases were influenced by a humanitarian desire to integrate Māori in the colonial economy, and just as surely, by colonial economics.
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New Zealand’s European settlers were also crucial. Grey was always conscious of his responsibility to both Māori and European. The whole point of purchasing Māori land so cheaply and efficiently was to open the country to European settlement. Kemp’s South Island purchase, he hoped, would be “a source of great satisfaction” to the imperial government, making “so large a tract of country of the most fertile description ... unrestrictedly open to British enterprise”.\(^{50}\) Grey was similarly satisfied with the Murihuku purchase. The whole of the southern South Island was “now set free for the occupation of Europeans”.\(^{51}\) Though Grey never accepted Earl Grey’s waste lands argument, his rhetoric echoes European notions of property ownership and management. He considered unoccupied, uncultivated land to be tied up or closed off, a hindrance to the advance of civilisation. Grey believed that European settlers would improve the land, civilise their native neighbours and promote the country’s economic progress.

Rutherford shows that the rate of European settlement and the demands of European settlers also influenced Grey’s land purchase policy. He explains that “natural increase and immigration sent up the demand for land in arithmetical proportion to the European population” whereas “speculation and sheep-farming combined [sent] it up in geometrical proportion”.\(^{52}\) Grey’s early purchases were aimed at settling current disputes and meeting the immediate needs of landless settlers. These purchases included the Wellington, Hutt, Porirua, Wanganui, Taranaki, Wairau and Waitohi blocks. The Canterbury, Murihuku and Rangitikei blocks, by contrast, were purchased in anticipation of future immigration. Without settlers right there, Māori were unaware of their land’s true value and Grey’s land purchase officers achieved devastatingly low prices. His land purchase policy changed pace again in the last few years of Grey’s first New Zealand governorship. With sheep farmers and speculators driving the demand for land ever higher, Grey embarking on a spending spree, using pressure tactics to secure large areas of native land in the Wairarapa, Hawke’s Bay, and Auckland.\(^{53}\) As Rutherford observes, Grey was “fortunate to get out before the reaction commenced”.\(^{54}\)

In December 1845 Hone Heke had warned Grey of interfering with Māori sovereignty over their lands. “God made this country for us;” he admonished, “it cannot be sliced, if it were a whale it
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might be sliced; but as for this, do you return to your own country, to England, which was made by God for you”.55 Some Māori were reluctant to sell to Grey’s officials, as in the case of the Wairarapa chief Ngatuere who in 1853 put up “a very obstinate resistance” to Donald McLean. It was only with “some difficulty” that McLean eventually purchased 40 000 acres from the chief for £2000 (the same price Kemp had paid five years earlier for 20 000 000 acres).56 Other Māori were only too eager to accede to Crown requests for land. After happily receiving £4 800 for 279 000 acres of land in mid 1851, the Hawke’s Bay chief Te Hapuku gifted the Crown a further 18 000 acres in extension of the sale.57

During the eight years of his first New Zealand governorship Grey professed himself well pleased with the Māori response to his land purchase policy. Māori vendors had sold his government a huge extent of land for a very minimal price. More significantly, Grey believed Māori land sales had promoted their advance in the scale of civilisation. In September 1850 he reported to the Colonial Office that the natives of Rangitikei and Wanganui had begun repurchasing small sections of the large tracts of land they had previously sold to the government. They now held the land with individual Crown titles, and intended to develop it for agricultural purposes.58 In August 1851 when he visited the Ngati Apa to hand over their third instalment of £500 for the Rangitikei block, Donald McLean observed that most of the purchase money had been spent on “good breeding mares, milch cows, agricultural implements, clothing, household furniture, and a variety of other useful articles”. He reported that the “sums expended among the Rangitikei tribe for their land, the location of England settlers among them, and the consequent demand for their produce and labour, [had] greatly stimulated their industry and wonderfully improved their disposition and circumstances”. Formerly known as an aggressive fighting tribe, the Rangitikei now lived on peaceful terms with their Māori and English neighbours. In the space of two years they had increased their stock holdings from one horse to eighty horses and thirty five head of horned cattle, with plans to buy sheep the next year. McLean boasted that a “trifling amount of purchase money” had opened up an important area for European settlement

55 Hone Heke to George Grey, 2 December 1845, enclosed in George Grey to Lord Stanley, 9 February 1846, GBPP 1846 (690), p.15.
56 Donald McLean to George Grey, 17 September 1853, Wairarapa Land Purchases and Regulations, ATL.
57 George Grey to Earl Grey, 8 January 1852, GBPP 1852 (1476), pp.62-4.
58 George Grey to Earl Grey, 26 September 1850, GBPP 1851 (1420), p.45.
and led to great benefits for Māori.\textsuperscript{59} When he returned to Rangitikei to oversee the final payment in June 1852 McLean showed how the sale had bought Māori and settler closer together:

The Rangitikei tribe have since the sale of their district made considerable progress in civilisation and wealth; they are now noticed by most travellers as being hospitable, friendly, and changed in the general features of their character than any other tribe of the coast; and the European inhabitants of Wellington, from their connexion with this district, have also had opportunities of forming a truer estimate of native character, and of the various peculiarities and local requirements of the country, than they could have otherwise possibly obtained.\textsuperscript{60}

When Surveyor-General C. W. Ligar visited Whaingaroa in April 1852 he reported that the natives there had spent their purchase profits to similarly good effect. Spending part of the money on horses and farm implements, they had “sat down to the quiet routine of agriculture”.\textsuperscript{61} Ligar was impressed by their capacity for hard work and thrift, finding them devoted to “the pursuit of gain”. Like Grey, Ligar saw Māori energy and enterprise as a valuable resource for opening the land to European commerce and colonisation. Starting out from the British settlements, he suggested, “one is apt to suppose that there ends the exertions of man to subdue the wild expanse of nature lying before him, but such is not the case”. The surveyor argued that the natives, “in their vast numbers”, represented “a power, if well directed, of accomplishing much towards” developing the countryside.\textsuperscript{62} At the Colonial Office, Ligar’s report was received as evidence bearing favourably on the conduct of Māori, and of the Governor. Herman Merivale dubbed it “a very curious account ... of a very singular people”. It was “fresh testimony, if any were wanted, to the sagacity of the Governor”. Ligar’s report confirmed what Grey had already pointed out - that “the numbers & intelligence & peculiar turn of mind of the natives” were a crucial consideration “in all projects for the government of the community”. Though Grey had “incurred no small obloquy for saying so” from the settlers and from factions in Britain, he retained the trust of his superiors at the Colonial Office.\textsuperscript{63} Forwarding reports like Ligar’s served to promote the reputation of Māori and of himself.
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In July 1853 Grey forwarded another report from Surveyor-General Ligar showing that Māori were responding favourably to the Governor’s new land regulations. In opposition to specified Colonial Office policy,64 Grey had issued regulations in March 1853 dramatically reducing the price of Crown land.65 According to quantity and quality, settlers and Māori could now purchase land from the government for ten shillings and five shillings an acre. Two months later he wrote to the Colonial Office defending his policy. On a 650 mile walking tour overland from Wellington to Auckland he had “found everywhere the people very grateful for what I had done”.66 Ligar’s report in July showed that 64 000 acres had already been applied for under the new regulations. The Surveyor-General anticipated that these sales would produce an immediate profit of £32 000 for the land fund. Now that Māori could purchase land “at a fair value”, Ligar reported that they were “already making considerable purchase of land from the government”. He suggested, in fact, that because Māori “much prefer a title emanating from the Crown to their own tenure of property held amongst many individuals they are in many places shewing themselves much more willing than heretofore to part with their lands to the government”.67 Ligar failed to back up this vague (and unlikely) generalisation with specific evidence, but for Grey this was evidence of successful economic integration. Māori were selling and purchasing land from the government, attaching themselves ever closer to Crown interests and European neighbours.

Following Grey’s departure from New Zealand in 1853 the negative effects of his native land purchase policy began slowly unfolding. Grey’s autocratic style had major repercussions. He had always retained a high level of personal involvement in actual negotiations and reserved final authority to himself. When he left, New Zealand’s land purchasing system seemed “utterly without system or order”. “We look about for something to guide us through this question”, lamented Henry Sewell, “- we find nothing. Not a particle of information left by Sir George Grey to light us through this dark labyrinth”.68 Without Grey’s guiding humanitarianism to mitigate the

financial imperatives of European colonisation, land purchases became even more aggressive and less circumspect.

As W. H. Oliver notes, the policy of native land purchase “was sure, in the end, to arouse antipathy”. Minimal purchase prices and hasty deals, in the context of expanding European settlement, produced a growing sense of dispossession and discontent in many Māori communities. Grey saw his land purchase policy as a stepping stone towards racial amalgamation. In fact, the resentment it engendered was a stepping stone towards war in the 1860s.

New Zealand society is still dealing with that resentment in the twenty-first century. The Waitangi Land Claims Tribunal and debates surrounding its authority and efficacy epitomise the struggle of both Māori and European New Zealanders to come to terms with past land deals. Māori scholarship highlights ongoing resentment over the loss of their lands. Ranginui Walker, for example, presents Grey as “the author of colonial dispossession”.

Despite its negative ramifications, Grey’s native land policy was based on humanitarian principles. He was firmly committed to honouring the Treaty of Waitangi, both by establishing British sovereignty in New Zealand, and by protecting Māori land rights. For Grey, re-establishing Crown pre-emption under the Treaty was a means of complying with imperial instructions, achieving financial stability, funding European settlement, and advancing racial amalgamation. He believed that the financial power acquired from land sales, and increasing contact with European culture and commerce, would raise Māori in the scale of civilisation. As Māori shared their land with European settlers, and the settlers shared their financial and technical resources with Māori, Grey hoped the two people would merge into one peaceful and prosperous community. The reality was far more complicated. Māori used the land sales process and profits for their own purposes. Some Māori rejected Crown authority on the basis that they had not, in fact, been protected in their land rights as promised under the Treaty. Grey had satisfied his superiors, restored the colony to financial solvency and funded considerable European expansion, but his native land purchase policy had hindered rather than hastened the cause of racial amalgamation.
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Native Labour Policy

Though underlain by the same motives, Grey’s native labour policy was far less controversial. In accordance with his 1840 Australian plan he hoped to civilise Māori and secure British sovereignty by employing them on civil works, primarily as road builders. This scheme served three inter-related purposes. Its first function was military. Road-building distracted Māori from rebellion and encouraged loyalty to the Crown. The roads themselves made communication between the main centres faster and gave British troops easier access to trouble spots. The second function of Grey’s native labour policy was economic. Roads were crucial for opening native land to European settlement and for getting produce to market. Māori road-builders also became labourers on European farms. Their cheap, ready labour was invaluable for the government and for farmers. Third, Grey believed that labouring on public works would elevate Māori in the scale of civilisation. Nineteenth century humanitarians saw hard work as a force of moral improvement. Grey believed that working in close contact with Europeans would teach Māori European habits of industry, encourage respect for the British government, promote Christian conversion and facilitate Māori participation in the settler economy. Once again, he interpreted the Māori response as proof of success.

Nineteenth century humanitarians saw industry as a powerful force of civilisation. Victorians placed a high value on hard work as a means of “achieving the twin goals of life – respectability and salvation”.71 In his 1840 Australian report Grey advocated labour as a means of native improvement, advising that local government employ Aborigines on road works.72 In November 1845, just as Grey assumed office in Auckland, a recently departed member of New Zealand’s Legislative Council submitted similar recommendations to the Colonial Office. William Brown argued that immediate measures should be taken to stimulate Māori industry, and specifically recommended road-building. It was imperative to “call forth their energies in their own civilisation, and in uniting their labours with those of the colonists in unfolding the resources of the colony”.73

The immediate purpose of Grey’s native labour policy was military. Māori still dominated much of the country throughout the 1840s. In areas of discontent and rebellion, European settlers were highly vulnerable. Roads were vital for bringing isolated farms and settlements into closer contact with the main centres, and for making the New Zealand countryside more passable for British troops. As well as roads, Māori labourers also constructed defensive walls and stockades. “I certainly think a more interesting sight can hardly be seen”, wrote Grey in May 1847, “than that of the natives voluntarily and cheerfully assisting to build our fortifications in this recently occupied country”.74 In July 1847 he forwarded to the Colonial Office a report by Government Surveyor T. H. Fitzgerald on the road being constructed between Wellington and the Wairarapa. Fitzgerald was impressed by the change effected in Māori labourers employed on the road. He observed them steadily “becoming quiet, active, and industrious”, and noted that road-building “certainly must have the effect of keeping many restless and turbulent spirits usefully employed, that might be engaged in mischief if left to themselves”.75 Once the road was finished, Grey boasted that Wellington would be safe from Māori attack, and once safe, would “then advance rapidly in wealth and prosperity”.76 Lieutenant-Governor Eyre was similarly positive, yet his vague reference to “disasters of the worst kind” overtaking the country if the roads were not built reflects the ongoing turbulence of political affairs in the late 1840s.77 With war so recently and tenuously concluded, Grey was highly conscious of the potential for further unrest. When the north-west coastal road out of Wellington was completed, Captain Russell, Superintendent of Military Roads, reported to Grey that the colonial government had now gained “mastery of the country”.78 Russell believed one of the road’s main advantages had been to make a “previously disturbed district” controlled by Te Rangihaeta safely passable to Europeans and other Māori.79 He argued that “the peaceful expenditure of £20,000” on roads had been far more successful than “a more war-like policy”.80 Though peaceful, building roads with Māori labour was an important military strategy. Grey’s roads represented a precautionary defensive approach to the ongoing threat of Māori rebellion, and an active attempt to extend the reach of British sovereignty. Riding out of Wellington in January 1848 G. C. Mundy reflected on the route. “It is unquestionable”, he
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declared, “that a road like the noble one we were now travelling on, running right through the heart of a new country inhabited by a savage and undisciplined people, is as fatal to their continued resistance as the thrust of a rapier through that of an individual foe”.81

Grey’s native labour policy was designed to extend British authority both in martial and economic terms. In May 1847 he wrote to the Colonial Office that Māori labourers were opening the country by roads “at the cheapest possible rate” and thus promoting “the prosperity of both the European and native population”.82 “Upon the whole”, he reported himself “quite satisfied that no cheaper, more effectual, or speedy mode of effecting the peaceable conquest of this country can be pursued than that of affording employment to a portion of the native population”.83 He believed that the cost of paying native workers would soon be defrayed by the results of their labours. Roads and public works that helped open the land to European settlement would boost the land fund and the general colonial revenue.84 In theory, native roads would pay for themselves.

For alongside Grey’s political and humanitarian motives for employing Māori labourers, the simple fact remained that Māori could be employed more cheaply than their European counterparts. The Royal Engineer Department first employed Māori on public works in and around Auckland in November 1846 due to a scarcity of European labourers in the district and the very high rate of wages those few labourers commanded.85 A year later, George Graham, Clerk of Works, reported to Grey that the Royal Engineers were currently employing over one hundred Māori labourers belonging to twenty four different tribes, and only one European overseer. The labourers were paid between 1s. 6d. and 2s. 6d. per day, and worked on a wide range of tasks, from rafting timber, to making mortar, to building and quarry work (at which they were “far better than any Europeans”).86 On the roads, Māori and European labourers worked alongside each other for different rates of pay.87 Māori wages were little more than half those paid to European workmen. Surveyor T. H. Fitzgerald commended Grey’s native labour policy.
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He believed that the government derived “a very considerable advantage” from employing Māori labourers, “for, at the relative rates of pay between them and the Europeans, I think they do almost as much as Europeans”. When the road along the coast north-west of Wellington was completed in February 1850, Captain Russell reported a total expenditure of £20,410. This averaged out at a cost of £829 per mile. In comparison, Russell pointed out that an ordinary parish road in England cost £1800 per mile. Van Diemen’s Land roads had been even more expensive, and roads recently constructed in Hong Kong cost £1000 per mile, with native labourers paid 10d. per day. In New Zealand, Russell had paid his Māori labourers between 2s.6d. and 2s. per day. Russell claimed his road was so cheap because of efficient superintendence. In reality, New Zealand’s early infrastructure was constructed cheaply and efficiently by employing Māori labourers, and paying them less than Europeans.

European settlers also benefited from cheap labour. Māori working on roads and public works learnt European work habits, became acquainted with European tools, and gained easily transferable manual skills. As Grey testified to the Colonial Office, the “European farmer has an abundant supply of labour, of the cheapest kind, kept almost at his very door”.

Māori labourers represented both savings and revenue to the colonial treasury. They eased the pressure on New Zealand’s struggling economy by providing cheap labour. At the same time, they boosted the economy by opening up the countryside to European settlement, providing farmers with access to markets, and purchasing material goods with their wages. Grey’s report on the roads in July 1847 gave two specific reasons for their construction: to provide Wellington with military protection and connect it to “the extensive tracts of good country in the south of the island”. Grey’s ultimate purpose was “thus to enable settlers to avail themselves of the natural capabilities of the country, and to bring their produce to market”. On completion of the north-west coastal route out of Wellington, Captain Russell described how European settlers were “hastening to take possession of their newly acquired district of Rangitiki [sic]”. If opening the land to settlers were the only advantage considered, he believed the new roads could still be
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counted a cheap purchase.\textsuperscript{94} Grey’s native labour policy encouraged Māori participation in the colonial economy as workers and as purchasers. Working on the roads and public works “they become acquainted with the value and nature of money, and with the use of European tools and implements, whilst from their savings they obtain[ed] the means of purchasing these”.\textsuperscript{95} As consumers they contributed to the economy twice over, paying for their goods and paying the tax imposed on those goods.

The process of integrating Māori in the colonial economy was an important part of Grey’s economic policy, but it was also part of the native policy that underlay his whole governorship. Building roads with native labour was a means of expanding military and economic control over the country, but the rhetoric in Grey’s reports to the Colonial Office is chiefly concerned with native civilisation. He believed employment on public works would improve Māori standards of living and encourage their moral development. In February 1847 he observed that Māori working on public roads “under strict European superintendence” were “taught the use of the principal European agricultural implements; ... the advantages of combined labour, - the necessity for continuous labour”. In addition they were “better accustomed to a better diet, to better clothes, to discipline, to regular hours of work ...”.\textsuperscript{96} Later in the year he affirmed again that Māori working on the roads were “acquiring habits of laborious and steady industry”.\textsuperscript{97} Their wages gave Māori the means of acquiring the material trappings of European civilisation. Grey was thrilled to observe Māori investing their wages by purchasing stock for breeding, and so “laying the foundation of future comfort and competence for themselves and their families”.\textsuperscript{98} T. H. Fitzgerald reported that Māori employed on public works had changed from “a lazy indolent set of people” to become “quiet, active and industrious”. They were “fond of money”, and Fitzgerald judged that they spent their wages well, “generally for European clothing, or for provisions, and in acquiring other useful property”.\textsuperscript{99} Captain Russell reported that the roads had “been one of the great means by which the Governor-in-Chief has converted disaffected natives into loyal subjects, enabling them to provide themselves with the comforts and necessaries of civilised life”. Increased contact with Europeans combined with increased purchasing power had created “a new demand for our home manufactures likely soon to become general”. Many
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labourers had used their wages to buy cattle, “every head of which”, Russell claimed, became “security for their good behaviour”. The improvement in Māori civilisation was so great, he reported, that the Canterbury settlement “the site of which was chosen as being remote from natives” had started importing Māori workers “at great expense”.

Grey believed that increasing contact between Māori and European would ultimately lead to closer relationships, and eventually to racial amalgamation. As employees Māori learnt “their duty” towards the government, “and the duty of the government towards them”. On European farms Māori learnt “improved methods of agriculture and of dairy farming ..., and, at the same time, reciprocal feelings of mutual dependence, and an interchange of good offices, spring up between the employer and the employed”.

Like Grey, Richard Taylor saw the roads as routes to civilisation. In February 1847 he recorded an encounter with Māori labourers on the road between Wellington and Wanganui. He notes that the first part of the journey was “very bad until we got to the new road”. In discussion with the labourers Taylor drew an analogy between John the Baptist preparing the way for Christ, and Māori building roads to prepare the way for civilisation. He told them “that was exactly what they were now doing – cutting down trees, rooting them out, filling up hollows, levelling the hills to make a good road for the Governor according to his command”. In the same way John was “commanded to make a highway for our God by preaching repentance that all those inequalities produced by sin may be removed & Christ come to take up his abode in our hearts”. The labourers agreed with Taylor’s analogy and said they would remember his words as they worked. Once again, God and the government worked together, both in pursuit of native civilisation.

The Māori response to Grey’s native labour policy reinforced his belief in their equality with Europeans and their capacity for improvement. They were willing and competent workers who soon began taking the initiative in new projects to extend the country’s infrastructure. In June 1846, only a month after the government first began employing Māori labourers, Grey was already boasting success. Captain Russell had so far employed twenty Māori, and turned down
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many other eager candidates. He was sure there would be “no difficulty in procuring any number
[of workers] required”. Grey interpreted their willingness to work as evidence of political
affiliation. “This circumstance”, he assured the Colonial Office, “sufficiently shows that the
sense of the majority of the native inhabitants of the southern districts is with the Government,
and that their attachment may without difficulty be permanently secured”. Russell had treated
the Māori labourers “liberally” according to Grey’s instructions, and found that as workmen they
“more than equalled the Europeans” and were “willing to conform to our hours and customs”. A
year later Grey emphasised to the Colonial Office that Māori working for the Royal Engineer
Department were “already equal to European mechanics”. Of sixty seven men employed by
the Department all could read in their own language and only one could not write. In the six
months of their employment there had been only one case of drunkenness, and they were
generally investing their wages wisely. Grey could find nothing “more satisfactory” than “the
moral and religious character” of these Māori labourers. In December 1847 he forwarded
further reports stressing that Māori had proved themselves “better workmen than the
Europeans”. Their continued occupation on the same job for more than a year had disproved
popular European notions of natives as fickle and capricious. Colonel Bolton, Commander of the
Royal Engineers, reported that “the uniform quiet conduct” of his native workers, “their perfect
sobriety, their ready obedience, - the cheerfulness with which they perform whatever they may be
ordered to execute, .. their anxiety to acquire knowledge” revealed “the Māori character in a
most favourable and interesting point of view, proving at the same time how much may be
effected, even with savages, by kindness and judicious management”. Like Grey, Bolton
believed that Māori were lower in the scale of civilisation than Europeans, but had proven their
ability to rise to the same level. “The results of all these experiments”, claimed Grey, had
“clearly demonstrated the entire capacity of the natives for acquiring and skilfully executing all
ordinary occupations in which a European population are generally engaged”. In March 1848
he reported on the progress of the southern roads, emphasising again the progress “made in
inducing the native population to conform to habits of continued industry”. Grey offered
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Captain Russell’s report on the efficiency of his Māori workers as “conclusive proofs of the change which is taking place in the character and disposition of the natives”. Their attitude and performance as labourers had reinforced Grey’s faith in the innate equality of all mankind. His reports to the Colonial Office cited evidence from officials to show that Māori were, in fact, being civilised day by day as they worked on the colonial infrastructure.

By the early 1850s Māori were building roads on their own account, a circumstance Grey interpreted as further evidence of increasing civilisation. In October 1852 Grey reported that Te Rangihaeta was simultaneously building three different roads to connect his pa at Porotawao with the rest of the country. In effect his roads would help connect Wellington, Wanganui, Taranaki and the Manawatu region. Te Rangihaeta, “once celebrated as a rebel”, had previously boasted of his pa’s impregnability and violently opposed the construction and use of government roads.\(^{112}\) Now, he was cooperating with other tribes and “opening up the country by excellent roads” covering a total distance of twenty two miles. Te Rangihaeta and neighbouring chiefs were paying for the construction themselves, saving the government an estimated five thousand pounds.\(^{113}\) A private letter to Donald McLean shows that Grey did, however, provide practical support in the form of clothing, tobacco and sugar to assist Te Rangihaeta. He was “anxious in every manner possible to assist a Chief formerly so troublesome in so laudable an effort as that of opening up an hitherto inaccessible country”.\(^{114}\) McLean testified that the change in Te Rangihaeta was “almost incredible”. In 1849 he had objected to government roads as a threat to his authority. In 1852 he proclaimed the roads he was building to be the Governor’s backbone, and “as a marked expression of good will ... absolutely transferred, according to native custom, the right of chieftainship” over the roads to Grey.\(^{115}\) Te Rangihaeta understood that the roads would help extend the Governor’s power, but he now hoped to harness that power to benefit his own people. Roads were a concrete means of opening his lands to the economic and social benefits of European civilisation.

As always, Grey was quick to recognise and acknowledge the role of missionaries in promoting Māori civilisation. Monsieur Le Comte, a Roman Catholic missionary at Otaki, had strongly encouraged the Ngatihuia tribe to participate in building one of Te Rangihaeta’s roads. He had
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promised to help them build a flour mill near Porotawhao after they first completed a road to take their produce to market. Grey conveyed this example to the Colonial Office as a good illustration "of the many ways in which missionaries living amongst a barbarous or semi-barbarous population can exercise an influence of the most beneficial nature over the natives by whom they are surrounded".\textsuperscript{116}

Other Māori were also building roads independently. In 1852 McLean reported a "mania" for road-building.\textsuperscript{117} Herewini Te Tupe had built a branch road at Waikanae. Ngati Te Upokoiri on the Upper Manawatu had opened a road between Manawatu and the Ahuriri plains. Māori at Turakina and Waengaehu had also opened up a length of road.\textsuperscript{118} For Grey these examples represented both a saving to the Colonial Treasury and convincing proof that Māori were being successfully integrated into the colonial economy. In his mind, Māori labouring on government projects and on their own roads demonstrated an acceptance of British authority, established their capacity for industry, and moved up the scale of civilisation, progressing towards amalgamation with their European employers and neighbours.

Māori, settlers, and both colonial and imperial governments benefited from Grey’s native labour policy. It was generally hailed a success. Internal memos within the Colonial Office registered a high level of satisfaction with Governor Grey’s policy. On 12 January 1847 James Stephen noted that Grey’s presence seemed to "have thrown a kind of sunshine" over New Zealand. He described the increasing demand for native labour as "by far the most promising event which has yet occurred in the history of our connection with New Zealand".\textsuperscript{119}

Some members of the settler community were not so well pleased. William Brown, who had forwarded his own roading proposal to the Colonial Office in 1845, denounced Grey’s roads as "the grand climax of malversation".\textsuperscript{120} In an official letter of protest he complained at the poor quality of the roads and the excessive cost of their construction.\textsuperscript{121} Brown blamed the "natural\textsuperscript{116} George Grey to Sir John Pakington, 22 October 1852, GBPP 1854 (1779), p.164.
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indolence of the natives” and poor management by government officers. Felton Mathew claimed employment on public works had in fact had “a most injurious effect on the character and conduct of the natives” around Auckland. Without proper superintendence, he argued, they had developed “habits of idleness and cunning”, achieving an “absolutely insignificant” amount of work. In effect, he fumed, “the money expended is literally buried in mud”. For all Grey’s enthusiasm and the positive Māori response to his native labour policy, these complaints reflect the complicated reality of race relations in mid-nineteenth century New Zealand. Some settlers would never accept the notion of Māori equality. Increasing contact did not lead inevitably, as Grey anticipated, to peaceful amalgamation.

**Economic Development**

Land and labour were the two main strands of Grey’s plan for integrating Māori into the colonial economy. They were supplemented by a policy of financial support for Māori enterprise. Under the third article of the Treaty of Waitangi Māori had been promised the same rights and privileges as British citizens. Grey sought to honour this promise by setting up savings banks, fostering Māori trade, and issuing loans for stock and equipment. Fully cognizant of its flow-on effects, Grey also saw Māori economic development as a means of strengthening the colonial economy and impressing the Colonial Office. Missionaries were the crucial point of access to Māori communities, working with the government to develop Māori industry. Like Grey, they believed that economic development would aid the progress of civilisation and Christian conversion.

New Zealand’s first banks were government savings banks, set up in Wellington in 1846, and Auckland in 1847. Grey wrote to the Colonial Office in February 1847 to report that Māori were readily availing themselves of the Wellington bank and “anxiously waiting” to deposit “considerable sums” in the Auckland bank due to open in a matter of days. Grey believed the “many advantages” of the banks to be self-evident, referring only vaguely to the “powerful
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influence” they would exercise “upon the advance of the natives in civilisation”. Savings banks suited several of Grey’s purposes. First, they gave the government an immediate cash injection. Second, they catered to the settlers’ need for familiar institutions and forms of economic management. Third, they encouraged Māori to save rather than spend their profits from land sales and labour, teaching them the benefits of long-term financial planning. Fourth, they encouraged a sense of equality and community, with both settlers and Māori contributing to, and benefiting from, the same establishment.

In August 1847 Grey’s Legislative Council passed the Savings Bank Ordinance, intended as a further inducement to Māori customers. The Ordinance allowed for the standard provisions regulating British savings banks, but included three extra provisions. The interest was never to fall beneath five per cent “to give Māori a feeling of security and confidence in the bank”. Māori deposits were not to be limited, as European deposits were, to £100. Those amounts exceeding £100 would not receive interest, “the only object in this case being to insure for [Māori] the safe custody of their money”. Grey presented these measures as a “means not only to promote and advance their civilisation, but to give them an interest in the stability of a Government, which provides the means for the investment and security of their savings”.

Though it would be a long time before Māori in isolated areas began banking, those around Wellington and Auckland quickly grasped its benefits. Grey must have been thrilled in mid 1847 to receive a letter from Octavius Hadfield reflecting on Te Rauparaha’s attitude to the savings bank. When Ngati Toa received their payment for the Porirua and Wairau districts, Hadfield reported that Te Rauparaha had advised his son to invest his £200 portion, saying “Do not keep this money here among the Māoris, we shall lose it, or waste it. I have confidence in the pakehas, take & deposit it in the Bank [sic]”. For Grey this anecdote served as evidence of both economic and political progress.

Colonial interests and settler politics also played a role in Grey’s efforts to develop native trade. In January 1847 he reassured the assembled European citizens of Auckland that he had always “endeavoured to promote the interests of every portion of New Zealand, doing that for each
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settlement which appeared to me best calculated to develop its own particular resources, trusting that Divine Providence would assist my earnest and sincere endeavours to promote the welfare of this country”. From the start he had recognised Auckland’s importance as “a depot for native trade”, and promised to do his utmost to foster and encourage its rapidly increasing export and import trade”. Travelling with Governor Grey on the Waitemata Harbour in December 1847 G. C. Mundy observed several large Māori canoes “full of pigs and other provisions for the Auckland market, running at a great rate before the wind in a rather heavy sea, with sails of canvas or blanket”. In early 1849 Grey travelled to the heads of the Waikato and Waipa rivers, and observed that Māori farmers in the district were growing large quantities of wheat, corn, potatoes, fruit and other produce. Their surplus, Grey believed, was enough to supply the needs of Auckland. He quickly appointed Lieutenant-Colonel Daniel Bolton to find a means of transporting Māori produce from the heads of the Waikato across the Manukau harbour to Auckland. Grey was eager to secure food supplies for the Auckland settlers, but equally hoped to “benefit the natives by giving them a good market for their at present almost valueless produce”. By 1853 all the flour milled in the Waikato was being sent to Auckland by means of the new route across the Manukau.

Grey also instituted a government loan scheme to assist Māori traders. Individual chiefs were lent “moderate sums” at the Governor’s discretion. The scheme was initiated to help tribes along the coast purchase small vessels to get their produce to market. Grey established them as deserving recipients on the basis of political allegiance and cultural development. “The chiefs of these tribes”, he wrote, “are Christians, have always been attached to the Government, and are desirous of promoting the extension of Christianity and civilisation amongst their people”. Because their new vessels would provide immediate means of profiting from their produce, Grey envisaged that the loans would all be repaid promptly. The positive effects of the scheme would be “to attach the natives to the Government from a sense of benefits received, to increase the
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trade of the colony, and to train up amongst the natives a race of coating seamen".137 Two years later he conveyed the accounts relating to Māori loans to the Colonial Office. His report emphasised “with what extraordinary punctuality the repayments” had been made.138 In November 1849 the Customs Collector at Auckland wrote to Grey asking for Māori translations of the colonial government’s boat licensing and customs regulations. The Custom’s House now needed to cater for a rapidly increasing number of Māori boat owners and labourers.139 From Grey’s point of view this was evidence of success on both small and grand scales. His loans had boosted Māori trade and increased the availability of fresh produce for European settlers. More importantly, he believed, they had played a role in integrating Māori within the colonial economy, increased contact between Māori and European, and contributed to the progress of racial amalgamation.

In addition to government loans, Grey also made personal loans and gifts to Māori. His surviving papers are full of receipts and letters of gratitude. In July 1848, for example, he donated five guineas towards the erection of a mill at Hokianga.140 He also gave livestock as gifts, including a horse to Te Heu Heu, the paramount chief of Ngati Tuwharetoa.141 Grey’s wife Eliza also lent money to Māori, on at least one occasion. She advanced £20 to a Māori man without security, so that he could take possession of a boat for which he had already paid £80. While the man was away on his first trading trip his tribe gathered together the money and paid off the debt.142

Most often, Grey conveyed financial assistance and agricultural resources to Māori communities through the missionaries living in their midst. Otawhao in the Waikato was one such community. CMS missionary John Morgan lived at Otawhao from 1841 to 1865. During both Grey’s New Zealand governorships Morgan worked closely with the Governor to further their shared goals of Māori conversion and civilisation. Morgan kept the Governor informed of Māori attitudes and activities, and later, operated an extensive spy network in opposition to the King movement. Grey, in return, maintained a strong interest in Otawhao’s development as a model of native industry. He visited the district in February 1849 and gave the neighbouring village of Rangiawhia a pair of horses, a dray, a harness and a plough. Morgan believed the gift had been a
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stimulus to other villages to acquire horses and ploughs. At the end of 1849 he described the district’s progress in idyllic terms. The villages surrounding Otawhao were growing wheat and barley, and forming orchards of peaches, apples, pears, plums, quinces, almonds and gooseberries from trees they had budded or grafted themselves. The mill at Rangiawhia was working well, and one of the chief’s there had built a small European style boarded house. The same chief owned several cows and regularly milked in the mornings. Morgan presented this “rapid advancement in civilisation” as “the fruit of Sir George Grey’s kind present, and friendly feeling towards those tribes”. Over the next few years Grey presented them with more horses, agricultural equipment, and grants of money, and paid for a European agricultural instructor to teach them ploughing. Morgan felt confident enough of Grey’s commitment to Māori progress to ask for further support. In June 1851 he requested that the Government send a carpenter to superintend the building of European-style barns and cottages and a church for the district. As well as farming and milling, Morgan also sought to encourage Māori in small scale industries like spinning, weaving, and shoe-making. In December 1851 he asked Grey for two frames and hackles for spinning wool.

Morgan depended on Grey’s humanitarian interest in Māori welfare, but he also understood the political and economic pressures that informed New Zealand’s early native policy. He believed that integrating Māori into the colonial economy through the acquisition of material goods was imperative for their improvement. “Until we can surround them with domestic comforts”, he wrote to Grey, “we must not expect to see them training their children in habits of honest industry”. But, like Grey, Morgan also understood that material goods represented political capital. “If we succeed in giving them valuable fixed property”, he argued, “they will not be disposed to risk the destruction of their mills, barns, dwelling houses, churches and other buildings ... for the uncertain chances of a war with the pakehas”. Morgan saw agriculture as the surest means of promoting Māori civilisation, which in turn would “ensure the peace, the
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safety, and the prosperity, of the entire Colony”. Once Māori found that peace was “indispensable to their own prosperity” they would “beat their swords into plough shares and their spears into pruning hooks”. British sovereignty would be assured, he believed, as Māori cheerfully submitted “to the authority of the law” and became “the dutiful and loyal subjects of our beloved Queen”. Morgan also understood the economic benefits of encouraging Māori agriculture and industry. He envisaged that the growing number of mills in the Waikato would soon supply the Auckland market with flour, and eventually produce a surplus for export to Australia.

Grey’s close relationship with Morgan was based on a shared vision of native conversion and civilisation. The Governor’s liberal Anglican humanitarianism was firmly based on these twin goals, and Morgan’s letters repeatedly echo the same agenda. Their sense of shared mission was a mutual encouragement. In June 1851 Morgan wrote to Grey describing the church Māori were planning to build at Rangiwhia as “the fruit of our labours”. “I feel encouraged”, he went on, “to endeavour by the blessing of God to lead them forward in Christianity and in civilisation”. Like Grey, Morgan looked forward to imminent success:

many years will not elapse before we witness [Māori] raised from savage & revolting cannibalism to the position of happy & civilised cottagers, each family with their neat boarded cottage surrounded by their orchards & wheat fields, the men employed in driving their carts, following their ploughs, tending their flocks, working their mills, and manufacturing their own linen and woollen clothes; & their women instead of labouring as beasts of burden, engaged with their sewing, their knitting & their spinning, training their children in the fear of the Lord.

And, like Grey, Morgan believed Māori were progressing on a daily basis. In May 1853 he wrote to the governor describing how the Rangiawhia Māori were baking leavened bread in a small brick oven and providing tea and bread to the Kawhia Māori who had come to help work at the mill. “These things are small in themselves”, he acknowledged, “but they denote improvement”. In June 1852 when Morgan heard of Grey’s looming departure for England he wrote to thank the Governor for “the many favours and kindnesses shown towards myself, my
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family, my school & my natives from time to time".  

In September 1852 he wrote again to acknowledge the inestimable “blessing and advantages” Māori had derived from Grey’s visit and gifts in 1849. “Our present prosperity”, he wrote, “is, under God, to be traced to that short visit”. It was largely within a network of missionaries like Morgan that Grey carried out his policy of Māori economic development.

By fostering Māori economic development Grey also hoped to increase their capacity as consumers. When Grey first arrived in New Zealand government revenue depended on a direct property tax, which had never been properly enforced. Previous governors had understood that Māori would not submit to such a tax, and that settlers would resent its uneven application. In 1846 Grey re-imposed customs duties, attempting to raise the revenue through indirect taxation. All imported goods were taxed, so all consumers, both Māori and Pākehā, contributed to the growth of the colonial economy. As Grey explained to the Colonial Office, the revenue would increase “exactly in the same proportion as the large native population were won from barbarism, and induced to adopt the habits and conveniences of civilised life”. In addition to land purchases, labour and loans, tax was a further means of integrating Māori within the European economic system. Grey’s tax system also reflects his liberal Anglican ideas about Christian civilisation. He put the highest duties on alcohol – seen by many nineteenth century humanitarians as the biggest pitfall of western culture. He exempted animals, plants, agricultural implements, ship building materials, books and flour – the tools of civilisation and cultural transformation.

As Morgan’s letters suggest, some Māori responded to Grey’s policy of economic development with enthusiasm. They accepted Grey’s gifts with alacrity. They were not, however, always as amenable to his political purposes as Grey and Morgan hoped. It was partly on the basis of their success as farmers, for example, that Waikato Māori in Morgan’s vicinity launched the King Movement. As always, Māori adopted and adapted European commerce to meet their own agendas. Surveyor-General Ligar observed that Māori worked extremely hard to acquire material goods and cash reserves. Like Grey, Ligar interpreted this circumstance as evidence of

154 Rev John Morgan to George Grey, 1 June 1852, GL:NZ:M44(17), APL.
155 Rev John Morgan to George Grey, 3 September 1852, enclosed in George Grey to Sir John Pakington, 15 November 1852, GBPP 1854 (1779), p.166.
156 George Grey to Earl Grey, 15 September 1851, GBPP 1854 (1779), p.43.
increasing civilisation. He did not understand that Māori often used new tools to fight old battles. Ligar reported that one of the most popular topics of conversation among Māori at Whaingaroa was the best means of raising money to build "a mill which shall grind more than one erected by a rival tribe". In some districts Māori had already outstripped their European competitors. At Whaingaroa and elsewhere they had ousted the "Native (European) Trader" from their villages, taking his role and profits for themselves.

Grey’s dispatches to the Colonial Office unsurprisingly focused on positive responses to economic aid. These responses reinforced Grey’s liberal Anglican faith in the innate equality of mankind, and inspired him to further activism in the cause of native improvement. His official dispatches were coloured by typical humanitarian optimism. In March 1847, for example, Grey wrote that “affairs throughout the whole of these Islands, are progressing in a most satisfactory manner. Commerce and agriculture are rapidly extending the improved methods of cultivation adopted by natives; the large quantities of wheat they now produce, and the erection of mills throughout the country ... are gradually rendering them an agricultural population”.

This overall picture was filled out by anecdotes, tables and maps which Grey believed showed tangible improvement in Māori civilisation. In September 1847 he forwarded a table showing the number and tonnage of small vessels owned by Māori in the northern portion of the North Island as evidence of “great progress” in civilisation. In March 1848 he forwarded a return showing the quantity of muskets and powder owned by Taranaki Māori. Their supply was “daily diminishing”, and Grey reported happily that they were so busily “occupied in other pursuits” that they had “almost wholly ceased to practice the use of the musket”. In February 1849 Grey described his travels to the Waikato district. “I was both surprised and gratified”, he wrote, “at the rapid advances in civilisation which the natives of that part of New Zealand have made during the last two years”. They had erected two mills at their own cost, with a further mill under construction. They were growing large quantities of wheat, corn, potatoes, and fruit, and had
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acquired horses and cows. Grey attributed this “marked and rapid improvement” to the missionaries.\(^{164}\) In August 1849 he forwarded charts showing the number of mills owned and operated by Māori. “It should be borne in mind”, he encouraged the Colonial Office, “that the erection of these mills evidences a total change in the habits and the mode of agricultural of the people, as also (which is not the least important circumstance) a complete change in the articles on which they subsist”.\(^{165}\) “I think it must be admitted”, he continued, “that the information contained in the enclosed Returns holds out most encouraging hopes for the future tranquillity and prosperity of this country”.\(^{166}\) In December 1850 Grey forwarded charts showing the extent of land under cultivation at Rangiawhia and the number of stock and farm implements owned by Māori. In 1846 scarcely 20 acres of land had been sown in wheat, in 1847 50 acres was sown, in 1848 120 acres, in 1849 480 acres (the vast increase being due to the farm implements given by Grey), and in 1850 600 acres. When Grey visited the village in 1849 he was presented with two bags of flour ground in the Māori mill at Rangiawhia to be forwarded to Queen Victoria as tangible evidence of Māori progress.\(^{167}\) In June 1853 Grey forwarded a map to the Colonial Office showing the number of mills already built and those still being planned or constructed in the region surrounding Otawhao and Rangiawhia.\(^{168}\)

The most comprehensive statistics Grey forwarded to the Colonial Office during his first governorship of New Zealand related to the agricultural progress of Māori in the lower North Island. In 1850 Native Secretary H. Tacy Kemp spent five months travelling the region collecting information. Kemp’s report emphasised that Māori were “becoming possessed of useful and valuable English property, such as cattle, horses, and sheep &c., as well as increasing in general wealth, tending not only to their own prosperity and comfort, but also to the prosperity of the country at large”.\(^{169}\) In acquiring this wealth, Kemp argued Māori had “attained a position among a civilised people which comparatively few other aboriginal races have done”.\(^{170}\) He described wealth as “the one great bond of union” between Māori and Pākehā, “bringing with it

\(^{164}\) Ibid.
\(^{166}\) Ibid.
\(^{167}\) John Morgan to George Grey, ‘A Narrative of the Ngati-whakaue War of the year 1835’, GNZ MSS 175, APL.
\(^{168}\) George Grey to the Duke of Newcastle, 10 June 1853, GBPP 1854 (1779), pp.249-50.
\(^{169}\) ‘Notes taken under the direction of Government, embracing Statistical Returns in connexion with the Native Population, and other Miscellaneous Information within the Districts of Port Nicholson, Porirua, Waikanae, Otaki, Manawatu, Rangitikei, and Wairarapa, in the Province of New Munster, in the beginning of 1850’, Appendix to GBPP 1851 (1420), p.240.
\(^{170}\) Ibid.
its other attendant privileges, and above all, the blessings of peace". Kemp estimated that the average amount Māori in these districts spent on articles of European manufacture amounted to nearly £6000 per annum. His charts detailed the number of churches, weather-boarded houses and huts in each settlement, the number of horses, cattle, sheep, goats and beehives owned, the extent of wheat, maize, potatoes, kumara and other produce grown, the number of canoes, sailing boats, carts, hand mills and water mills in each settlement and the amount of rent they received from their lands. For Kemp and Grey these figures showed concrete progress in civilisation and represented the promise of imminent racial amalgamation.

When Grey left New Zealand in 1853, John Baptist Kahawai, a Roman Catholic convert, expressed it even more clearly. “Nor will we forget the treasures which the Queen and yourself have given us”, he told Grey, “namely, ships, carts, horses, and Ploughs by which we have been assimilated to the good usages of the Europeans. You have made our lands, and our property important. Our love to you, and our remembrance of you will not cease; no, never”.

A significant proportion of the settler population resented Grey’s policy of native economic development. Walter Brodie asserted that the Governor’s reputation was solely based on misspent colonial revenue. He had conciliated Māori in the short term by “no other means than spending scores of thousands of pounds sterling amongst them in the shape of cargoes of flour, sugar, rice, treacle, &c., tons of tobacco, and bales of blankets and prints”. Brodie’s perspective has filtered down through history in negative references to Grey’s ‘flour and sugar’ policy. However insignificant or ineffectual, his gifts were part of a broader economic policy designed to elevate Māori in the scale of civilisation and stimulate the colonial economy.

Conclusion

Based on land purchase, labour and financial assistance, Grey’s policy of economic integration stemmed from liberal Anglican humanitarian principles. Like other nineteenth century humanitarians Grey believed that hard work and access to the physical trappings of European culture would hasten Māori civilisation. In the words of Thomas Chapman, a missionary at
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Maketu, Grey sought to improve Māori by “giving them more to do & more to lose”.175 By purchasing Māori land for European settlement and engaging Māori labourers on public works he also sought to increase inter-racial contact and aid the progress of racial amalgamation. Land, labour and economic development were part of a unified economic policy intended “to incorporate the natives with the Europeans, to blend the interests of the two races, to render them mutually necessary to each other, and to induce the natives largely to contribute to that revenue, which will provide the means for their own more perfect control and government”.176 Grey’s native economic policy was just as surely driven by political and financial imperatives as by humanitarianism. By promoting Māori prosperity Grey hoped to increase their regard for the government and ensure lasting amity. As Māori helped open the country by means of land sales and new roads, European settlers would also prosper. Māori labour would increase the value of the land and “produce a rapidly increasing land fund, which will again afford the means of more extensively employing them upon roads and public works, and thus provide the means of still further promoting their civilisation, and of opening up the country by roads”.177 In March 1849 Grey assured the Colonial Office, “I never lose sight of the financial position of Great Britain”.178

The colonial economy eventually became self-supporting in 1854. Grey’s native economic policy had successfully boosted colonial revenue and reduced government expenditure. Grey had achieved his economic objectives. But despite his commitment to honouring the Treaty of Waitangi, Grey’s native land policy fuelled rather than quelled political discord. One of the main grievances Māori fought to address in the Taranaki and Waikato wars was the loss of their land. Grey’s native land purchase policy had ongoing negative repercussions that still affect Māori and Pākehā in substantive forms and in a persisting sense of cultural estrangement. In the long term it did little to hasten his grand vision of racial amalgamation in New Zealand.

Yet Grey believed his vision was already coming true. The enthusiastic Māori response to his economic measures was convincing proof of their capacity for improvement. In 1851 he concluded his annual financial report on a note of triumph:

I think it must be to every British subject, and to every man of benevolent mind, an object of congratulation that Parliament, by adopting the liberal and generous
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course in reference to this colony which it thought proper to pursue, has at length shown to mankind that a barbarous race may be led to adopt the habits of civilised life, and that it is possible for Europeans and people of another and previously savage race to inhabit the same country as fellow-citizens, with equal rights, with a common faith, and united in feelings of loyalty to the same sovereign. Equally I think every British subject must rejoice to see that Parliament, by so wise a liberality, has restored this country from rebellion and war to tranquillity and peace, and from want and poverty to a wealth and prosperity which is alike participated in by persons of every rank and of every race.¹⁷⁹

Grey’s economic policies were inextricably bound up with his overarching goals of native civilisation and racial amalgamation. Land purchase, labour schemes, loans and tax were a means of restoring New Zealand to financial solvency within the framework laid out by the Treaty of Waitangi. Equally, Grey believed they were a means of fulfilling God’s plans for improving humankind.

¹⁷⁹ George Grey to Earl Grey, 15 September 1851, GBPP 1854 (1779), p.47.
Chapter Five
Social Improvement: Education, Health and Culture

During his first governorship of New Zealand Governor Grey established the country’s first hospitals, created a national system of education, and encouraged Māori conversion, both to Christianity and to the best customs of European culture. Implemented in the context of imperial and colonial humanitarian networks, Grey’s native social policy reflects his liberal Anglican faith in the unity and improvability of mankind, and his sense of Christian duty. In practical terms it served to reinforce the government’s political authority and underpin the process of economic integration.

The third article of the Treaty of Waitangi promised Māori the rights and privileges of British citizens. Grey’s social policies sought actively to honour that promise. Popular education and working class living conditions were major concerns for nineteenth century liberal Anglicans. When the Whig party took power in 1830 they ushered in an era of unprecedented reform affecting the relationship between church and state, popular education, sanitation and working conditions. By the time George Grey left Britain in 1837, Whig policies had already effected significant improvements in day to day life for many Britons. In New Zealand Grey hoped to effect even more significant improvements, for Māori, he believed, were starting from a lower position in the scale of civilisation. With the same access to education and health care, and the same cultural opportunities as British citizens, Grey believed they would rise to the same level, and join with their European neighbours to form a unified society of equals.

Grey therefore implemented his social policies according to the principle of positive discrimination. In theory, his 1847 Education Ordinance established a national system of education for Māori and Pākehā. In reality, it supported native mission schools, doing little to foster European education. Grey’s hospitals were open to both races, and treated a significant number of colonists, but in rhetoric and practice, Māori patients were the main priority. Though ameliorating the social position of Māori was Grey’s main concern, he actively encouraged a policy of mixing the two races in the same hospital wards and schools. He believed that increasing contact between Māori and Pākehā would promote amalgamation at a personal level.
Grey’s health, education and cultural measures were based on liberal Anglican humanitarian principles. His 1847 Education Ordinance set up a partnership between the government and missionaries, though Grey reserved the role of dominant partner for himself. The colonial government provided funding for mission schools on the basis of four specific requirements. Schools had to provide religious education, industrial training, instruction in the English language, and submit to government inspection. These requirements reflect Grey’s belief in the superiority of Anglo-Saxon culture, his practical approach to education, and his understanding of Christianity and civilisation as mutually conducive processes tending to the advancement of humankind. Grey’s government also encouraged boarding, rather than day schools, reflecting his fears of racial degeneration. Like other humanitarians, Grey believed that young converts subjected to the detrimental influence of their own uncivilised communities might well revert to barbarism.

Grey’s health policy was perhaps the least controversial aspect of his first New Zealand governorship. Though limited by finance, the country’s first four public hospitals indicate a commitment to improving Māori health.

Grey’s cultural measures focused on converting Māori to Christianity and to European customs. He opposed only those Māori customs that actively defied British law. He also legislated to protect Māori from the negative influences of European culture. Grey believed Anglo-Saxon culture to be the highest point of civilisation thus reached, but he also believed in the potential for all races to degenerate.

Grey used social issues to augment personal and institutional authority. His policies were based on liberal Anglican humanitarianism, and on an understanding of schools, hospitals, and comfortable houses as political capital. He believed that Māori could be tied to the government by tangible improvements in their lives, and that European settlers would welcome the conversion of troublesome foes into comfortably familiar neighbours. Grey’s cultural measures also complemented his native economic policy. Māori acculturation to European habits represented solid wealth to the fragile colonial economy. He sought to integrate Māori into the colonial economy and boost colonial revenue by purchasing Māori lands, employing Māori on public works, assisting Māori industry, and also, by encouraging Māori to adopt the customs and the accoutrements of European culture. In reports to the Colonial Office, Grey flaunted schools,
hospitals, and conversions as evidence of his own success as governor. In July 1849 Grey presented his political, economic and social policies to Earl Grey as a comprehensive native policy, assuring the Colonial Secretary that all “these measures appeared calculated to secure a permanent and constantly increasing, instead of a scanty and superficial civilisation for the native population”.

For Grey, personal success was inextricably linked with Māori progress. His reports also presented schools, hospitals and conversions as evidence of advancing civilisation. Some Māori responded to Grey’s social measures with enthusiasm, reinforcing his liberal Anglican faith in the unity and improvability of mankind, and his vision of imminent racial amalgamation.

Education

In 1851 CMS missionary Robert Maunsell wrote to Governor Grey expressing his conviction that “the only way we can hope really to civilise & to make this people act worthy of their professions as Christians is, to teach them when little children”. Native schools were fundamentally important to Grey’s policy of racial amalgamation in New Zealand. Like Maunsell, he saw education as a means of elevating Māori and extending British authority. In consultation with Bishop Selwyn and the missionaries, Grey developed a system that formalised and extended the existing policy of government support for mission schools. His 1847 Education Ordinance offered financial backing to schools which provided religious, industrial and English language instruction and were prepared to submit to official inspection. These institutions were usually missionary boarding schools. The scheme was implemented in partnership with Anglican, Wesleyan and Roman Catholic missionaries. Though the head of each denomination held nominal control over their missionaries’ schools, Grey himself exercised a significant influence on individual schools. Māori seized opportunities for educational advancement, reinforcing Grey’s faith in their capacity for civilisation. Yet the mission schools’ decline in the 1860s illustrates the complex connections between political and social issues in nineteenth century New Zealand, and the persisting drive for Māori cultural autonomy.

2 Robert Maunsell to George Grey, 14 November 1851, GL: NZ:M31(10), APL.
For nineteenth century humanitarians, native education served multiple inter-related purposes. In October 1852 Grey presented the model of native schooling implemented in New Zealand as a solution to the problems of Britain’s Cape Colony. He argued that industrial mission schools along the frontier “would, by christianising and civilising the natives, in a few years prove more efficient for the purposes of peace and order than any force that Great Britain could maintain there”. He emphasised that industrial schools with attached farms would eventually become self-supporting. The overall cost, Grey suggested, might be less than one sixth of current military expenditure on the colony. As in New Zealand, he envisaged that native schools in the Cape would simultaneously further the objectives of Christian humanitarianism, imperial economy and political expansion.

Grey’s faith in education reflected evangelical and liberal Anglican influences. It was shared by a wide network of humanitarians both in Britain and on the colonial periphery. The early nineteenth century push for popular education was based on the enlightenment project of rational progress and the evangelical imperative of increasing access to the Bible. The evangelical APS focused on education as a force of civilisation, and advocated government aid for native schools. “Amongst the means best calculated to elevate as well as protect the injured Aborigines” they argued, “must unquestionably be reckoned the diffusion of education amongst them”. In New Zealand, CMS missionary Octavius Hadfield held similar views. He wrote to Grey in 1847 reflecting on the purpose of native education. Hadfield suggested that the state’s primary responsibility was “to improve [Māori] socially – to make them good men & good citizens”. The process of education ought “to evolve from man that which exists potentially in him”. In the 1830s Grey’s liberal Anglican mentor Archbishop Whately began implementing a new system of non-sectarian national education in Ireland. His daughter writes that he “entered on the undertaking with the most earnest and single-minded desire of extending the blessings ... of

---

4 The Colonial Office received the letter as further evidence of Grey’s successes in New Zealand, but were not hopeful as to the implementation of his plan in the Cape Colony. Herman Merivale wrote to Lord Peel “I wish the cases were parallel. In N.Z. an excellent & self-improving system has been introduced by a governor of peculiar ability for such purposes, & an admirable missionary Bishop, besides the valuable cooperation of other bodies. At the Cape we inherited an evil system from the Dutch, & except by the mere abolition of slavery we have not improved it”. Herman Merivale to Lord Peel, 27 January 1853, CO209/105, p.277.
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civilisation and intellectual culture, ... as widely as possible among his adopted countrymen of all creeds”. Whately understood that education might also serve political and religious functions. He saw the new Irish school system as a circumspect means of promoting Catholic conversion and extending Britain’s political authority. In his earlier years in Suffolk, Whately had established an adult school in his parish to raise the locals from their “state of heathenish ignorance”. In education, as in politics and theology, the liberal Anglicans sought a balance “between the extremes of High Church conservatives and non-religious radicalism, between ‘classical’ and ‘useful’ education”. David Brent argues that liberal Whig politicians saw education as the means of establishing a liberal Anglican state. “According to the liberal Anglican ideal, each individual school, rather than the education system taken as a whole, was to act as a crucible of social harmony by accepting within its walls the divergent groups of the recently enlarged political nation, and by imparting to the pupils a common sense of morality”. Schools would serve “as institutional proof that politically warring factions were in fact both reconcilable and compatible”.

Grey himself was ever conscious of political potential, both in personal and imperial terms. He believed that promoting native schools would increase colonial security and enhance his reputation at the Colonial Office. In October 1852 he forwarded a report to Colonial Secretary Sir John Pakington from Richard Maunsell, presenting native schools as “a source of benefit to the colonists” as well as a “matter of justice to the aborigines”. Referring to the military pensioners recently established around Auckland, Maunsell argued “that a still stronger protection would be found in a cordon of schools amongst the aborigines occupying the neighbourhood of the chief European settlement”. Maunsell was certain that native schools would “be the most effectual means, with God’s blessing, of converting a wild into a civilised people, of attaching by much higher connexions the hearts of those who now only value the European for the trade he brings”. As well as attaching Māori more firmly to the government, Maunsell believed that schools could promote economic and military goals. He saw them as a means of “rearing up in a wide circuit an intelligent, friendly and industrious population, who
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will not only aid the colonist in his agricultural labours, but will also be a shelter to him from assault by the uncivilised tribes in the distant settlements".  

Grey saw schools as a form of security for settler interests, and also for Māori interests. During his first governorship of New Zealand he continually (and controversially) delayed the implementation of representative government. He was fiercely reluctant to relinquish control of native affairs to an unsympathetic settler assembly. Grey believed that schools were the most effective means of increasing Māori literacy - a pre-requisite for voting - and equipping them to exercise their rights most effectively within the structures of European politics.

In 1853 Bishop Selwyn wrote to his friend William Gladstone regarding native schools in New Zealand. "Sir George Grey is very warmly interested in this work", he maintained "and rightly thinks that it will tend more than any other plan, to consolidate the two races upon a permanent basis of friendship & common interest". Like Grey, Selwyn believed that schools were the solution to civilising South Africa. The decided failure of martial policy had shown, he argued, that "all men, whether black or white, naked or clothed, are of like passions, and can be governed only by moral influence". For Selwyn and Grey, schools represented the chance to establish that moral influence among indigenous populations in Africa and the Pacific.

New Zealand’s first schools had been established on the same principle. In 1814 the metropolitan CMS opened a separate fund expressly for the purpose of establishing and supporting mission schools. Literacy and numeracy were seen as tools of conversion, enabling indigenous peoples to understand the bible. CMS missionary Thomas Kendall opened New Zealand’s first school on 12 August 1816. Progress was initially slow, but by 1840 most villages had some inhabitants who could read and write.

16 Ibid.
18 G. A. Selwyn to W. E. Gladstone, 5 March 1853, W. E. Gladstone Correspondence, British Library Collection, ATL.
20 Reading skills opened the bible to indigenous peoples, while numeracy gave them the skills to understand chapter and verse numbers.
21 Barrington and Beaglehole, pp.10-15.
In principle, the British government supported missionary schools. The early Victorian humanitarians who influenced British colonial policy saw education as a powerful tool for elevating native peoples in the scale of civilisation. Lord Normanby’s instructions to Hobson acknowledged a responsibility to promote Māori civilisation, “understanding by that term whatever relates to the religious, intellectual, and social advancement of mankind”.23 Normanby instructed Hobson to encourage and protect the missionaries and to support their work with funds from the colonial revenue.24 He gave specific instructions that Māori civilisation should be promoted “by the establishment of schools for the education of the aborigines in the elements of literature”.25

In reality, the Colonial Treasury had insufficient funds to aid established mission schools, let alone set up new ones. Neither the Protectorate of Aborigines, nor the Native Trust achieved any progress in Māori education.26 It was not until October 1844, when FitzRoy granted six acres for a Wesleyan school at Auckland, that the government made its first active contribution to Māori education.27

The gap between Crown principles and practice in the early 1840s stemmed from political and economic issues in the context of colonial isolation. Both imperial and colonial governments espoused native education as a force of civilisation and racial amalgamation. Yet Māori schools were a relatively low priority for the British government as they struggled with the imperatives of maintaining an increasingly costly and controversial overseas empire. The New Zealand government was similarly constrained by lack of funds and a pressing need to establish Crown authority. These impediments were compounded by the physical distance and consequent communication problems between imperial centre and colonial periphery. With insufficient and outdated information, officials at the Colonial Office struggled to formulate appropriate policy or allocate sufficient funds for such specific purposes as native education. Grey’s appointment as governor signalled a crisis point for the colony, and a new approach at both levels of government. The British government authorised supplementary finance for the struggling colony, recognising the need for short-term investment to effect long-term cost-efficiency. And Governor Grey, with
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ruthlessly authoritarian efficiency, established the peace and order requisite for introducing such social measures as a national education system.

Grey framed his 1847 Education Ordinance with advice from the colony’s small network of Christian humanitarians. Though consistently authoritarian in his approach to government, Grey recognised missionaries embedded in Māori communities as valuable sources of information and avenues of implementation for all kinds of policy. He formulated his education policy in consultation with Bishop Selwyn and CMS missionaries Octavius Hadfield, and Robert Maunsell.

Like Grey, Selwyn believed that Māori could be swiftly elevated in the scale of civilisation. He saw Christianity as the “cement of civilisation”, and promoted missionary boarding schools as the most effective means of Māori civilisation.28 In 1842 Selwyn set up St John’s Theological College to train the best of the Māori mission students together with European students, for a career in the church. By 1846 St John’s had forty English students and fifty Māori. In September 1846 Grey conferred with the Bishop on the possibility of government funding for native education.29 Selwyn made it clear he was happy to accept as many children as the government could afford, but that he would resist any attempts to interfere with his school’s syllabus. The Bishop was fiercely anti-erastian. He warned his friend W. E. Gladstone, who was now Colonial Secretary, that he would “decline any assistance coupled with conditions prescribing any particular course of religious instruction”.30 Selwyn agreed with Grey on the need for industrial education and instruction in the English language.

Octavius Hadfield shared the same general views. In 1846 Hadfield composed a memo for Grey on the ‘Relations between the British Government and native tribes of New Zealand’. He laid out the government’s responsibilities under the Treaty of Waitangi and then detailed their failure to meet those responsibilities. Hadfield recommended the appointment of a magistrate to “report on the probable advantage to be derived from the establishment of schools or the instruction of the

29 G. A. Selwyn to W. E. Gladstone, 15 September 1846, W. E. Gladstone Correspondence, British Library Collection, ATL.
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children in the English language”. In July 1847 Grey wrote to Hadfield requesting further details of his views on Māori education. Hadfield responded in September. He was more concerned with principles than practicalities, advocating a thorough and sustained system of schooling that would develop students’ “moral matter”. Hadfield identified the two main difficulties as good teachers and finance. He believed it was “the duty of every state to set apart some portion of the material revenue (not an annual grant) for the purpose” of education. He argued that the most effective means of educating Māori would be to encourage a “learned class” who would themselves become teachers. Like Selwyn and Grey, Hadfield believed education would have an immediately beneficial impact on Māori civilisation. “I see daily more & more clearly”, he concluded, “that any thing might be done with the natives, that is, towards their improvement, by unswervingly pursuing a course grounded on philosophical principles and a knowledge of human nature”. Hadfield’s letter would have reached Grey as he finalised the details of the Education Ordinance before taking it to the Legislative Council in early October.

In contrast to Hadfield’s observations, fellow missionary Robert Maunsell offered practical advice on the Ordinance. He had the advantage of an early draft to work from. On 29 September 1847, just a week before the Ordinance was passed, Maunsell wrote to Grey that he had studied the bill with great care “as your Excellency has kindly invited me to express my sentiments upon it”. He enumerated eight specific points. First, he believed the Ordinance to be based on “principles of liberality & justice”. Second, he endorsed the principle of assisting rather than maintaining the schools (being the same system applied in Britain). Third, he suggested that school Inspectors should investigate teachers’ qualifications and commitment. Fourth, he hoped that lessons in English would not “be largely required in those districts that are purely native”. Fifth, he expressed vague unease about the open-ended task of Inspectors. Sixth, he urged that the government immediately begin purchasing the necessary implements for establishing industrial schools. Seventh, he observed that the schools would need books, maps, “and other
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school apparatus”, as well as “clothes for the scholars”. Eighth, Maunsell volunteered to translate and publish any texts the schools might need. With Maunsell living at St John’s College, his letter would have reached Grey in ample time for the Governor to consider.

The settler population was also concerned with native education. Over the first few months of 1847 the Wellington Independent newspaper highlighted local government’s lack of attention to Māori education on several different occasions. In his Masters thesis on George Grey’s influence on New Zealand education, Peter Rich suggests that the views expressed in the Independent had little influence on Grey’s Ordinance. Yet the Governor was always aware of settler politics.

In the context of colonial politics, imperial instructions and humanitarian networks, Grey passed ‘An Ordinance for promoting the Education of Youth in the Colony of New Zealand’ through New Zealand’s Legislative Council on 7 October 1847. Reflecting Grey’s liberal Anglican principles of equality and inclusion, the Ordinance established a single system of education for Māori, half-caste and European children. In reality, few schools taught both Māori and Pākehā children. Grey’s main priority was Māori civilisation. “It is proposed, in the first instance”, he informed the Colonial Office, “to apply the provisions of this Ordinance chiefly to the education of Māori and half-caste children, and subsequently to extend their operation to children of European parents”. While the government sought to offer free education for Māori children, they only gradually subsidised European children’s education. European parents in Auckland paid between 6d. and 9d. per week for their children to attend church-run schools. Many were highly disgruntled by the government’s education policy. Some objected to a single system for Māori and European children. In Auckland, the Southern Cross newspaper claimed it was “absurd to imagine that European parents would … send their children to the same school with natives”. In Nelson the settlers objected to Grey’s disproportionate allocation of funds for
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Māori schools.\textsuperscript{45} In Wellington, the New Munster Council formulated an alternative education bill to replace Grey's ordinance.\textsuperscript{46} They wanted a system of compulsory education under which Māori and European children would be entitled to the same assistance.\textsuperscript{47}

The underlying principle of the Education Ordinance was government support for native mission schools.\textsuperscript{48} In his covering dispatch to the Colonial Office, Grey expounded at length on the beneficence and success of Anglican, Wesleyan and Roman Catholic missionaries in New Zealand. He proposed to avail himself “of the extensive and really admirable machinery” already in existence to promote Māori education.\textsuperscript{49} Grey observed that mission schools had previously been hindered by decentralisation and inadequate funds.\textsuperscript{50} His Education Ordinance aimed to resolve those issues and increase the schools’ efficacy in civilising and converting their students.

School funding took several forms. In line with Hadfield’s suggestion, Grey set aside a portion of the colonial revenue for education purposes. One twentieth of the colonial revenue, as well as fifteen per cent of the land fund was reserved for schools. In addition, Grey sometimes obtained supplementary funds from the parliamentary grant. The money was given to the heads of the mission societies to distribute among their own schools. In the first four years Grey dispensed education funds in the ratio of five: four: three to the Church of England, the Wesleyans, and the Roman Catholics respectively.\textsuperscript{51} This ratio favoured the Wesleyans and Catholics over the Anglicans, who far outnumbered the other denominations in terms of converts and schools. Considering Grey’s close relationships with Anglican churchmen in New Zealand and his liberal Anglican commitment to religious tolerance, it seems likely that this ratio was intended as a boost to the two smaller denominations. When settlers protested at government aid being afforded to Roman Catholics, Grey defended the Roman Catholics’ claim “upon the justice and consideration of the Government”.\textsuperscript{52} Grey sometimes dispensed financial aid, as well as practical resources,
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directly to the schools, and he often provided extra support from his own resources. The mission societies usually paid for the missionary / teacher, and in many places Māori provided food and grants of land for their schools.

Grey also made government land available for native schools. In March 1849 he wrote to the Colonial Office describing the difficulties of procuring adequate food for native schools. Grey advised that the government should grant reserves of land on which the schools could grow their own food and simultaneously further their students’ industrial education. Each religious denomination would be able to purchase the land reserved for their schools at a price of one pound per acre over a ten year period, on condition that the land be “solely used for the support of an education establishment". Colonial Secretary Earl Grey responded by suggesting even more favourable terms. With due license Grey granted government land gratuitously to Anglican, Wesleyan and Roman Catholic schools. Held in trust by the head of each denomination, such lands allowed “for the growth and production of the necessaries of life required by the children, and for their training in agricultural pursuits”. The terms of Grey’s land grants reinforced the principles of the 1847 Ordinance. For example, a deed transferring government land to Bishop Selwyn at Kaikokirikiri in the Wairarapa specified that the land was “for a school for children of all races of New Zealand and the children of the poor and destitute from other Pacific Islands”. The grant was “in trust nevertheless and for the use and towards the maintenance and support of the said College so long as Religious Education Industrial Training and Instruction in the English Language shall be given to the youth educated therein or maintained thereat [sic]”.

Under the 1847 Ordinance religious education was the first prerequisite of government aid. Grey believed that Christianity and civilisation were complementary processes inextricably bound together, “marching over the world with a rapidity not fully known or estimated by any one
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nation":60 He argued that there was “a peculiar necessity for insisting upon religious instruction” in schools which would teach both the children “of heathen parents”, and of colonists who might be “compelled to reside in different places, where they would be removed from all the ordinances of religion”.61 Robert Maunsell advised his fellow missionary teachers to remember above all that their schools were “Religious Institutions”.62 Religion “must be made the basis of your system”, he warned, “- religion, not as consisting in a mere attendance on services and ceremonies, - but religion as brought home to the intellect and feelings of your scholars by a daily catechisation in, and exposition of its blessed precepts by yourself”.63 Grey’s ordinance sought to ensure that all New Zealand’s schools functioned as ‘Religious Institutions’. He believed that knowledge of the Bible and of Christian principles was just as important in elevating Māori (and Pākehā) pupils as reading, writing and arithmetic.

Although Christian teaching was compulsory for schools, it was not compulsory for individual children. The Ordinance allowed for dissenting parents to apply for their children to be exempt from the religious component of state-funded education. Richard Whately was a strong proponent of religious tolerance, and particularly advocated the need for freedom of conscience in education. He argued that “pupils should not be obliged to learn or to practise anything against their religious conviction, however erroneous that conviction might be”.64 In Ireland, Whately worked with Catholic Archbishop Daniel Murray to devise a system of religious instruction acceptable to both Catholics and Protestants. Though Murray endorsed Whately’s Lessons on Christian Evidences, their non-denominational system was never fully implemented.65 Grey had experienced Ireland’s religious intolerance for himself and maintained a strong connection with Whately. In New Zealand he sought to avoid sectarianism by establishing the principle of religious tolerance as a legal obligation for schools receiving government aid. Whately and Grey also believed in the liberal Anglican notion of inclusion as a source of social cohesion and religious harmony. They reasoned that children excluded from education on the basis of religion
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would only be further alienated from the possibility of conversion and the processes of government.

In 1877, with Grey as Premier, the New Zealand government passed a new Education Act creating a compulsory, free, secular system of education. Grey originally opposed the Act's secularism, but came to defend it in preference to the spectre of sectarianism. As a liberal Anglican, Grey placed a high value on religious tolerance and harmony. Like Whately, he believed that the Bible and nature both pointed to God. Without Bibles in schools, science would still lead to God through the revelations of His law in the natural universe. As Governor and as Premier Grey saw all education as fundamentally religious, part of God's plan for improving humankind.

Grey's insistence on industrial training was integral to his policy of amalgamation. It was an important component of his 1840 Australian report, and also featured strongly in Whatley's Irish education system. Some historians see the industrial clause as evidence that the Governor viewed Māori as inferior to Europeans. Training in trades and manual occupations seemed designed to restrict them to labouring roles. At times, official reports reinforced this idea. In 1852, for example, a Government Inspector reported of St Joseph's girls' school that the student's time was "divided between exercise of piety, study, manual work of a nature to make them useful servants, and necessary recreation". Grey himself believed that a practical education was imperative for the children of Māori and Europeans, all of whom "had a country to create, and who would almost certainly all be placed in situation where they would have little but their own energy and skill to depend on". He also saw industrial training as a means of integrating Māori into the settler economy, and by bringing them into closer contract with Europeans, further hastening their civilisation. There was the extra hope that associated farms would eventually render schools self-supporting.
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In English education, the 1840s and 1850s was a period of increasing professionalism and rising academic standards. Under Dr James Kay-Shuttleworth’s administration, English schools began emphasising comprehension over rote learning, and came to follow a liberal curriculum covering reading, writing, arithmetic, singing, drawing, physical education, geography, grammar, history and etymology. In New Zealand, Governor Grey was aware of Kay-Shuttleworth’s innovations. There is some evidence that he promoted those innovations in New Zealand. In August 1852 Robert Maunsell wrote to Grey that he intended “adopting a plan recommended in the ‘Suggestions of Mr Kaye Shuttleworth’, which you were so good as once to send me [sic]”.

But the main focus in New Zealand was industrial training over academic achievement. Maunsell described the difficulties of finding that balance. For new schools, he estimated that the first two years would be largely occupied “in those labours absolutely needed by the institution”. Such labours included making and repairing clothes, grinding flour, making bread, fencing, gardening, and cooking. Maunsell advocated “special care” that industrial training did not “trespass” on academic instructions. He believed that the number of hours spent in school was a matter for “careful and anxious adjustment to the circumstances and position” of each individual institution. The essential areas of curriculum were “familiar knowledge with the leading doctrines of the Bible, the English language, singing, reading, writing, geography, arithmetic; to which should be added some acquaintance with those subjects of art and science, which may be hereafter useful, or may induce our pupils to seek with greater avidity for enlarged knowledge”.

Grey’s Cape dispatch clearly prioritised industrial over academic education. “When it is intended to found a new school”, he wrote, “... a missionary is stationed there, accompanied generally by a carpenter and an agricultural labourer, and furnished with proper tools, implements, horses, cows, &c.; sometimes a teacher is added to the party. They train the natives as carpenters, agriculturalists, &c., and gradually the buildings are constructed, and a farming establishment is created”. Significantly, the government paid for every aspect of school development, except for the salaries of missionary and teacher.
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This emphasis on industrial training reflected Grey’s understanding of schools as a vehicle not merely of education, but of civilisation. Nineteenth century humanitarians believed strongly in the edifying potential of work. They believed that native peoples should be taught British industrial and agricultural skills and actively instilled with the British work ethic. In New Zealand, Grey promoted adult labour on public works and industrial schools as the means best calculated to impart both the skills and the ethic. As in so many other areas, he was supported by the missionaries. The WMS had introduced “instruction in the mechanical arts” well before Grey’s arrival. They deemed industrial training a necessity for Māori students who would one day inherit large tracts of land.\(^79\) In the early 1840s CMS missionaries had also started teaching industrial skills. St John’s College had its own industrial department. CMS missionary John Morgan was a particularly enthusiastic proponent of industry as a tool of civilisation. He wrote to Grey that nothing would “contribute more to promote the civilisation and advancement of the native tribes than the introduction of the plough and the erection of mills”.\(^80\) Once the mission schools were “firmly established” he hoped Māori would take up spinning and weaving with as much enthusiasm as they had milling.\(^81\) Like Grey, Morgan understood industrial education as a dual purpose policy. On the farm and at the loom, Māori children would learn British skills and habits, and contribute to their own upkeep. By September 1851 Morgan’s school pupils at Otawhao were growing all their own food on the school farm.\(^82\)

The third condition of state aid was that schools give their pupils instruction in the English language. Grey assumed that the reasons for teaching English were “so obvious” as to bear no further repetition.\(^83\) “It appeared essential that the native and half-caste children should be brought up to speak and read the English language”.\(^84\) Again, historians have seized on this clause as evidence of ethnocentrism.\(^85\) But Grey’s language clause was not exclusive. Instruction also continued in the Māori language. In 1848 Grey commissioned illustrated Māori translations of Robinson Crusoe, Pilgrim’s Progress, and Archbishop Whately’s Organisation of

\(^{79}\) Morley, p.110.
\(^{80}\) Enclosed in George Grey to Earl Grey, 1 December 1849, GBPP 1850 (1280), p.107.
\(^{81}\) Ibid., p.108
\(^{82}\) John Morgan to George Grey, 22 September 1851, GL: NZ: M44(13), APL.
\(^{83}\) George Grey to Earl Grey, 9 December 1847, GBPP 1848 (1002), p.48.
\(^{84}\) Ibid.
Labour. In 1851 he had Whately’s *Easy Lessons in Money Matters* translated and printed at the Colonial Press.

When Grey first arrived in New Zealand most schools taught only in Māori. In general, the missionaries opposed teaching English. They feared it would serve as a medium for Māori to “learn every species of vice”. Their position was almost universally unpopular. In 1845 Samuel Martin expostulated that the “missionaries have hitherto, with a most extraordinary and ignorant pertinacity, set their face against every attempt at teaching English to the natives”. New Zealand Company naturalist Charles Heaphy lamented the missionaries’ “systematic neglect ... in not introducing the English language in a country which they knew would be colonised from England”. In January 1846 the *Nelson Examiner* argued that the “disagreements between the two races never can be properly adjusted until the Māoris are bred to the use of the same tongue with ourselves”.

In this political context, with colonisation an accepted fact, the mid 1840s saw an increasing openness to English language instruction among humanitarians at the imperial centre and colonial peripheries. In 1846 the APS published a pamphlet enthusing over “the boundless stock of knowledge, and the abundant resources, both for pleasure and for profit”, which an oral and written knowledge of English “would immediately throw open to the native”. Referring particularly to CMS practice in New Zealand they termed it “a fatal mistake to suppose that the English language is the forbidden tree of knowledge to the uncivilised Pagan recently converted to Christianity”. Like Grey, the APS believed that knowledge of English was “absolutely essential” to place natives “more nearly on a par” with British colonists. At a public meeting in
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Auckland on 14 May 1844 the WMS decided to start English lessons at their native schools. By 1847 some Wesleyan schools were using English as the medium of instruction for reading, writing and arithmetic. Bishop Selwyn also supported English language instruction. Students at St John's received English lessons, and Selwyn encouraged those missionaries such as Richard Taylor who had already started teaching English prior to Grey's 1847 Ordinance. Robert Maunsell promoted English language instruction according to utility. He believed it was "an object of considerable desire with those portions of the population that come into contact with the settlers".

Grey's inclusion of the English clause in his 1847 Education Ordinance stemmed from a broader understanding of language as a force of civilisation. Like Maunsell, he anticipated practical advantages for Māori who spoke and wrote English. They would gain an instant advantage in social, political and economic dealings with British settlers. But Grey also saw the English language as a civilising force in itself. He believed that Anglo-Saxon culture ranked higher on the scale of civilisation than indigenous cultures, and that the Anglo-Saxon language was superior to indigenous languages. He looked forward to a time when the English tongue dominated New Zealand and the world. Grey's attitude to the Māori language was far more ambiguous. While he hoped that all Māori would eventually speak the same language as their colonisers, he still saw a future for Te Reo. His philology was a means of uncovering the relationships between different races, and of preserving native languages. He was a fluent Māori speaker himself, and understood the political value of conversing with Māori in their own tongue. Although English was the language of civilisation, Grey saw both English and Māori languages as tools of civilisation.

The fourth condition of government funding was inspection. Actual observance of the inspection clause was delayed and erratic. The government did not appoint official inspectors until 1852. When Grey left the country in 1853 his vision of a formal national inspectorate scrutinising individual schools was still far from reality. Yet local government was very well informed of many schools' progress. Individual missionaries sent frequent reports direct to the Governor. In
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September 1849, for example, George Kissling reported on his native girls’ school, encouraged by Grey’s “liberal support” for Māori education, and by his “kind interest” in Kissling’s school. In November 1849 Bishop Selwyn instigated an external review of the native school at St John’s. “In the absence of any regular system of inspection of schools assisted by Government grants”, he wrote, “I have requested the two judges, and the attorney general to inspect our school on Saturday next”. He invited Governor and Lady Grey to attend, and to bring other government officials. Bishop Pompallier was similarly pro-active, writing to Grey in 1850 with his own recommendations for Roman Catholic schools inspectors. In February 1853 Judge William Martin, Native Secretary Andrew Sinclair, and Colonial Surveyor Charles Ligar were finally appointed as Government School Inspectors for Auckland. They reported on all seven native industrial boarding schools around Auckland, covering physical environment and staff, student numbers, academic and industrial progress, and finance.

Though boarding facilities were not a pre-requisite for government aid, they were encouraged and endorsed as official policy. The earliest missionary schools were day schools. Bishop Selwyn first began promoting boarding institutions in 1843. Convinced of “the need and the hopefulness of them”, Selwyn believed that boarding schools were “the only efficient way of educating the people and training them in civilised habits”. Teachers could exercise far more effective control over boarders than over day pupils, whose irregular attendance often stemmed from tribal obligations such as kumara planting and harvesting, and from the distance between home and school. “Besides”, counselled Maunsell, “in a day school, it is almost impossible to form those habits the native population so much need”. As boarders, Māori children were immersed in the daily routines and attitudes of British culture. Acculturation to an idealised model of English society was the ultimate goal. The native teachers’ rules at St John’s warned that no teacher would be “admissible into the first Class, who does not pledge himself to adopt English habits, to divide his house into rooms, to abstain from smoking, to take care of his wife and children, and attend to their improvement, to wear English clothes constantly, and, above all,
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to be regular in his attendance at Church and School”. 107 Grey described New Zealand schools as “properly industrial boarding schools”. 108 Day scholars were admitted only if a school was situated close to a large Māori population. Male and female boarders lived in different houses, meeting together in a common classroom and a common church. By 1852 at least one school provided separate bedrooms for its students, and Grey observed that this plan would be followed for all new schools. Because it was “considered that a state of half civilisation” was “as bad as no civilisation at all”, boarding students were housed and fed, and generally “brought up”, “in quite as comfortable a manner as the children of European peasants”. 109 Like Selwyn and Maunsell, Grey believed that boarding schools offered the best chance for Māori children to advance up the scale of civilisation, and the surest safeguard against degeneration. Isolating Māori children from their own culture seemed, to European humanitarians, the only way to prevent them from sliding back down into barbarism. Writing to Grey in 1852 the Rev G. T. B. Kingdon went further, suggesting model villages be attached to native schools. “I am inclined to think”, he wrote, “that a school will not be productive of the benefit that it ought to have unless we have an adjunct to it in the shape of a village under the control of the school authorities, where the young men would not be in danger of forgetting amongst their uncivilised friends the civilisation which they had learnt at the school”. 110 In December 1851 Richard Taylor wrote to Grey proposing male and female boarding schools be established for Māori children in connection with Wanganui’s daily English schools, “to assimilate the two races by equalising the instruction they receive”. 111 Taylor recommended accepting only very young children, arguing that “native habits” were “too deeply fixed” in older children “to be ever effectually eradicated”. 112 In July 1852, with his plan about to be realised, Taylor enthused over boarding schools as the means by which Māori might “be intimately brought into contact with European manners & customs”, and thus raised in the scale of civilisation, and amalgamated with Pākehā. 113

Within the provisions of the 1847 Ordinance, mid-nineteenth century education in New Zealand was a partnership between governor and missionaries. In theory, Grey delegated authority over

107 Quoted in Barrington and Beaglehole, pp.47-8.
109 Ibid.
110 Rev G. T. B. Kingdon to George Grey, 2 December 1852, GL:NZ:K14(2), APL.
111 Rev Richard Taylor to George Grey, 23 December 1851, GL:NZ:T5A(6), APL.
112 Richard Taylor to George Grey, 12 July 1852, GL:NZ:T5A(7), APL.
113 Ibid.
native schools to the heads of the three main religious denominations. Bishop Pompallier took full responsibility for Roman Catholic schools, the Wesleyans appointed a school superintendent accountable to the district meeting, and the Anglicans constituted two regional educational boards consisting of the Bishop or Archdeacon, two elected members of the church, and two lay members of the church nominated by the Governor. In reality, Grey maintained a high degree of personal authority over native schools. Usually he exercised that authority through direct relationships with individual missionary teachers. In his Cape education dispatch Grey acknowledged a heavy dependence on “the untiring and unwearied efforts” of the missionary bodies. He believed that his relationship with the missionaries was the single most important feature of his whole native policy. “Indeed the only point I insist upon is this”, he wrote to Colonial Secretary Sir John Pakington, “that the whole of my experience, now extending over many years, has thoroughly convinced me that no efforts of the Government to civilise such races as inhabit Southern Africa can produce a permanent effect, unless such efforts are carried on concurrently and in harmony with missionary efforts”.

Some of Grey’s closest relationships were with CMS missionaries. In March 1846 he visited Richard Taylor’s school at Wanganui. Grey listened to the adult students say their catechisms, and after breakfast visited the infant school. He “expressed his approbation of the way it was conducted & left a Sovereign to be given as prize money to deserving children”. Taylor had no reservations in addressing his concerns over education direct to the Governor. Technically, Taylor should have addressed himself through the Bishop. But this technicality was Taylor’s main concern. In December 1851 he wrote to Grey advising a major transformation of the national education system. Rather than supporting denominational schools, Taylor believed the government should establish and control its own schools. He suggested that the CMS schools, at least, were being ineffectively managed under the existing education structure. Taylor lamented the “deplorable state of the church government (or sway of it)”, which had prevented him from getting “one single portion” of the annual government grants for Anglican schools. If government schools could not be practically established he suggested that aid should be given
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direct to individual schools. No such changes were made, and Grey’s reply is no longer extant. In other letters, Taylor kept Grey informed of progress and problems at his native schools. It seems he held himself accountable to the Governor rather than to Selwyn or to the Anglican Education Board.

John Morgan’s relationship with Grey followed a similar pattern. In April 1850 he wrote to Grey seeking approval to turn his native school into a specialised half-caste boarding school. According to the terms of the 1847 Ordinance such decisions were properly the province of Morgan’s denominational head, Bishop Selwyn. Grey nevertheless approved the adjustment, and in December 1850 Morgan wrote to inform him of pleasing progress. In June 1852 Morgan wrote to thank Grey for a £60 grant towards the erection of school buildings. In the same letter he asked for further funds for building and for the basic costs of school maintenance. Again, the terms of the 1847 Ordinance made it clear that Selwyn ought to have been Morgan’s source of funding. At one level, Grey’s allocation of extra funding direct to individual schools reflects a clear prioritisation of Māori education. At another level, it shows a determination to maintain personal authority over every aspect of native policy. The Governor had promised Selwyn exclusive powers over Anglican education and reneged. Grant Phillipson’s PhD thesis argues that Grey’s “financial intervention ... prevented Selwyn from establishing any genuine control over education”. Like Taylor, Morgan reported regularly to the Governor, giving details of his school’s financial, industrial and educational progress.

Grey’s collected correspondence reveals numerous instances of financial intervention in native schools. Even in retirement, Grey was kept informed of the progress of Maketu Native School, which he had set up and assisted from his own funds during his first governorship of New Zealand. In 1855, when Grey was Governor of Cape Colony, Benjamin Ashwell wrote to update him on the progress of New Zealand’s CMS schools and particularly of Taupiri school. Grey had assisted the school with gifts such as a plough and horses, and in December 1853 paid
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£100 towards the school’s crippling debt. At the time, Ashwell wrote that Grey’s “kind interest” was “an encouragement to persevere”. Back in New Zealand in the 1860s Grey sent the Taupiri children a package of hats, balls, marbles, shuttlecocks, and jews harps, received with thanks from his “loving children”. When George Kissling presented Grey with the worrying financial position of his native girls’ school at Ruareore outside Auckland, Grey provided £100 to balance the books. Kissling’s relief at not having to reduce his student role was almost palpable. “It will no doubt be gratifying to Lady Grey and yourself”, he wrote, “that our School or I should rather say your School (for you have in God’s hands the main instrument in giving it efficiency) is going on comfortably and I may add prosperously”. Kissling’s grateful rhetoric acknowledges the true structure of power relations within New Zealand’s denominational education system. With financial power, Grey held centralised control over all the schools. At the same time, missionaries like Kissling and Morgan drew on Grey’s resources to exercise local control on their own terms. It was they who approached Grey with specific information and requests, wanting to further the progress of their individual schools, and to hasten the goal of Māori civilisation that they shared with the Governor.

Robert Maunsell’s letters to Grey show power and support moving simultaneously in both directions, from governor to missionary and missionary to governor. Like Taylor, Maunsell took his concerns over education funding straight to Grey. In mid 1849 his school at Waikato Heads was in serious strife. With sixty boarders and eleven adult pupils Maunsell had no means “for procuring them common food & common clothing”. Maunsell’s object in raising these facts was to expose “an evil” which he believed was seriously affecting Māori education. That evil was an uncertainty of funding. Maunsell asked that the government announce the amount of aid to be given to each school at a set time each year. Like Taylor, Maunsell wished to bypass the Bishop and deal directly with the government. Though Grey retained the denominational structure, he did in fact deal directly with Maunsell over finances and staffing. In June 1850 Maunsell wrote to thank the Governor for his “kind and encouraging letter”, and for the offer of a
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farm servant, which he promptly accepted. A year later he took up a further offer of assistance in paying for a carpenter. Maunsell kept Grey well updated on the progress of the school. "I have sometimes wished you were here", he wrote, "to see our lads ploughing or carting, or fencing (post & rail). The pleasure of the sight would not have been diminished by the reflection that for our prosperity we were indebted to you". In January 1851 Maunsell wrote to acknowledge £159 paid in liquidation of the school's debt, an assistance which had "much encouraged him", and enabled him to hire a matron for the girl's section of the school. Acknowledging "the debt which the schools in this island owe to Governor Grey", he argued that this assistance laid all school teachers "under strong obligations to put forth [their] utmost energies in this work". Maunsell was aware, however, that the partnership between governor and missionary teacher was personal. "From Governor Grey we need fear but little that will thwart our efforts or damp our spirit. We know not however who may be his successor". Faced with this uncertainty, Maunsell advocated independence and ultimately, self-sufficiency. In the meantime, he related directly to Grey, rather than to Selwyn, as the source of school funding and authority. Grey in turn, provided practical aid and emotional encouragement, supporting Maunsell's authority as School Master in the day to day business of educating and civilising Māori school children.

The relationship between Governor Grey and Octavius Hadfield was likewise characterised by mutual support. Hadfield was one of Grey's most trusted advisors throughout his first governorship. When in Wellington, the Governor visited him almost daily. In September 1846 Hadfield wrote that Grey had "behaved in the kindest manner to me, listening to every suggestion I make and thanking me most strongly for the information and advice which my residence in this country has enabled me to give him". Hadfield in turn valued advice from Grey. It was Grey who first suggested a native school at Hadfield's Otaki mission station. In 1847 Hadfield wrote to Grey that he could "see no real difficulty in the way of carrying into execution that suggestion". With Henry Williams' son Samuel as head teacher, the Otaki mission school flourished. Pleased with such promising progress, Grey made a £300 direct grant for school
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expansion. Worried about the delicate racial and political situation north of Otaki, Grey spent two years convincing Williams to establish a school in Hawke’s Bay, with the incentive of 4000 acres of Crown land. Williams eventually moved to Hawke’s Bay in 1854. Grey had promised a capital grant to build the new school, but following his departure for England the funds evaporated. Te Aute College nevertheless went on to become a hugely influential locus for Māori education and culture in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Grey’s actions suggest a process (if not an official policy) of active intervention in Māori education. The Governor also operated as a point of connection between imperial centre and localised peripheries. In January 1852 Hadfield wrote to thank Grey for sending him Lord Grey’s dispatch on schools, found “very satisfactory”. Like other CMS missionaries, Hadfield kept Grey well informed of his school’s progress, and when it ran into financial difficulties, applied directly to the Governor rather than the Bishop. In December 1852 he let Grey know of Māori plans for a native teachers’ school at Otaki, “a rather crude scheme … requiring much more thought”. By June 1853 the school was underway, established as a branch of Otaki native school and directed by Hadfield. Tamihana, the chief Māori sponsor, particularly wished that Grey be informed. Taking their cue from the missionaries, it seems that Māori expected and accepted the Governor’s personal interest and involvement in their schools.

Though CMS missionaries dominated mid-nineteenth century Māori education, Grey also maintained a high degree of personal involvement with Wesleyan schools. In May 1851 at the Annual Missionary Meeting held in Exeter Hall, the New Zealand WMS Committee reported “a general thirst for knowledge” among “the rising generation” of Māori. In meeting this increasing demand for education, they were supported by Sir George Grey, who was always “most anxious to afford us all the assistance in his power, both from his private purse and the Government
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Grey understood the relationship as one of mutual support between state and mission, centre and periphery. When the WMS parent committee in London sent out a new teacher and a large supply of school materials, the Governor assured them that “it affords no slight encouragement to those who in this distant part of the world labour for the benefit of the Native race, to receive such substantial proofs of the warm interest which is taken in this subject by those in Europe who have it in their power to lend so powerful an assistance to us”. Grey took a special interest in Three Kings Institution in Auckland, often riding out to visit and watch the students at work. Thomas Buddle, the teacher at Three Kings, felt himself “under increased personal obligation” by Grey’s “continued interest”, sending regular progress reports in the same way as many of the CMS missionaries. Buddle also raised school finances with Grey, though he professed great embarrassment at doing so after the Governor’s “munificence”. In 1851 Buddle forwarded plans for the new accommodation buildings at Three Kings direct for Grey’s approval. As with CMS schools, it was Grey rather than the head of the denomination, who exercised effective authority over the establishment and operation of Methodist Māori schools.

John Whitely was another WMS missionary teacher who relied on Grey for financial assistance, advice and encouragement. His letters convey a sense of personal obligation stemming from the Governor’s personal interest. “Your Excellency kindly enquires”, he observed, “notwithstanding the vast amount of care and labour which must devolve upon you, for information respecting my school, myself & my family”. When Whitely was particularly discouraged about his school, he received Grey’s correspondence as “a cordial”. Such personal relationships characterised the style and the process of Grey’s first governorship of New Zealand. Through missionaries like Buddle and Whitely he gained an intimate knowledge of otherwise isolated Māori areas, and a wide network of collaborators eager to implement his policies of native education and civilisation.

With Grey supporting individual missionaries, the WMS Committee reciprocated full-hearted support for Grey. When they established a central native school at New Plymouth they named it
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the Grey Institute in honour of the Governor.\textsuperscript{154} When Grey departed for London in 1853 the District Meeting of the Wesleyan Methodist Church passed a minute acknowledging Grey’s assistance and expressing their gratitude.\textsuperscript{155} Thomas Buddle added his “personal gratitude for the kind manner in which you have at all times assisted by your influence and otherwise the great work in which we are engaged”.\textsuperscript{156} Whether WMS, CMS, or Roman Catholic, this was the basis of Grey’s partnership with the missionaries; their shared vision of a single great work. Together they believed they were fulfilling God’s plan for civilising and converting the Māori.

Together they watched for progress, interpreting the enthusiastic Māori response to European education as convincing evidence of advancing civilisation. In 1851 Thomas Buddle wrote to Grey that the “mental improvement” of his pupils and their “progress in Civilisation” was “almost daily visible”.\textsuperscript{157} “In reference to the advancement of Civilisation amongst the Aborigines”, John Morgan wrote in June 1852 that he was “happy to say that it is steadily advancing”. He cited mill-building, ploughing and the success of his school farm as evidence.\textsuperscript{158}

The official government school inspectors identified similar advances in Māori civilisation. In general, they were well pleased with Māori students’ conduct. Reporting on the Grey Institute in 1852, Josiah Flight and P. Wilson reported “with much pleasure … that the tenor of the scholars’ behaviour is … docile, teachable, and generally obedient”. They concluded that “all such establishments as the Grey Institution must, under Divine Providence, prove a powerful means of civilisation, and tend efficiently to make good British subjects of those so educated”.\textsuperscript{159} In February 1853 Andrew Sinclair and Charles Ligar reported favourable progress at St Stephen’s native girls school run by George Kissling at Auckland. All the older children had a good religious knowledge, and could read and pronounce English well. Their writing was good, and their arithmetic “more than usually correct for learners”. Their geography was “creditable”, and their singing showed “considerable proficiency”. They were trained in sewing, knitting, and “the ordinary domestic employments of a large household”. All the girls “appeared to be acquiring neat and orderly habits”. The Inspectors could find no contrast “more striking or more pleasing
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than the appearance of these young women, as compared with that of the girls in a native village”.

Grey’s own observations of Māori schools and his correspondence with missionary informants reinforced his belief in native equality and improvability. In 1853, on an overland journey from Auckland to Wellington, his party visited Ashwell’s school at Taupiri. One of Grey’s companions reported:

There were about 50 girls present of all ages .... They looked neat and clean, and infinitely better than any we had seen at the villages on the way up. They were all intelligent looking, and some rather pretty. Mr Ashwell began by making them chant their arithmetical tables, which they did very prettily. He told us that they had generally a good ear for music ... He then showed us they could count, and they exhibited great quickness in adding up figures as fast as he could speak them, and telling the amount in pounds, shillings, and pence as directed. Afterwards some of them read English from the New Testament, and two of them wrote correctly in English on a small slate. They also shewed considerable knowledge of the Bible by answering any questions which were put to them. They pointed out on the map the principal countries and chief towns, concluding by singing several little songs and glee songs, which they admirably, taking different parts. None of these girls had been more than three years in the school, and before admission were perfect savages. Altogether it was a very pleasing sight, and showed amply the immense amount of good of which the missionary labours have been productive in this country.

Before he left New Zealand in December 1853, the Taupiri school girls sent a letter of farewell to “our affectionate parent Governor Grey”. They were “grieving, and weeping, and feeling sad” on account of his departure. “You will think of us”, they wrote, “the children belonging to the Schools you have established”. Thirty girls attached their signatures as “your loving daughters of the Taupiri School, Waikato”. The partnership between governor and missionary was paralleled by personal partnerships between governor and Māori.

Ultimately, the schools depended on a Māori response. During the term of Grey’s first governorship this response was largely positive. By 1851 between 700 and 800 Māori regularly attended government aided schools. Māori understood the benefits of a European education, particularly of literacy and numeracy skills, in the competitive colonial economy. Native schools were the main focus of Waikato chief Hori Te Waru’s farewell address to Grey. “Our love for
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you is great”, he wrote, “because you have shown us much kindness. You have elevated us, and provided teachers to instruct our children, who are implanting in their hearts good principles”.164

For Grey, the Māori response to education was proof of innate racial equality. In the preface to *Polynesian Mythology* he reassured readers that Māori were “in no way deficient in intellect, and in no respect incapable of receiving the truths of Christianity”. In school, they stood “a fair comparison with Europeans”.165 In his 1852 Cape education dispatch Grey emphasised the change from “formidable rebellion” when he first arrived in New Zealand, to “a continued state of tranquillity”.166 Education, he argued, was one of the main tools by which Māori had made such “sure and rapid progress in the adoption of Christianity and in the arts of civilised life”.167

Subsequent analyses of Governor Grey’s education policy have been far less positive. Barrington and Beaglehole’s historical review of Māori schools judges the 1847 Education Ordinance as “restrictive and inflexible”. Working simultaneously through three different organisations inevitably led to over-organisation and a duplication of resources.168 Barrington and Beaglehole also point to the lack of trained teachers, inequitable financial arrangements, and tribal difficulties that hampered many schools.169 Ranginui Walker argues that the missionaries and the government “used education as an instrument of cultural invasion”.170 Grey’s centralised system certainly enhanced government access to Māori communities and extended the reach of British authority. J. Simon identifies three main objectives of the government’s native education policy: to civilise Māori, gain influence over Māori, and facilitate European access to Māori land. She argues that the government supported Māori education “primarily to further its own interests and those of the settlers rather than those of Māori”.171 Colonial and imperial interests were intimately involved in Grey’s education policy. So were personal interests. Grey consistently played up native schools’ progress in dispatches to the Colonial Office, conscious that their success reflected on his own. But his 1847 Education Ordinance was also informed by liberal
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Anglican humanitarianism. His personal involvement in Māori schools reflected a firm belief that education was crucial to the process of Christianising and civilising native peoples.

Shortly before the end of Grey's first governorship of New Zealand he laid out a new plan for native education. Under the newly approved New Zealand Constitution Act £7000 per annum was reserved for native purposes. Grey proposed that most of those funds be devoted towards consolidating and extending the existing system of denominational education, "which after an experience of several years, has worked with very successful results".172 The Governor allocated £3,500 per annum to the Church of England for educational purposes, £2,300 to the Wesleyan Church, and £1,200 to the Roman Catholic Church. To be eligible for government funding schools still had to provide religious education, industrial training and instruction in the English language, and submit to annual instruction. Again, the head of each denomination was responsible for dispersing the funds. In addition to supporting existing schools and establishing new ones, Grey indicated that a portion of the funds should be used to train native teachers, and a portion go towards teachers' salaries. The details of his scheme suggest an increasing tendency towards professionalisation. As ever, the churches responded eagerly. Bishop Pompallier was particularly appreciative of Grey's liberal Anglican tolerance, praising "the catholic principles, that are so good for the improvement of religion and civilisation".173 Grey forwarded Pompallier's response and those of the Anglican and Wesleyan leaders to the Colonial Office, who were duly impressed.174 Barrington and Beaglehole conclude that the plan in effect was far from satisfactory, with inequitable funding a continuing problem.175

In 1858 the colonial government passed the Native Schools Act to regularise Grey's denominational system, which eventually broke down during the turbulent 1860s. In 1867 the Native Schools Act established a system of national, state-controlled village primary schools for Māori, with English the required medium of instruction. Like Grey's 1847 Ordinance, the new system aimed to extend British authority and elevate Māori in the scale of civilisation. Though the fundamental aims were the same, the colony had undergone major social, economic and political change, and the government's approach to native education had also changed: the partnership between governor and missionary was over. Grey's education policy in his first
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governorship of New Zealand is a striking example of the relationship between church and state in the mid-nineteenth century British empire. Christianity and civilisation were intimately bound together in the terms of the 1847 Ordinance, and in its implementation through Grey’s relationships with Anglican, Wesleyan and Roman Catholic missionaries.

Health

As with education, Grey’s native health policy rested on the premise that Māori were fundamentally capable and deserving of improvement. Grey did not believe, like some nineteenth century European observers, that declining Māori health represented inevitable racial decline. Rather, he acknowledged contact with Europeans as the underlying cause. Under the Treaty of Waitangi, which promised Māori the rights and privileges of British citizens, Grey believed that local government had a legal and humanitarian obligation to address and improve Māori health. He also understood healthcare as a tool of government. Grey believed that hospitals and doctors, like schools, could serve as points of access to Māori communities, tying them to the government through tangible benefits. He took an active, personal interest in the hospitals as with the schools. And when it came to his own personal ailments, Grey showed an openness to Māori forms of healing. He interpreted the positive Māori response to hospitals as confirmation of their capacity for civilisation, and of progress towards amalgamation with Europeans.

Early nineteenth century humanitarians were gravely concerned about native health, particularly by the impact of European diseases on indigenous peoples. The APS lamented that “whole tribes – nay nations, are being swept from the face of the earth by diseases both of a demoralising and contagious nature – diseases introduced by Europeans – poisons, destroying life at its very source, administered by whites without an attempt at an antidote”.\(^{176}\) In New Zealand, the Māori population declined rapidly between 1840 and 1878.\(^{177}\) By 1840 European diseases had already begun to impact heavily on some Māori communities, particularly in the Bay of Islands.\(^{178}\) At the end of Grey’s first governorship, Dr Rees of Wanganui Hospital observed that the “preponderance of disease in the aboriginal over the immigrant population” was “still
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remarkable”. He warned that foreign diseases would continue to “be imported with the increase of foreign population, there can be no doubt”. Rees also stressed the potentially positive effects of European civilisation. He believed, like Grey, that disease would diminish in proportion to the increase of “personal comforts” among Māori; referring to European houses, clothing, food and luxuries. In Britain, Colonial Officials took a pessimistic view of Māori health. James Stephen observed that only "a sanguine man" could believe that Māori would survive the nineteenth century. He himself "attached great weight to the opinion that the uncivilised people with whom we come in contact wither away chiefly because they acquire European maladies, without at the same time acquiring the high toned European Constitution by which alone such maladies can be successfully encountered". At the start of Grey's first governorship, Māori standards of health and access to European health care fell well below the levels for most other British citizens.

Before Grey's arrival, the missionaries, together with Mary Martin and Sarah Selwyn, offered the first European medical services for Māori. In 1837 the CMS sent the first resident doctor to New Zealand. Most missionaries administered rudimentary health care according to their own capacities. Richard Taylor extracted teeth, lanced boils, reset dislocations and administered medicines. William Williams and his wife Jane also paid particular attention to Māori health, as did William Colenso. Derek Dow explains that Colenso regarded his medical work "as a worthwhile and necessary part of his pastoral role, not least in providing an antidote to the influence of the tohunga". Thomas Chapman, the CMS missionary at Rotorua, often had several patients staying at his station, an opportunity to demonstrate the "practical lessons of Christianity" to a captive audience. This amalgam of medical and religious agendas reflected nineteenth century humanitarianism's dual concern for native peoples’ physical and spiritual well-being. It also foreshadowed the use of medical services as a point of entry into Māori communities for political purposes.
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In 1842 the Chief Justice’s wife Mary Martin opened a hospital for Māori patients at Taurarua. She had brought supplies of quinine and other medicines from England, but Raewyn Dalziel observes that her remedies “were usually simple – good food, rest, herbal poultices, fresh air and prayers”. The Selwyns ran a native hospital at Waimate. “In a very humble way”, wrote Sarah, “we made provision for receiving some of the sick, fitting up an outhouse for them”. In her condescension, Sarah reveals an awareness of medical care as an influential form of intervention in Māori communities. “Bless the dirty old things!”, she wrote in her Reminiscences, “it was very amusing to be a quack among them, though I felt it to be a great responsibility too, they were so entirely confiding and appreciative, just as they were when teaching them”.

Derek Dow argues that these first, very basic attempts to improve Māori health were crucial in shaping the Māori response to later forms of European health care. The missionaries created “an expectation among Māori that Western medicine had a contribution to make to their welfare”. Until the early 1860s missionaries were still playing a significant role in Māori health care.

Under Grey’s first governorship that role was seen as supplementary. The process of professionalisation in mid-nineteenth century British hospitals was well in advance of the same process in schools. Rather than working through the missionaries, as he had with native education, Grey based his native health policy on professional medical care administered by British-trained doctors. He established four hospitals, in Auckland, Wellington, Wanganui and Taranaki. In February 1847, with three of the hospitals under construction, Grey wrote to the Colonial Office that they would all “be provided with baths, and the patients will receive every medical attention and comfort which could be provided for them in the best European establishments”. Colonial Office staff were suitably impressed. Internal memos described Grey’s February letter as a “very remarkable Despatch”, deserving “the most cordial
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Wellington Hospital was opened in September 1847 under the charge of Dr J. P. Fitzgerald, Auckland Hospital towards the end of 1847 under Dr J. Johnson, New Plymouth Hospital in 1849 under Dr P. Wilson, and Wanganui Hospital under Dr Rees in 1849 also. All four hospitals were open to Māori and European patients. From small beginnings (between twenty and thirty beds in the first year of operation) they expanded rapidly, each hospital treating several hundred patients annually by the end of Grey’s first governorship.

Proposals for further expansion and improvements were curtailed by financial restrictions. The hospitals were initially funded from land endowments and provincial revenues. In 1852 the New Zealand Constitution Act reserved an annual sum of £7000 from the Civil List for native purposes, including medical care, pensions, and poor relief. The figure was to remain unchanged for nearly a century. Derek Dow explains that the task of calculating actual expenditure on Māori health care in the nineteenth century is almost impossible, with accounts and categories changing year by year.

Grey’s hospitals, like his schools, were multipurpose sites of imperial expansion. He believed that access to European health care would precipitate an improvement in the physical, cultural and spiritual condition of Māori recipients. Their increased attachment to the government would be paralleled by a corresponding increase in the reach of British authority, and an acceleration of the pace of racial amalgamation. In old age Grey reflected on medical aid as a central feature of his native policy. “My hardest trouble”, he told biographer James Milne, “was the witchcraft, which held in bonds, the savage people whom I had to govern”. Like the missionaries, Grey understood that western medical science might effect social, as well as physical change, particularly in societies which combined healing and religious functions in one authoritative role.
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His “antidote” to witchcraft “was the introduction of medical aid, so that in the cures wrought, those children of the dark, might see what surpassed their own magic”.200

New Zealand’s first government hospitals served explicitly political, as well as social, goals. As Malcolm Nicholson notes, colonial authorities throughout the empire saw doctors and hospitals “as a vital part of their apparatus of authority and control”.201 Grey considered Auckland, Wellington, Wanganui and Taranaki to be “important districts”: the four most turbulent zones of Māori-Pākehā contact during his first governorship.202 He distributed health funding on the same basis as military resources, paying most attention to the most unsettled areas. In his annual report of 1849 Grey referred specifically to hospitals as a measure intended to “bring the natives under the influence of the Government, and to gain their confidence and attachment”.203 He also saw hospitals as a venue for racial integration. Though primarily conceived as part of his native policy, Grey’s hospitals accepted Māori and European patients. In the planning stages, Grey anticipated that “mixed hospitals” would “produce very beneficial effects on the native race” by exposing Māori to the positive influence of European staff and patients.204 He chose his doctors with particular attention to “education, manners, and position in society”, appointing men “qualified to gain the regard and esteem of the natives”, and who shared his understanding of healthcare as a force of cultural transformation.205 In November 1847 Grey wrote to the Colonial Office boasting that Wellington and Auckland Hospitals were now in full operation, “conducted upon the European system”, receiving both Māori and European patients, who were “treated in precisely the same manner”.206 He enclosed a letter from Wiremu Tamihana Te Nike, the first patient at Wellington, treated for the removal of a large tumour. “Excellent is this humane system of yours”, wrote Te Nike, interpreting the hospitals as evidence of the Governor’s “love to the natives”.207 It was this sense of appreciation that Grey sought to use as a basis for extending Crown authority and promoting racial amalgamation.
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Grey’s personal approach to government extended into healthcare. Dr Fitzgerald submitted a brief annual report for Wellington Hospital in 1853, acknowledging the Governor’s active support. “It is unnecessary for me to say more connected with the hospital”, explained Fitzgerald, “as His Excellency, from his regular visits every Sunday and frequent visits on other days, is aware of the aid and assistance it has afforded to many persons in and around Wellington.”  When smallpox broke out in the Australasian colonies in 1849 Grey took the lead in a comprehensive prevention campaign. The government published a small booklet “educating the natives about small pox”, and circulated it through both North and South Islands. They also established a vaccination programme. The programme was launched with thirty Māori chiefs congregating at Government House where Grey submitted to the first injection, followed by each of the chiefs. Some Māori were trained to vaccinate and sent “to every part of the islands” to vaccinate other Māori. Grey’s diary records satisfaction “that not a single native died of the small pox”. Grey also took a personal approach to more chronic public health issues such as hygiene, housing and clothing. In 1852 Dr Fitzgerald reported that the main causes of disease among Māori were “the use of the blanket as an article of clothing, together with their generally cold, draughty, & ill-ventilated houses, combined with the poor & stinking food which they frequently make use of”. Fitzgerald believed that rates of disease would fall as soon as Māori adopted European clothing, housing and food. He sought to inculcate European standards of hygiene in his hospitals with mandatory steam baths and haircuts upon entry, followed up by a “regular system of cleanliness”. Grey hoped to promote this process in his personal interactions with individual Māori by encouraging the move to a European lifestyle.

Cultural conversion was not, however, a simple process. Though he advocated Māori acceptance of the Anglo-Saxon language and culture, Grey was clearly fascinated by indigenous languages and cultures, witnessed in his ethnography and philology. A brief, but tantalising anecdote in
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Henry Sewell’s journal reveals Grey as the somewhat ambivalent recipient of Māori medical aid. In 1853 Sewell attended a dinner party at Government House where Lady Grey told the “queer story” of her husband’s healing. Three years earlier, on a trip to Taranaki, the Governor had been “dangerously ill”. A Māori tohunga offered “to make the God’s speak”, performing convincing supernatural feats in front of Lady Grey, who found them “perfectly unaccountable”. The tohunga asked to see the Governor, touched his side, and told Grey he would be able to ride on horseback in three days. Three days later a European medical attendant pronounced the Governor’s condition much improved; fit indeed to ride on horseback. After some hesitation “chiefly arising from unwillingness to verify the tohunga’s prediction, out he went and was received by the Tribe who had been expecting to see him in consequence of the Priest’s announcement that he would be visible on that day”. Grey was certainly not a convert to Māori medicine. It seems he was involved in this episode at his wife’s initiation, in a state of personal vulnerability, if not incapacity. A more dogmatic, less liberal Anglican might still have resisted. Yet here was the Governor of New Zealand healed by a Māori tohunga while his British doctors set up hospitals to heal the Māori. In the mid-nineteenth century New Zealand was still a frontier zone with significant cultural overlaps.

Māori responded to Grey’s health policy with enthusiasm. Grey interpreted their response as evidence of an innate capacity for civilisation, and of his own success as governor. Four months after opening Dr Fitzgerald reported that Wellington Hospital was already effecting major changes in the Māori population. The hospital itself, and the efficacy of its treatments, were inspiring increasing confidence in western medicine. Fitzgerald had previously struggled to make Māori out-patients complete their treatments or take their medicine punctually. In hospital, with the example of European patients, they learnt to submit “to many things for the cure of their diseases”. Most Māori patients arrived at the hospital in blankets, but in “almost every instance” were discharged wearing European clothes provided by themselves or their friends. Fitzgerald attributed this symbolic transformation to “what they have seen in the hospitals, and from a fear that if they take again to blankets they will die”. These kinds of public health warnings gradually filtered through whole tribes. After successful treatment in Wellington
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Hospital the elderly chief Hiangarere returned home to Waikanae where he lectured his people “as to what was conducive to their health and what was prejudicial”. He threw away “some stinking karakas” (rotten corn favoured by Māori in the mid-nineteenth century), “saying that when he was in the hospital the doctor told him such food was bad”. Fitzgerald reported that the hospital was also producing “grateful feelings in the minds” of its patients. The “first and surest proof” he offered was the number of patients treated: Wellington Hospital was consistently full from its first opening, with Fitzgerald ever eager to expand. His report included letters of thanks from grateful patients. In December 1853 Wiremu Tamihana wrote to thank Fitzgerald for his treatment of Hiangarere. “My friend, his wound is healed, and he speaks well of you”. Fitzgerald also reported a tendency towards racial amalgamation. After four short months he had “sufficient data to ... say that incalculable good will arise by making this establishment a mixed hospital”. Though dubious at first, Fitzgerald had carried out the “plan originated by his Excellency the Governor-in-chief of mixing natives and Europeans in the same wards ... with the most perfect and satisfactory results”. The doctor had seen “with feelings of great pleasure, the good and kindly spirit manifested by the white patients towards their darker brethren on all occasions, and the grateful feelings of the latter for acts of kinds which the European patients have been always ready to afford”. As Grey had hoped, the hospital formed a focal point for positive interactions. Fitzgerald contended that a bond of reciprocal good feeling will be formed between natives and Europeans, moulded and cemented to a certain extent by this institution under the mixed system, and which will not easily be broken, for we all know what feelings of sympathy and friendship spring up between individuals attending upon each other’s ailments; and I now speak from experience when I say that, since the hospital has been opened nothing but harmony has existed between both races, each and every one ready to assist the other, without any distinction. So far, then, this plan of mixing has been attended with beneficial results.

For Grey, this was success. Fitzgerald’s report showed Māori patients being treated and cured, adopting European clothing and food, forming attachments with European patients, and expressing a sense of appreciation to European authorities. Subsequent reports from Wellington Hospital followed similar themes. Statistical returns showed an ever increasing resort to British
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medical attention. The hospital treated 86 Māori patients and 13 Europeans in 1847; 180 Māori and 48 Europeans in 1848; 340 Māori and 32 Europeans in 1849; 497 Māori and 39 Europeans in 1850.229

As well as official reports from Fitzgerald, Grey received informal updates on Wellington Hospital from trusted ally Octavius Hadfield. In October 1847 Hadfield forwarded a letter from a grateful Māori patient as evidence of racial equality. “I am sure it will be gratifying to you”, he assured Grey, “as it manifests that real sense of gratitude which you, I am aware, as well as myself, know to exist in a native equally as in a white”.230 Hadfield was convinced that hospitals would “prove to the natives that their interest & welfare were matters of serious concern to the Government”, causing an “incalculable” amount of good will between Māori and Pākehā.231 He reported that Te Puni “could scarcely find words to express his admiration” of Wellington Hospital, confirming in the same conversation that “he would not, on any account do what Governor Grey disapproved”.232 In December 1848 Hadfield wrote again that the benefits extending from Wellington Hospital had “altogether exceeded” his best expectations at several different levels.233 Individual patients, both Māori and European had derived great benefit from its services. In general terms, it had given the Māori population practical proof “of the good intentions of the government towards them”.234 The hospital had also shown “the good effects flowing from Christianity and civilisation combined – that is from a government acting on, & imbued with, Christian principles”.235 Hadfield had been gathering together various sanitary works to discuss with Grey, encouraged by the Governor’s “kind attention” to other suggestions.236 Though Grey had chosen to work through professionals in establishing hospitals, his close relationships with individual missionaries like Hadfield ensured an ongoing public health dialogue between civic and religious authorities. Though lacking the specific skills to implement native health policy, the missionaries collaborated at a broader level, understanding hospitals as part of Grey’s mission to civilise and Christianise native peoples.
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Direct evidence from Māori patients confirmed European reports. On 17 April 1849 Te Watene made a public address at Port Nicholson in approbation of Wellington Hospital. “When the Māori Chiefs came – they considered – consented – and were pleased – the Chiefs of Ngati Raukawa – of Ngatiota – of Ngatiawa – at the good work – kind work of Dr Fitzgerald”.237 Te Watene understood that “the Queen and Sir George Grey” stood behind the doctor in his “love … to the Māoris – to the invalids”.238 His satisfaction with the hospital extended to the Queen, the Governor, and the settlers.239 For Grey, this was corroborating evidence of Wellington Hospital as a locus of British authority and a force of racial integration.

At Auckland, New Plymouth and Wanganui, Māori responded to government hospitals with similar enthusiasm. Though Auckland had not yet integrated Māori and European wards, Colonial Surgeon Dr Davies found that Māori patients were “much improved by their intercourse with the European patients”, yielding happily to recommended therapies, and casting aside bad habits.240 Like Fitzgerald, Davies reported a positive effect on Māori attitudes to government. At Auckland he had treated patients from Rotorua, Tauranga, Waikato, Kawhia, Rangiawhia, Rangitoto, Taupo, the Bay of Islands, and Hokianga. His patients invariably entertained “a deep sense of gratitude for the great interest the Government of this colony is taking in their comfort and improvement”, persuading Davies that extending the hospital scheme would “prove one of the most powerful means of civilising and improving the moral habits of the aboriginal population”.241

At New Plymouth’s Colonial Hospital Dr Wilson reported “a growing faith in the curative powers of medicine, together with a more rational appreciation of medical advice”.242 In general, Wilson believed the Māori people were “becoming more robust”.243 “To account for these sanitary ameliorations”, he referred to changes of lifestyle. Māori were “becoming more and more habituated to the changes which civilisation has introduced among them”, such as European food and clothing. More importantly, believed Wilson, they were “getting rid, comparatively, of much of their loitering, lazy, and idle, together with somewhat of their personal dirty habits, and,
moreover, being in all invigorating ways more industrious”. The hospital was a means both of encouraging civilisation and of monitoring its progress.

At Wanganui Māori were also eager to embrace the benefits of European medical attention. Dr Rees reported that the patients were “properly aware of the advantages derived from medical treatment”, and placed “implicit confidence in the means employed”.

The four colonial hospitals played a vital role in Grey’s plans for Māori civilisation and racial amalgamation. Viewing “it simply as a question of relief to the suffering, the maintenance of these hospitals is a matter of paramount importance to the native race”. Viewing it as a question of diffusing civilisation “by showing the natives the value of and accustoming them to European houses, food, and comforts”, and “gaining their attachment to the British Government and British race”, the hospitals were even more important. As a means of civilisation their benefits were enhanced by their cost efficiency. Thanks to considerable endowments, Grey assured the Colonial Office that hospitals would incur only “a very trifling charge upon the public funds”. Carefully attuned to the exigencies of colonial economy and imperial approval, Grey’s reports skimmed over his surgeons’ warnings about inadequate resources and deficient facilities. For Grey, the hospitals were most important as evidence of civilisation in progress, reinforcing his liberal Anglican faith in the unity and improvability of humankind.

Culture

Grey’s native education and health policies were complemented by a vaguely ill-defined but pervasive project of cultural modification. Grey made active efforts to undermine traditions that he understood to be inconsistent with British law or Christian morals. At the same time he encouraged Māori to adopt European customs, perceived from an imperial perspective as an expression of the rights and privileges of British citizens promised in the third article of the Treaty of Waitangi. But like other Victorian humanitarians, Grey was keenly aware of the negative effects of colonisation. He sought to protect Māori from its worst excesses by
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discouraging those European customs, such as smoking and drinking, classified by liberal Anglicans as symptoms of cultural degeneration. Māori adapted to many aspects of European culture with striking enthusiasm, a process Grey eagerly interpreted as further evidence of progressive civilisation.

For liberal Anglicans like Grey, Christianity and civilisation were inextricably interconnected. With most Victorians in thrall to the advancing technologies of their age, mid-nineteenth century Britons understood progress in terms of material improvement. Duncan Forbes explains that liberal Anglican theologians rejected this view, emphasising moral and spiritual more than material and intellectual developments.249 Archbishop Whately and his colleagues saw civilisation as a fundamentally religious process. They understood true progress as mankind’s education in Christian morality, the “one saving force in a dissolving civilisation”.250 This was the theological basis for Grey’s first governorship of New Zealand. In December 1853 Grey addressed the Anglican Bishop and clergy with thanks for their support in implementing his vision of Christian imperialism in New Zealand. “I have long believed”, he wrote, “that if, as an Empire ... spread its dominion, it spread also equal laws, the Christian faith, Christian knowledge, and Christian virtues, it would link firmly to itself by the ties of love and gratitude each nation it adopted, thus strengthening as it spread”.251 Proceeding on this conviction, he had sought to deal with Māori “purely upon Christian principles”.252 Instead of finding himself “a single man, governing with doubt and difficulty a great and turbulent country”, he had found himself “one of a large body of Christian men all united in the bonds of a common friendship, and all earnestly and zealously labouring for a common end, the means to which were so clearly understood by all, that hardly a direction became necessary, each one knowing almost instinctively what was his share in the common task, and doing it with all his heart and will”.253 Grey acknowledged that all his duties in New Zealand had been performed “in close and friendly cooperation” with diocesan clergy and missionaries.254 In his 1849 annual report Grey praised all three Christian missions, Anglican, Methodist and Roman Catholic, as crucial to his governorship. Embedded in Māori communities throughout the country they had “exercised an influence without which all the measures adopted by the Government would have produced but
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little effect". As agents of cultural change they were particularly successful. "Won by their teaching", wrote Grey, "the natives have almost as an entire race embraced Christianity, and have abandoned the most revolting of their heathen customs". Every constituent feature of his native policy relied on advice and support from missionaries, particularly from close and trusted friends like Hadfield and Taylor. Many elements of that policy also relied on missionaries for their implementation. Grey understood that partnership with the missionaries was the most expedient means of extending and maintaining British authority among Māori. In the 1840s they still dominated New Zealand politics. But in principle, as well as practice, Grey believed in the partnership of government and church as forces of Christianity and civilisation.

Grey’s most important missionary partners shared this vision. Octavius Hadfield’s 1846 memo on ‘Relations between the British Government and native tribes of New Zealand’ reveals his role as a significant policy advisor. Hadfield’s extensive recommendations were based on the premise that “Christianity alone without the existence of law, will not produce civilisation”. At the same time, he believed that a Christian community in itself implied some level of social order.

Hadfield’s frequent letters to Grey are liberally strewn with direct references to “Christianity and civilisation” as a symbiotic pair. Benjamin Ashwell, CMS missionary at Kaitotehe, submitted his own proposal for native government to Grey in September 1850. “The missionary if true to his principles”, he began, “aims at the Temporal & Eternal welfare of the people committed to his charge”. Ashwell observed that all attempts to civilise without Christianity had failed. He proposed to preach the gospel and introduce the social benefits of civilisation simultaneously.

Māori also understood the connection between Christianity and civilisation. In 1853 twenty chiefs from the east coast of the North Island wrote to twenty four chiefs on the west coast agreeing to support British authority. “This then has been our agreement, viz., that the Supreme Being, the Lord of all, shall be our main ridge-pole, New Zealand and its inhabitants the rafters on one side, and England with its inhabitants the rafters on the other side, thus making one entire
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and complete roof or building”. This powerful statement of amalgamation was both political and religious, expressing a desire for partnership based on Christian principles.

Grey was profoundly affected by the widespread Māori acceptance of Christianity. After visiting Waikanae in July 1846 he told Hadfield that “the effect produced by Christianity and civilisation on these people was greater than any that had been produced in any part of the work within the range of his information”. He was particularly impressed that religion prevailed over politics. Grey had arrested one of the Waikanae chiefs only three days previously, and here he was “almost alone and unarmed among four or five hundred men”, kneeling “in worship in the same house of prayer without the slightest disturbance”. Grey believed that the Polynesian and Melanesian races had “cast aside idolatry and its attendant vices” much more readily than the Saxons or Celts. He saw their ready acceptance of Christianity as evidence of human unity, proving that all races had originally known God. James Milner relates the tale of Governor Grey and Bishop Selwyn on a walking expedition on Easter Sunday when the pair learnt of the death of Siapo, a native Christian. Selwyn was overcome with tears, while Grey professed himself “so wrapped in thought that I could not weep”. The Governor had been “thinking of the prophecy that men of every race were to be assembled in the kingdom of heaven”. He was trying “to imagine the wonder and joy prevailing there, at the coming of Siapo, the first Christian of his race. He would be glad evidence that another people of the world, had been added to the teaching of Christ”. Christianity was implicit in Grey’s agenda of Māori civilisation, and their conversion was his evidence of progress.

As a liberal Anglican, Grey interpreted Māori conversion to Christianity as a propitious move upwards in the scale of civilisation. Post-colonial scholarship has shown that Māori adapted rather than adopted Christianity, in the same way they adapted other aspects of European culture. In many cases, Christianity, or parts of it, resonated with Māori experiences and
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agendas. Citing the King Movement as an example, Lindsay Head observes that Christianity was "politically empowering" for Māori, "to the point of sanctioning conflict with the state". \(^{271}\)

Understanding Christianity as the basis of civilisation, Grey encouraged Māori to embrace "the comforts and conveniences of civilised life" and "abandon their old habits". \(^{272}\) Yet the Governor was clearly fascinated with Māori language and traditions. In the preface to *Polynesian Mythology* Grey referred to Māori traditions as "puerile" and their religion as "absurd", but the general tone is wonder. He writes of an "ancient mythology, and ... interesting legends" which dominated "the great mass of the islands of the Pacific Ocean" for more than two thousand years, taking care to establish that Māori were innately equal to Europeans. \(^{273}\) In his 1851 speech to the New Zealand Society Grey sensationalised Māori history as "a night of fearful gloom" coloured by "some of the most fearful spectres which have ever stalked amongst mankind, in the hideous shapes of idolatry, human sacrifices, and cannibalism". \(^{274}\) But he also identified "much of real poetry, and of actual grace of fancy". \(^{275}\) Though debased by barbarity, Māori had still "felt and cherished so much of the poetic & good". \(^{276}\) Grey was determined to preserve native traditions for posterity, and encouraged others to join him in the task. \(^{277}\) Emphasising Christian utility, he explained that a comprehensive record of past barbarism was the best means of preventing future degeneration. In some respects Grey was an advocate, rather than an opponent, of indigenous culture. As governor he did not prohibit or prevent any specific Māori customs or traditions. \(^{278}\) On his overland journal from Auckland to Taranaki in 1849-50, he honoured the local laws of tapu and accepted customary hunting practice. \(^{279}\) Grey did insist on the implementation of British law, and actively sought to eliminate practices such as infanticide and murder that were
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contrary to Christian principles. But he saw amalgamation as a two-way process. Grey viewed cultural misunderstanding as the main threat to successful amalgamation. “The two races had so recently been brought into close contact”, he explained, “that their ignorance of their respective appearance, of their language, customs, and manners, filled them with mutual distrust”. Grey believed that “as the two races became more accustomed to each other, as their knowledge of each other’s language and customs increased, and as their private differences were adjusted, so would all necessity for war and conflict between them wear away”.

Despite this vision of a mutual cultural exchange, Grey did not see Māori and European culture in comparable terms. Grey’s hierarchical understanding of race convinced him that Māori had first to be elevated in the scale of civilisation before amalgamating with European settlers. Political, economic and social measures all served this common goal. The Governor used military might and legislation to establish British authority and create the context for cultural conversion. He used native land and labour policies to afford Māori the means of cultural participation. He used education to teach Māori children the attitudes of European culture, while his hospitals convinced their parents of the government’s good intentions.

With these main policies as his base, Grey implemented several specific measures aimed at cultural improvement. Recognising that English literature was a potential means of conveying British cultural attitudes to Māori readers, Grey translated and published English texts in Māori. In June 1852 he forwarded Earl Grey a Māori translation of Robinson Crusoe, “made and published by my directions for the use of the natives of these islands”. Māori had apparently received the text “with great avidity”, and Grey noted that the government was likely to profit from its sale, so great was the book’s popularity. Encouraged by Crusoe’s success, Grey directed his Native Secretary to begin translating Pilgrim’s Progress. He had “little doubt that by opening to the native population such instructive sources of literature, the Government will, in a very material and excellent manner, add a fresh stimulus to the rapid advances the natives continue to make in the arts of civilised life”.
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In November 1848 Grey appointed journalist David Burn to produce the *Māori Messenger, Ko Te Karere Māori*, a fortnightly newspaper in English and Māori “for the civilisation and amusement of the Natives”. The *Māori Messenger* was to be “exclusively devoted to native Culture; as a medium through which the native mind may be enlightened and instructed – amused and .. informed”. Grey informed the Colonial Office that the paper was published to give Māori “useful information and plain practical directions on all those points to which the Government is anxious they should direct their attention”. With Burn as editor, the newspaper included articles by missionaries and by Grey himself. Subjects included law, agriculture, literature, medical advice, financial advice, vices such as gambling, and idealised aspects of Anglo-Saxon culture such as conjugal fidelity and gallantry. In May 1849 Burn wrote to friends in Britain that the *Messenger* had succeeded beyond all hopes. Though only a relatively small number of copies were printed – 800 in May 1849 – the paper probably reached many through gradual circulation. As ever the missionaries were Grey’s main point of access to Māori communities, serving as newspaper delivery men. In June 1849 Father Pere Maxime Petit wrote to thank the Governor for copies of the *Māori Messenger*, which he agreed to distribute among his contacts in the Hokianga. Petit promised to encourage Māori to apply the information and advice in the paper to their own improvement.

Public occasions also presented opportunities for promoting and observing social improvement. In December 1847 G. C. Mundy attended dinner at Government House, after which Grey entertained a “select party of Aborigines with an exhibition of the magic lantern”, or slide show. Mundy records that the guests “squatted on the floor in solemn silence, and maintained perfect gravity and decorum during the ordinary passages of the spectacle”. At the Wellington Anniversary Day festivities organised on 24 January 1848 Mundy observed that Māori were gradually adopting English habits. He was particularly struck by “the number of young native exquisites riding about the course and the strand with new English saddles and snaffle bridles, dressed in neat fitting round jackets, and forage caps of blue cloth, with white trowsers, a cheroot
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struck jauntily in the corner of the mouth [sic]”.293 “Progress is amongst them”, Mundy asserted, “... The New Zealander of the day has rubbed intellects with the European, and he finds that there is no great difference in their natural abilities”.294 Mundy concluded his account of the Wellington celebrations with a compliment to Māori on their general sobriety. The English revellers had formed a sorry contrast with many “a reeling and reeking wretch among the white civilisers of the savage”.295 Mundy noticed only one drunk Māori, a woman who was “instantly surrounded by a crowd of Aborigines, male and female; her child was taken forcibly from her, a blanket was thrown over her head, and she was hurried from the Race-course”.296 Influenced so strongly by the missionaries, it seems that some mid-nineteenth century Māori held more strictly to Victorian cultural expectations than their European neighbours. On New Years Day 1848 Grey organised a grand ceremony to celebrate the publication of the colony’s new charter and his own inauguration as Governor-in-Chief. Mundy observed a large crowd, with “white, brown, and whity-brown subjects [sic]” all mixed together.297 The crowd was impressed by a guard of honour formed by the 58th Regiment, about 700 native Christians parading, and a “grand Māori war-dance”.298 In February 1852 Grey forwarded the Colonial Office a series of newspaper articles on the annual Wellington Anniversary Day Sports and on race meetings in Wellington, Wanganui and Wairarapa. He observed that “the natives entered with spirit into all these sports, mingling and competing on equal terms with the Europeans”.299 Grey’s covering dispatch waxed lyrical on sport, among other things, as evidence of increasing civilisation and progressive amalgamation. Māori and Pākehā “already form one community”, he claimed, “connected together by commercial and agricultural pursuits, professing the same faith, resorting to the same courts of justice, joining in the same public sports, standing mutually and indifferently to each other in the relation of landlord and tenant, and thus insensibly forming one people”.300

More private occasions also served as sites of active amalgamation. During Grey’s first governorship Bishop Selwyn officiated at several double weddings, marrying Māori and European couples in the same service.301 In April 1850 Grey attended the wedding of newly
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appointed Lieutenant-Governor Edward Eyre to Adelaide Ormond. At the same time Henry Taratoa, a student and cook at St John’s College, was married to Emily Te Rua, a student at St Stephen’s Māori girls’ school. One ceremony was in English, the other in Māori.  

In his personal interactions Grey encouraged European manners and material acquisition. In March 1846 Grey used Richard Taylor’s house to discuss land with the three principal chiefs of Wanganui. “Mawai spoke very loud & clapped his sides. The Governor bid him speak lower saying it was not our custom to bawl in houses”.  

Mundy similarly observed that Grey never missed an opportunity for instilling in Māori “a taste for civilised habits”. “He quizzes the young dandies who use red ochre to rouge their cheeks – a not uncommon practice; and the young women may be seen hiding away their pipes when he passes, because he sets down smoking as an unfeminine habit”.

In some cases, Grey used his powers as governor to impose legislative controls on the process of cultural contact. During his first year in government he passed the Resident Magistrates Ordinance, an ordinance to restrict the importation, sale, manufacture and repair of arms and ammunition, and an ordinance to prevent Europeans from abandoning their half-caste children. The Resident Magistrates Ordinance formed a basis for imposing British law among Māori communities and settling disputes between Māori and Pākehā. Expressly political in purpose, the Courts also served as sites of cultural adaptation. As witnesses, complainants and defendants, Māori became active participants in the rituals of British law.

The ordinance to prohibit Māori from procuring arms and ammunition was first and foremost a measure of military precaution. Grey hoped that by disarming Māori he could quash any potential threat to British authority and put an end to inter-tribal wars. But the arms ordinance was also a social strategy. Grey hoped that funds previously used on arms and ammunition would be redirected towards economic and social advancement, specifically towards the purchase of agricultural implements. In February 1847 he informed the Colonial Office that the arms
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ordinance had worked “a remarkable change in the appearance of the country and in the habits of
the people”.

The ordinance to prevent European fathers from abandoning children born to Māori mothers was
intended to protect those mothers and children from the “state of utter destitution and misery”
which many had previously endured. Grey’s efforts towards racial amalgamation usually
focused on elevating Māori in the scale of civilisation, but he was keenly aware that
amalgamation also depended on a positive European response. This ordinance represents an
unusual attempt to force that response. Aside from his insistence on the strict application of
British law there are few other recorded instances of Grey intervening to control the conduct of
European settlers. In 1850, however, he was alerted to a lack of Christian piety among European
military pensioners. Under the terms of their agreement with the colonial government,
pensioners were required to attend ‘Church parade’ each week. Every Sunday they dutifully
marched to church, but turned around when they reached the doors, returning home and missing
divine service. After observing this behaviour for himself, Grey issued a warning memorandum
to the officers commanding the pensioner battalions. He was quite prepared to take “more
stringent measures” if the memorandum failed. Grey was determined that European soldiers set a
devout example for the wider settler population and for Māori. He believed their continued
irreverence could only produce the “worst possible moral effect”.

In August 1847 Grey passed the Sale of Spirits Ordinance, making it illegal to sell or supply any
Māori with alcohol. Again the ordinance served political and social purposes. Grey believed it
necessary to protect the European population. Alarmed by increasing alcohol consumption
among Māori and displays of drunkenness around town, Grey worried about the impact on race
relations. On “several occasions Chiefs of some importance, and who could bring a large number
of armed followers into the field, [had] been drunk in the streets”. Grey was also concerned
that arresting Māori for drunken behaviour would create further problems. To Grey these
threats outweighed the potential difficulty of enforcing such a controversial law. He assured Earl
Grey that “the opinions of the most influential of the native race are with me upon this subject”,
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as well as those Europeans “who are likely to have most influence over the natives”, referring indirectly to the missionaries. Grey had “little doubt” of enforcing the ordinance with “the cheerful consent and concurrence of the native population”. Grey hoped that the “natural good sense” of the Māori would “lead them to see that these more distasteful restrictions had originated in … care for their welfare”. In his annual report of 1849 Grey claimed that Māori had “acquiesced in these regulations, and generally and cheerfully acknowledge their beneficial tendency”. It seems likely Grey was bluffing. On 6 January 1853 John Morgan wrote to inform the Governor that another supply of spirits had arrived at Rangiawhia. “Are we to allow one or two evil disposed Europeans to destroy the work of civilisation & … enrich themselves at the expense of the moral degradation of the Aborigines whom for years past we have been endeavouring to lead from heathenism & cannibalism to Christianity & civilisation”. Morgan appealed to Grey to “check this evil” immediately. “I cannot bear to see the destruction of my people & the frustration of those plans which for years we have been endeavouring to carry out”.

Morgan’s letter reflects a widespread humanitarian ambivalence about the impact of European civilisation on native peoples. “By civilisation”, wrote Morgan’s colleague Benjamin Ashwell “is not meant a spurious and superficial state of social advancement Viz Better Houses and Better clothes with the vices also of the White Man – such is a mere transfer of vices, the bloodthirsty barbarian has become the cunning knave or licentious Profligate”. In 1853 Morgan wrote to Grey at the wish of Hori Te Waru of Rangiawhia. The chief was anxious “that an effectual check should be immediately put to the giving of wine & spirits to the Aborigines & that the Europeans residing amongst them should be obligated to behave in an orderly manner”. He wished to discuss the matter with Grey in person. Morgan implored Grey for help, “for as civilisation advances the same evils, if now unchecked, will be found in every Māori village, & … it will soon end in their degradation, ruin & extinction”. Morgan’s letter exposes the contradiction against which Grey was legislating. In promoting European civilisation among Māori he exposed them to its benefits – the “rights and privileges of British citizens” - and to its attendant vices.

Liberal Anglican theologians understood the paradox in terms of national development and degeneration. They theorised that all nations developed in the same manner, passing through states analogous to the life history of man, from birth to childhood, adolescence, maturity, and old age, ending in a state of "second barbarism". Victorian Britain had reached its second barbarism, rife with corruption and skepticism. Liberal Anglicans referred to true civilisation as pure advance in terms of religion and morality. Grey himself believed strongly in the superiority of Anglo-Saxon culture, but he also acknowledged and deplored "the vicissitudes to which the human race is subject in its march from degree of civilisation to degree of civilisation". Grey did not wish to create a new Britain in the South, but to build a better society based on Christian principles. Legislative controls on social issues such as parenting and alcohol represent Grey's attempts to confront the paradox of European civilisation. He was determined to advance God's plan for 'true' civilisation in New Zealand.

Grey could not, however, anticipate or dictate the Māori response to European civilisation. In the main areas of contact Māori embraced many aspects of British culture, both spiritual and material. They invariably adapted that culture for themselves.

From Grey's liberal Anglican imperial perspective, Māori acculturation was a process of steady improvement which offered convincing evidence of innate racial equality. In 1849 he presented the Colonial Office with a summary of progress:

Nearly the whole nation has now been converted to Christianity. They are fond of agriculture, take great pleasure in cattle and horses; like the sea, and form good sailors; are attached to Europeans, admire their customs and manners; are extremely ambitious of rising in civilisation, and of becoming skilled in European arts; they are apt at learning; in many respects extremely conscientious and observant of their word; are ambitious of honours, and are probably the most covetous race in the world. They are also agreeable in manners, and attachments of a lasting character readily and frequently spring up between them and the Europeans. In February 1851 Grey forwarded a letter from the principal chiefs of Waikanae to the Queen. The chiefs assured her that Grey was a good Governor, that his laws had "ever given satisfaction", and his policy "been constantly liberal". "Hence the good customs which are
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steadily gaining ground among us Māoris – belief in God, the building of churches, and works also for our bodily wants.”\textsuperscript{323} These works included the establishment of towns, the building of boarded houses, industrial and agricultural training, “so that we may resemble the Europeans”.\textsuperscript{324} The Waikane chiefs concluded with a biblical reference to Matthew 7:33, affirming Grey’s beneficence on the basis of these good works.\textsuperscript{325} For Grey this was unquestionable evidence that Māori were willing and active participants in his programme of social elevation. When Grey left the country in 1853 many Māori expressed appreciation of his efforts, evincing a high regard for civilisation. Te Rangikaheke of Rotorua was one of Grey’s closest associates and informants. His farewell address is a powerful testimony of cultural change.

But when you came, O Governor Grey, it was like the shock of an earthquake; your fame rose to the centre of the island, and extended to the waves on the ocean shore. You came with two lights and these are they: - the lamp of God, and the lamp of the world. Your efforts on behalf of God’s cause are, - the establishment of Schools, the erection of houses of prayer, thus following in the footsteps of the Church. These are the things you did in regard to the body: - encouraged industry in the cultivation of the soil, pointed out the means of acquiring property, and raised this island to its current state of prosperity. You have done these things; you have taught us to shun evil, and pointed out the bad practices of this world so that we might cast them aside. You have been as one of the Ministers of the Churches, therefore we call you by these names: - the Peacemaker, the Honourable, the Friendly one, the Loving one, the Kind one, the Director, the Protectors, the Far-famed one, the Lifter-up and the Father.\textsuperscript{326}

Te Rangikaheke accepted Grey’s authority in discerning the “bad practices” associated with European culture, and praised the Governor’s economic and social policies. He clearly believed that he himself had been elevated in the scale of civilisation, naming Grey as “the Lifter-up and Father”. The chiefs of Ngati Tipa in the Waikato expressed similar sentiments in their farewell address. “When you first came”, they told Grey, “our hearts were desiring to learn the usages of the Europeans; and you leave us advanced as a people”.\textsuperscript{327} Tamati Ngapora of Ngati Mahuara reiterated that Grey was “indeed a loving friend”, “energetic” in his efforts towards Māori civilisation.\textsuperscript{328} Grey’s social measures had been “alike beneficial to body and soul”.\textsuperscript{329}

\textsuperscript{323} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{324} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{325} Ibid. “The tree shall be known by its fruit, whether it be a good tree or a bad tree”.
\textsuperscript{326} C. O. B. Davis, p.3.
\textsuperscript{327} Ibid., p.31.
\textsuperscript{328} Ibid., p.43.
\textsuperscript{329} Ibid.
Grey and his officials also measured social progress with a range of specific cultural indicators. Kemp’s 1850 census of the southern North Island analysed population, religion, moral condition, buildings, stock and crops. Religion was broken down into Church of England, Wesleyan and Roman Catholic, with no category allocated to traditional Māori beliefs. Moral condition encompassed the number of inhabitants married according to English custom, the number married according to native custom, the number who could read and write, and the number who could read only. Buildings gave a breakdown of churches and chapels, weather-boarded houses and huts. Stock covered horses, cattle and sheep. Crops covered wheat, maize, potatoes kumara, and other garden produce. Miscellaneous items included the number of war canoes, hand mills, tame pigs, boats, gcats, daily scholars, bee hives, half castes, water mills, carts, and sailing vessels in each settlement, the amount of flax prepared, and the quantity of rent received. Kemp was satisfied that the figures showed steady progress in civilisation. The Victorian passion for science, natural laws and quantifiable evidence saw other similar attempts to measure racial progress. In 1861, for example, the CMS produced a ‘Chronological Statement Showing the Progressive Civilisation now going on among the New Zealanders’. Covering thirty six different categories, the statement tracked evidence of social improvement from 1770 to 1836 to 1859. The range of categories included cannibalism, infanticide, slavery, literacy, vaccinations, agricultural crops and techniques, legal processes, housing, clothing, alcohol consumption, cooking methods and implements, and inter-tribal relationships.

During Grey’s first governorship of New Zealand other government officials also observed cultural improvement in their contact with Māori. Dr Rees reported that Christianity was increasing in the Wanganui district, with only 712 unbaptised natives out of a total Māori population of 3,374. Native mats were now seldom seen, with most Māori favouring a loose gown covered by a rug or blanket and bare feet. Ornamental carving was still popular, but interest in weaving had declined, and “their old pastimes of Ti Haka, and similar frivolities” were now rarely seen. To Rees these changes marked steady social improvement, “as much as
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[could] be fairly expected”. Mundy travelled from Auckland to Wellington with Grey and a party of Māori in January 1848. On board the government brig Māori passengers exhibited exemplary behaviour. Every morning and evening they joined together for public prays and hymns. Mundy was quick to observe the incongruity of cultural reversal, “for in the forecastle of the ship a party of Christian sailors and soldiers were singing after their manner what might well be described as a set of heathenish songs; whilst, on the quarter-deck, a group of ‘the heathen’ were chanting, with great apparent unction, a well-known psalm in their own tongue”.

In June 1852 Grey forwarded the Colonial Office a report from the Surveyor General of a journey from Auckland to Whaingaroa, giving detailed information of the “vast improvement which continues to take place in the condition of the natives in the interior of the country”. As Grey understood, these reports reflected not only on Māori, but also on himself. An internal Colonial Office memo from Herman Merivale to Earl Grey described the Surveyor General’s report as “a very curious account … of a very singular people”. It also served as “a fresh testimony, if any were wanted, to the sagacity of the Governor on this particular head: who has always pointed out the numbers & intelligence & peculiar turn of mind of the natives”.

In some cases, specific villages served as show cases of Māori civilisation. Under the guidance of Octavius Hadfield, Otaki was the most impressive. Lieutenant-Governor Eyre reported that “the natives are doing wonders there, and are most comfortable, with good barns, huts with fire-places, nicely fenced large gardens, extensive wheat fields beautifully tilled, numerous small paddocks of grass, and a variety of other comforts and conveniences”. Charlotte Godley reported that Otaki was “by far the best specimen of Māori life to be seen in New Zealand”. She noted that one of the chiefs, Tamihana Te Rauparaha had “selected the name of Thompson for his start in civilised life”, taking on a British name with the culture. Thompson had 3-4000 acres of land, and Godley reported with glee that she had met him one day riding into Wellington with his wife to attend the Governor’s ball. When Richard Taylor took breakfast at Thompson’s house he observed that the meal “in every respect, resembled one at an European’s
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To Grey, Otaki was further proof that Māori could be successfully raised in the scale of civilisation.

Evidence of social improvement was counter-balanced by subversive reports of continuing barbarism. Henry Sewell described an official government function attended by Māori and Europeans. “After the settlers came Natives; a few, very shabby and dirty; specimens of {Sir George Grey's highly advanced} native civilisation) whom on every account one desires to keep outside one’s doors”. Sewell's barbed remarks highlight the reciprocity of cultural contact, reinforcing that amalgamation ultimately depended on a positive response from British settlers. In 1850 the Settlers' Constitutional Association forwarded a letter to Earl Grey comparing the Māori settlements on either side of Cook Strait. They argued that those living in Motueka (under the influence of the New Zealand Company) were far more civilised than those at Otaki and Waikanae (under the influence of Government and missionaries). They acknowledged a general advance in native civilisation, but attributed it to contact with colonists, claiming that “the Government neither possesses the means nor makes any attempt of the slightest consequence to improve their condition or to promote their civilisation”.

By the turn of the twentieth century Māori occupied a marginalised position in New Zealand society. Their political aspirations had been subordinated to settler interests and their economic power limited by loss of land. They lived in poorer living conditions than their European neighbours and suffered attendant health and welfare problems. In separate Native Schools they were discouraged from speaking their own language. Their social status fell well below that of European New Zealanders. While some Māori still shared Grey’s vision of advancing Christian civilisation, others sought to preserve their culture and traditions through semi-separatist groups. As Alan Ward points out, settler attitudes precluded true racial equality in mid-nineteenth century New Zealand. Grey’s full programme of cultural integration could never be applied without the cooperation of both settlers and Māori.
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Conclusion

Education, health and culture were powerful agents of social change in nineteenth century New Zealand. But neither under Grey’s governorship nor under subsequent settler governments did social policies bring about effective racial amalgamation. For Grey, education, health and Christian culture were vital adjuncts to his political and economic policies, providing a long-term basis on which to establish British authority. In October 1852 Grey wrote to the Colonial Office that Māori were no longer tied to the government purely by “fear of our arms and of our strength, but upon the much firmer basis of a sense of duty, of gratitude for benefits conferred, and upon a consciousness of community of interests and prosperity”. In his departing words to the Ngati Toa and Ngati Raukana people of Otaki, Grey described his governorship as a shared journey towards civilisation. “So I came here to still the strife which prevailed”, he recalled, “and to attempt to carry out as the servant of God His will, that there might be established in New Zealand a nation to walk in His laws”. He had found many “good men, Europeans and natives alike”, who had helped him in his role. Together Grey believed they had achieved great progress. “For nearly eight years we have thus laboured together, churches and schools have been raised, men have abandoned false gods, peace has been established, lands have been ploughed, mills have been built, great roads have been made, abundance prevails everywhere”. Grey believed that future generations of amalgamated Māori and Pākehā would look back with “wonder and gladness” at the efforts of their ancestors, both European and native.

During his first governorship of New Zealand Governor Grey sought to improve the social condition of the Māori population in order that they might join with European settlers to form a civilised Christian society of equals. He was motivated by liberal Anglican principles of justice and inclusion, and by a political desire to secure Māori loyalty. In partnership with the missionaries he improved the quality and accessibility of Māori education. He established hospitals to ameliorate their deteriorating physical condition. And he encouraged Māori to adopt the cultural habits of Christian civilisation. Māori adapted rather than adopted these habits, though Grey interpreted their often enthusiastic response as evidence of civilisation, a process
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which confirmed and strengthened his faith in the unity and improvability of mankind, and his own sense of mission as God’s Governor.
Chapter Six
Personal Rule: Performing Authority

In old age George Grey described being drawn to the far south by a kind of fairy-tale charm; "Yes, it’s all new. Hardly anything has yet been done. It’s mine to do with as I will". ¹ Born into a family of heroes and a culture of Christian duty, Grey had a strong sense of his own natural authority. Commissioned by the Queen and supported by an international web of scientists and humanitarians, he employed a highly personalised style of governance in South Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. In his first governorship of New Zealand this personal approach served to complement Grey’s political, economic and social strategies for establishing and extending British authority.

At one level New Zealand really seemed all Grey’s to do with as he would. Appointed in 1845 to resolve the colony’s escalating racial and financial problems, the new Governor was granted unusually wide powers. Far away in England, Colonial Office officials empowered Grey with unfettered discretion in addition to supplementary financial and military resources. Late twentieth century historians have revelled in the notion that New Zealand really was all Grey’s. They have emphasised his dictatorial style of governance and insisted on Grey’s personal culpability for the long-term negative effects his policy of amalgamation wrought on Māori society.² Such interpretations ignore the imperial and colonial contexts in which Grey operated. Practical circumstances, political issues, intellectual influences and religious movements in Britain and New Zealand all affected the substance and style of his governorship.

Grey’s self-assured exercise of personal authority was firmly based on imperial authorisation and on liberal Anglican notions of active duty. “My Children”, he wrote to Otaki Māori in 1853, it was not originally any arrangement of mine that I should come to New Zealand, to a people unknown to me, and whose language I did not then understand ... But troubles had fallen upon the land, race strove with race. Then our Queen and the rulers of our great empire sent to me, and directed me to proceed without delay to New Zealand, to strive to allay the dissensions and troubles in this land. So I came here to strive to still the strife which prevailed, and to attempt to carry out as the

Grey believed that New Zealand was all his, under God and the Queen. In reality, he was accountable to the British Colonial Office and susceptible to the complications of settler politics. Even more significantly, he was engaged in a dynamic relationship with Māori. Some Māori welcomed British authority and played an active part in developing and enforcing Grey's various political, economic and cultural measures. Some responded by taking what they saw as beneficial from British culture and adapting accordingly. Some rejected colonisation outright, and in the remote parts of the country many remained untroubled by European authority.

To all these audiences – settlers, Māori and metropole – Grey performed the role of governor. With a self-conscious awareness of his appointed position he reified his authority through activity. Grey employed policies and personnel to augment his authority. He deployed an understated charm in public conduct and a style of extravagant persuasion in written rhetoric. The sense of performance in his governorship was heightened by personal ambition. Grey believed that his own success was inextricably bound up with God's plans for advancing human civilisation. Public service was neither selfish nor self-less. For Grey it was a stage on which both to glorify God and win personal glory for himself.

This chapter begins with a discussion of Grey's understanding of authority. Grey saw God as the ultimate source of authority, and his sense of mission was intensified by a family history of heroism and a wider culture of hero-worship. The chapter contextualises personal notions of authority in the worldwide web of Victorian imperialism. Grey's authority in New Zealand was delegated by the Queen and legitimated by the Treaty of Waitangi. It was supported by the Colonial Office and reinforced in theory and practice by an enormous network of humanitarians and scientists across the globe. Most importantly, it was challenged and accepted by Māori. The chapter then moves on to discuss Grey's performance of authority. It focuses on how the Governor manipulated the structures of colonial authority to increase his personal power, learnt the Māori language and cultivated strategic relationships with individual chiefs and tribes, wrote carefully crafted dispatches to the Colonial Office, and used colonial and native ceremonies for

---

political impact. This provides the framework for a deeper analysis of Grey’s famous ‘Blood and Money’ dispatch and the contemporary and historical controversies surrounding missionary land claims. I argue that issues of personal and political authority are central to the debacle, but also that Grey’s pursuit of the missionary claimants is consistent with his liberal Anglican humanitarianism and compatible with his missionary partnerships. The chapter finishes by analysing the breakdown of Grey’s authority in New Zealand.

Understandings of Authority

Grey’s personal understanding of authority was based on religious faith, family history and experience in the context of Victorian cultural expectations. God was the ultimate source of authority. “We stand here the servants of our Maker”, Grey declared at the opening of the New Zealand Society in 1851, “with that degree of knowledge which the talents He has endowed us with, and the opportunities he has afforded us, have permitted to retain”. In 1875 as a newly elected member of the House of Representatives Grey reiterated his sense of godly leading and stewardship. He was convinced that “the noblest thing a man can do is to serve his fellow-men”, and the worst he could do was prevent God’s blessings of human intellect and goodness being used for the benefit of mankind. In 1878 as Premier of New Zealand he observed that “God has endowed every one of us with different faculties”. The power of these gifts did not belong to the individuals who exercised them, but to God. “Some men have one gift”, he noted, “and some another. Such gifts as they have they cannot avoid using, and for those gifts and their use they are responsible”. In 1886 Grey described the earth as “a training place for another world”. It was a “world of noble duties” in which Grey sought to bring his will “into conformity with God’s will” and fulfil his responsibilities in helping God’s creatures.4
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Grey’s understanding of duty and authority arose from a fluid combination of evangelical and liberal Anglican theology. His mother’s evangelical assurance was formative. Bebbington describes complete and absolute assurance as a central feature of early Victorian evangelicalism, translating into a “bubbling confidence” in devotional life. The evangelical “cult of duty, self-discipline and high seriousness” was at its peak in the 1850s and 1860s when George Grey’s career was also at its peak. Though he veered away from the intolerance and solemnity of the later evangelicals, Grey’s personal confidence, his religious assurance and his sense of duty were rooted in his mother’s faith. Owen Chadwick begins his history of nineteenth century British religion by reflecting that the “Victorians changed the face of the world because they were assured .... Part of their confidence was money, a people of increasing wealth and prosperity, an ocean of retreating horizons. And part was of the soul. God is; and we are his servants, and under his care, and will do our duty”. Convinced of his calling and ensured of his entitlement, George Grey claimed his authority from God.

The liberal Anglican influences of his early adulthood confirmed Grey’s sense of mission. Many of the Whig politicians analysed in Richard Brent’s *Liberal Anglican Politics* were raised in Evangelical households like Grey’s. Like him, they were members of the English country gentry, “possessed of an elevated understanding of their social duties and responsibilities”.

Brent writes that their “participation in English public life” was underlain by “a sense of Christian duty, of a debt owed to God for the blessings of Providence, which obliged them to be worthy stewards of whatever earthly lot the Deity had bestowed on them”. In *Lessons on Morals* Richard Whately argued that “A Divine Command in any Particular Point Creates a Duty”. Whately believed that moral laws were more important than those laid down by human governments, and that individuals with superior talents had a special duty to use their gifts for the glory of God. These two principles form the crucial intellectual context for understanding many of the controversial aspects of George Grey’s governorships. Like Whately, he was convinced of an overriding duty to God surpassing all other considerations.
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The network of British humanitarians who supported and augmented Grey's authority in New Zealand shared a similarly high view of duty and authority. Jane Samson's study of nineteenth century British naval officers emphasises that her subjects' sense of moral responsibility far exceeded their commitment to official instructions. The authority invested in them by God was higher than that attributed by their Commodore. William Martin, Chief Justice during Grey's first governorship of New Zealand, wrote to Grey in 1863 that "the best uses of time & power, the life most fruitful in the cause of God & of human advancement, the best for a man's own nature is that of upholding the right calmly & firmly, against the selfishness & the impatience & the ignorance of men". As Geertz writes, religion is "communal, yet personal". Grey's inner convictions of Christian duty and his sense of righteous authority were magnified by communal concord.

A family history of heroism heightened Grey's sense of authority and destiny. His father had died a hero at the head of his regiment in Badajoz. Grey inherited his father's posthumous medal for gallantry, sent to his mother with a personal letter from the Duke of Wellington. He also inherited a gold snuff box from his mother's father, presented by fellow officers after his exploits at the siege of Gibraltar. His mother's brothers were also heroes, one a naval officer killed in battle at the age of twenty two, and one a captain of the British army in America. Bohan suggests that Grey was also aware of the ancient history of the Grey family, and was "consciously brought up to add glory to its name".

Family expectations were intensified by a culture that craved heroes. Thomas Carlyle described hero-worship as "the basis of all possible good, religious or social, for mankind". His hero functioned both as exemplar and creator, providing a pattern for others to follow, and a focal point for historical progress. Carlyle's philosophy of heroism emphasised duty, courage and pragmatism, seeking to liberate great leaders from the constraints of "mechanical philosophies or restrictive codes". In a time of radical social, political, economic and religious change,
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Victorians looked for a messiah, a revelation from God, a focus of moral inspiration. As Houghton writes, the need for a hero underlay the impulse to find one, and the inspiration to be one. Grey’s call to the men of the New Zealand Society to fulfil their duty as stewards of the Most High echoes Carlyle’s fifth lecture on heroism calling British intellectuals to fulfil their potential as religious and political leaders. Some aspects of Carlylean philosophy were antithetical to Grey’s liberal Anglican humanitarianism, but the philosopher’s “religion of power” was profoundly influential in shaping (and justifying) Grey’s understanding of leadership and his devotion to duty.

Grey’s sense of personal authority was also influenced by Victorian attitudes to gender. He spent his first few years in a female dominated household, raised by a mother whom he loved and respected. At the age of twenty seven Grey married sixteen year old Eliza Spencer. A year later they lost an infant son. The relationship seems never to have recovered. Grey immersed himself in the arduous business of government, leaving Eliza lonely and bored. In 1860 Grey abandoned her en route from England to South Africa, after a dramatic episode sparked by suspicions of adultery. Even after a brief reunion in old age he seems never to have forgiven his wife for her uncorroborated, unconsummated infidelity. Unsubstantiated rumours of his own infidelities proliferate. Like most Victorian gentlemen Grey subscribed to a hegemonic masculinity based on notions of strength, action and rationality. Women were idealised and cherished when they conformed to the counter-model of feminine passivity, charm and mystique, but ultimately controlled by men. Grey’s gender gave him an implicit sense of masculine authority.

Victorian ideas about authority were also closely connected with ideas about race. Like Grey, many humanitarians believed in the ultimate unity and improbability of mankind. They believed
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in innate racial equality but saw themselves as culturally superior. Others, whether polygenists or social Darwinists, saw themselves as racially superior to indigenous peoples. Governor Grey claimed authority in New Zealand on the basis of a widespread sense of British cultural superiority.

His Australian explorations also contributed to Grey’s understanding of authority. Nicholas Thomas observes that the diverse experiences of travel “are frequently self-fashioning exercises that discompose and recompose the traveller, sometimes with absurd or degraded rather than refined and accomplished results”.31 Appointed as leader of the 1838 Australian expedition, Grey took his role seriously, establishing a hierarchical chain of command and demanding complete submission from his party.32 The explorers found little of real value and lost much (including a man).33 With a profound sense of personal destiny Grey took responsibility for none of their failures, and all their small successes.34 In a series of life and death situations he had been forced to rely on himself and on God:

... but for the support I derived from prayer and frequent perusal and meditation of the Scriptures, I should never have been able to have borne myself in such a manner as to have maintained discipline and confidence amongst the rest of the party: nor in all my sufferings did I ever lose the consolation derived from a firm reliance upon the goodness of Providence.35

Grey’s religion, his family, his gender, his nationality, and his life experiences all reinforced a strong sense of personal authority and a duty to exercise that authority in the service of God and mankind.

Networks of Authority

Grey’s personal ideas about duty and authority were formed and implemented in the context of an international web of Victorian imperialism. At the emotional centre of the web lay Queen Victorian herself. In practical terms, the Colonial Office authorised, supported and curtailed his powers as colonial Governor. Grey’s network of humanitarian and scientific correspondents
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33 George Grey, Journals of Two Expeditions of Discovery in North-West and Western Australia, London, 1841, vol.1.
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formed the basis of a wider web that provided both ideological and practical support for his personal and political authority.

Victoria’s accession in 1837 marked a turning point for the declining British monarchy. On the day of her accession she wrote in her journal “that she would do her utmost to fulfil her duty to her country”. Just as importantly, she took it for granted from the start “that others would obey her”. Victorian drew her anointing from an established tradition of the Monarch as God’s representative on earth. Grey in turn, was Victoria’s representative in New Zealand. Through her, his authority was both religious and political. Mark Francis explains that personality was crucial to the appointment and success of colonial governors. Their authority rested not only on the competent performance of administrative affairs, but also on personal virtues. The Colonial Office and the colonists expected a “moral exemplar” to serve as “a true representative of an idealised and distant monarch”.

Grey (and his biographers) played up this role, conscious that it enhanced his authority. Rees and Rees enthused on the connection between Queen and Governor in their preface:

There are in the world two human beings, and two only who from the month of June 1837, till the present day, have been ceaselessly and intimately connected with the progress and development, the happiness and the welfare of the colonial portion of that Empire upon which the sun never sets; whose interest in the colonies has never ceased, and who have occupied, without intermission, positions of trust and responsibility in relation to them. The first is Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen – the second is her servant, Sir George Grey.

James Milne and James Rutherford emphasised Grey’s personal circumstances on 20 June 1837, the date of Victoria’s accession to the throne. Grey and his party were waiting in Plymouth as they finalised the details of their Australian expedition before departing England on 5 July. He would always remember watching the celebrations from his hotel room. Rutherford concludes this vignette by noting Grey’s “special sense of personal devotion to his monarch”. Grey’s first opportunity to display his devotion came shortly thereafter. On his Australian explorations he
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named the finest region Victoria, in an act of imperial conquest. "I knew that within four or five years civilisation would have followed my tracks, and that rude nature and the savage would no longer reign supreme over so fine a territory". In South Africa, Grey had the chance to express his devotion as host to Prince Alfred, the Queen's young son. The Governor saw this duty as an honour. Victoria hoped that the royal tour would be as beneficial to the natives as "it must be on Prince Alfred to have witnessed the manner in which Sir George Grey devotes his whole time & energy to promote the happiness & welfare of his fellow creatures".

In April 1894, shortly after his final return to England, Queen Victoria swore Grey in as a member of the Privy Council. "The tribute was cheerful to him", writes Milne, "since the very nature of it set seal upon his services to the Empire". He valued his meeting with the Queen and the honour bestowed as a mark of that esteem. Grey was particularly touched by Victoria's special instructions that he should not go down on his knees during the ceremony. "Yet for the first time in his life", dramatises Milne, "he was to disobey that Sovereign. Nothing, not ever her protest of 'No, no', could stop him from getting down on his knees, as if he had been a younger subject". Grey was determined "to pay to the Queen that reverence and loyalty which had always been hers". No doubt his own sense of drama was also well in motion.

As colonial governor, Grey drew on his connection with the Queen to augment his authority. In later life he asserted that native peoples understood personal rule, and the great thing was to make the Queen vivid, a reality, to them. England? Yes, it was a place far distant, where there were no dark-skinned peoples. The Queen of England? Ah, yes, they could comprehend her! She sat on a throne, so beautiful that its place must be where all was beautiful and good. Her heart beat for her folk, irrespective of their colour; she would minister to their happiness. Nothing could more delight her, than to secure the well-being of those who claimed her powerful protection. That was intelligible!

Grey made it a policy to present himself as the Queen's representative. "Thus, when I had a measure of mercy, of justice, or of guidance to announce, I did it directly, in the Queen's name,
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and in the native languages. It was the Queen’s utterance, though spoken by me, and it would be difficult to indicate how well the charm worked”.

In New Zealand the Treaty of Waitangi had established a direct and personal relationship between Queen Victoria and the Māori chiefs who signed the treaty. In his performance as Governor, Grey added the Queen’s mantle of dignity and authority to his own. Māori accepted and responded to the connection between governor and Queen, engaging with Grey as Victoria’s presence in New Zealand. On 22 March 1849 the Ngatiraukawa and Ngatiawa tribes living at Otaki and Waikanae wrote to the Queen to express their “gratitude to you for your good selection in sending here your Governor and our beloved friend Governor Grey as a Governor for New Zealand”. Though they looked upon Hobson and FitzRoy with positive regard, it was not until Grey’s arrival that they clearly perceived “the intentions of your Majesty to us the natives”.

“When we have now adopted him as our father, and we consequently look upon you as our mother in the love of Jesus Christ; therefore we look upon the words of the prophet Isaiah (xiix, 23), ‘And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers’.” This fiercely personal statement of affection acknowledges Grey’s authority under God and the Queen.

When Grey left New Zealand in 1853 he urged Māori to continue on the path of Christianity and civilisation, that “the name of the Queen, of Victoria, the beneficent, will live with yours as the name of one who conquered natives by love and good works”. Grey concluded with an admonition to “obey all those in authority under the Queen, whether Governors, Magistrates, or people of your own race”.

In practical terms, it was officials at the Colonial Office who appointed colonial governors and dispensed royal authority. Grey’s relationship with the Colonial Office was based on mutual dependence and a constant struggle for power.

In general terms the permanent staff at the Colonial Office in the late 1840s and early 1850s shared Grey’s vision of Britain as a beneficent force of expanding civilisation. In his analysis of
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British colonial theories from the sixteenth through nineteenth centuries, K. E. Knorr shows that Britain’s sense of duty to the colonies and to mankind in general reached a high point in the nineteenth century. Earl Grey, Secretary of State for the Colonies during much of Grey’s first governorship of New Zealand, claimed authority as an imperial duty.

I conceive that, by the acquisition of its Colonial dominions, the Nation has incurred a responsibility of the highest kind, which it is not at liberty to throw off. The authority of the British Crown is at this moment the most powerful instrument, under Providence, of maintaining peace and order in many extensive regions of the earth, and thereby assists in diffusing amongst millions of the human race, the blessings of Christianity and civilisation.

While the Colonial Office shared Grey’s notions of imperial duty and the beneficence of imperial authority, they struggled to exert enforceable authority over their governors and dominions. The problem was distance. During Grey’s first governorship of New Zealand it often took six months for correspondence to travel from the Colonial Office in London to the Governor’s desk in Auckland. William Denison served as Governor of New South Wales in the same period. In January 1847 he wrote to his brother bemoaning the “absurdity of attempting to legislate at home in matters of detail, for a colony at such a distance as this .... My instructions were drawn up from the latest information received; and they contemplated a state of things exactly the reverse of what I found to prevail”. In British Colonial Administration J. W. Cell analyses the mid-nineteenth century policy-making process from an imperial perspective. He explains that although the Secretary of State for the Colonies had to assert some authority to maintain a cohesive empire, he could only lay down “the most general principles, hoping to assert his control primarily by means of salutary reviews of actions long since taken”. Local authorities were responsible for the details and application of colonial policy, “both of which did so much to define it”. Cell concludes that colonial government was “primarily the responsibility of the governor”. But Grey, like other British governors, was answerable to his superiors, vulnerable to censure and discipline. The possibility of recall was a real threat, exercised on Grey’s predecessor in his first New Zealand governorship, and in his second New Zealand governorship.
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During his first governorship of New Zealand Grey was highly successful in negotiating with the Colonial Office for personal authority over the colony’s affairs. In mid 1845, as Colonial Office officials discussed possible replacements for Governor FitzRoy, they understood that it was “impossible to take any course which does not involve entrusting great discretionary powers to whoever is charged with the Govt.”. On appointing Grey as Lieutenant-Governor of New Zealand, Lord Stanley acknowledged that his instructions were “necessarily general ar indeterminate”. Unable to discuss New Zealand’s difficulties in person, Stanley was forced to trust in the “energy, capacity, and circumspection” Grey had displayed in his governorship of South Australia. Subsequent Secretaries of State were even more generous (or realistic) in their delegation of authority. On his appointment as Secretary, William Gladstone wrote to Grey in a private dispatch. His motive was to prevent Grey being “in any degree fettered or embarrassed” by public knowledge of Colonial Office dispatches that might contain incorrect views or inappropriate policies. Gladstone assured Grey that he was “entirely at liberty” to make use of his dispatch as he saw fit, “treating it as unofficial, or making it official, according to your views of sound policy”. Gladstone was succeeded by Earl Grey. Though Earl Grey took an active interest in formulating colonial policy he usually acceded to Governor Grey’s local knowledge and experience. New Zealand’s first Constitution, for example, looked very different after Earl Grey had taken the governor’s suggestions into account. Just before leaving office in 1852, Earl Grey wrote to thank Grey for accepting the weight of responsibility in governing New Zealand with such minimal guidance. He claimed only for himself “the merit of having given you the best support in my power”.

For Grey, New Zealand’s distance from England and his consequent burden of personal responsibility constituted surmountable difficulties that he turned to his own advantage. In June 1846 he wrote to Gladstone congratulating himself on having pre-empted imperial instructions based on his own recommendations. In April 1849 Grey received a dispatch from the Colonial Office dated 10 October 1848 and informing him of a £2 000 parliamentary grant for the year
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1848-1849. (The grant for the previous year had been £3 800). The dispatch instructed Grey to restrict government expenditure accordingly. Having “no previous intimation” that the grant was to be reduced by half the amount of the previous year Grey informed the Colonial Office that it was impossible to comply with instructions “which did not reach me until after the termination of the period of time to which those instructions applied”.66 Earl Grey accepted his explanation and granted him a further £2000 to meet the shortfall.67

Grey was not, however, impervious to official discipline. In settling the financial affairs of the New Zealand Company he had contravened specific instructions by exempting Auckland from its portion of the Company’s debt. Herman Merivale greatly regretted Grey’s conduct - “a governor’s first duty is to execute the law: one of his next duties is to obey instructions from home. This conduct is a violation of both”.68 Merivale did not think Grey “guilty of mere popularity seeking”, but rather believed he had been “much more carried away by a strong sense of injustice & his old personal hostility to the Company”.69 Appalled at such direct disobedience, the Colonial Office directed Grey to comply with their original instructions immediately.70 This episode reveals Grey’s ultimate submission to imperial authority, but it also highlights his sense of higher calling, as suggested by Merivale. Grey justified his disobedience with reference to Māori. They had sold their land to the government on the understanding that the purchase money would be used to hasten the process of Māori civilisation. Grey did not believe that debt repayment for the New Zealand Company came under that category.71 He further argued that forcing the inhabitants of Auckland to pay such a debt might well endanger “the peace and prosperity of the province”.72 God’s plan for advancing Māori civilisation and racial amalgamation was more important to Grey than imperial instructions.

To the Colonial Office Grey avowed himself “one of the servants of the government of a great empire”. In August 1853, in a covering letter to a dispatch of complimentary farewell addresses, he claimed “no intention of aggregating to myself so large a share in bringing about this happy
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He was aware that his success had been largely due "to the measures of the Home Government, and to the encouragement and support which the Secretary of State for the Colonial Department has for so long a series of years inviolably afforded me; as also to the exertions of the civil, military and naval officers who have served in this country". Grey ruled New Zealand as a British governor on the basis of imperial instructions.

Grey's authority was supported by imperial networks spread across the empire. In February 1848 his old teacher from Sandhurst, J. Narrien, wrote to assure Grey of his interest and support. He congratulated his pupil on the golden opinions which you have gained in this country from men of all parties for the zeal and talent which has distinguished the measures you have taken for securing peace and in administering the affairs of that important colony entrusted to your care. I earnestly hope that New Zealand may long have the benefit of your paternal superintendence, and that your residence there may be an uninterrupted series of happy days for yourself and family.

Humanitarians in the APS were also strong supporters. Like Grey, they insisted that the "power to mitigate" against the evils of barbarism conferred "a high privilege" and imposed "an imperative duty on all civilised nations". In 1841 they published his report on the best means of civilising the Aboriginals of Australia. During his first governorship of New Zealand their annual reports referred to the "benevolent auspices of Governor Grey" and warmly praised his racial policies. In New Zealand, clergy of all denominations provided a spiritual and practical buttress for Grey's political authority. Bishop Selwyn's farewell address on behalf of the Anglican clergy rejoiced in the knowledge that "whatever post of duty your Excellency may hereafter be called to, you will exercise the authority entrusted to you, for the glory of God, the furtherance of the Gospel of Peace, and the social, moral, and religious improvement of the people committed to your charge". Members of the colonial bureaucracy were also important in supporting Grey's authority. In 1879 William Martin wrote to Grey from Torquay.

The burden of public affairs lies upon you still. I hold strongly to the conviction that you will not bear it in vain, but that you will see the result towards which you are
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striving, and will have your rewards in the reconcilement & union of the estranged races and in the abiding peace of the land: Which may God of his goodness grant.80

Grey’s connections with the APS, Selwyn, Martin, and many others discussed in chapter one, were vital in providing a solid basis for his exercise of authority in New Zealand. That authority was based on religious ideas, family history and life experience. It was reinforced by official instructions from the Queen and the Colonial Office, and underlain by the support of information-gatherers and civilising agents spread across the empire.

Kawanatanga

Māori formed a vital part of this world wide web. They were also the main subjects of Grey’s authority during his first New Zealand governorship. Māori understandings of authority were crucial to the relationships they formed with Europeans, and particularly with representatives of British imperial authority such as Governor Grey.

Under the Māori version of the Treaty of Waitangi, signed in February 1840, the chiefs of New Zealand ceded ‘kawanatanga’ to the Queen of England. Based on the transliteration of ‘Governor’ to ‘Kawana’, ‘kawanatanga’ translated literally to mean ‘governorship’. In the English version of the Treaty, the chiefs ceded ‘sovereignty’, a term carrying far more complex and weightier implications that ‘kawanatanga’. The 1835 Declaration of Independence had translated ‘sovereignty’ as ‘mana’, meaning authority, with connotations of personal prestige and charisma. In the second article of the Māori version of the Treaty the chiefs were promised ‘rangatiratanga’ or ‘chieftainship’ over their lands. The English version promised them “full, exclusive and undisturbed possession of their Lands and Estates, Forests, Fisheries, and other properties which they may collectively or individually possess”. In the late twentieth century post-colonial historians debated the inaccuracies and inadequacies of Treaty translations widely. Early twenty-first century scholars and politicians have re-focused on the ‘principles of the Treaty’ in a search for public consensus and contemporary relevance. Yet the language of the original documents remains important. The terms used in the Māori version, for example, convey a far more personalised understanding of authority than the English version. While the English version transfers abstract concepts such as ‘sovereignty’ and ‘possession’, the Māori version
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attaches notions of authority to recognisable figures such as the governor and the chiefs. The Treaty represented a personal agreement between Queen Victoria and the Māori signatories. For the missionaries (who helped engineer it and translated it) and for many of their Māori converts, the Treaty of Waitangi held the weight of a personal contract and a religious covenant.

But by November 1845, when George Grey arrived in New Zealand, some Māori were already contesting Crown authority. Others were supporting it. As the Queen's representative, Grey held official kawanatanga over New Zealand. In his relationships with individual chiefs he also established his personal mana (integrity and power), a quality that enhanced his standing and authority as Governor.

On Friday 28 November Grey addressed the chiefs friendly to the government at Kororareka. Calling on the Queen's authority, he personally acknowledged the loyalty of individual chiefs and promised to honour the Treaty.\(^81\) The ensuing debate represents a delicate negotiation of power as loyal chiefs acknowledged Grey's kawanatanga while asserting their own rangatiratanga. Macquarrie explained that he had fought against Heke "not because I was directly asked to do so by Governor FitzRoy, but because we had said to him that we would assist in putting down evil".\(^82\) This was a loyalty based on autonomy rather than submission. Moses Tawai asked that the Governor come and live in the north; "we wish to have you with us, and your presence is pleasing to us. If you go to a distant place, who shall we have to express our wants and feelings to".\(^83\) Grey assured them that "they should always have a patient hearing".\(^84\) His relationships with Māori supporters hinged on mutual respect and personal accessibility. "Although I am of a different nation, and speak a different language, and my face is of a different aspect", said Pukututu, "yet I have heard your words, and have digested them".\(^85\) Tamati Waka Nene attributed Grey full authority in the war against Heke and Kawiti. "I will always remain firm to you", he promised, ".... it is a strangers war, and I leave it all in your hands".\(^86\) When Grey confirmed that the loyal chiefs would retain their land after the war, Waka Nene turned to his tribe saying "Listen all of you to these words, how just they are".\(^87\) John King espoused
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similar feelings of respect and loyalty. "I have come here to see you being the Governor; you are the root of both the strangers and natives .... I shall be glad to escort and defend you". King’s phrasing conveys a sense of governorship as theatre. The highly personalised nature of crown colony government and the tenuous hold of British authority in the early 1840s meant that the governor’s power was vested in his very person, in his personal performance as an orator, negotiator, soldier and leader. Grey’s attributed authority, or kawanatanga, was only as strong as the mana he displayed in personal appearances and relationships.

Over the next few months Māori expectations helped shape Grey’s approach to personal rule. In May 1846 he wrote to Lord Stanley that many of “the most influential chiefs” of the north island had visited him recently, and that “nothing could be more satisfactory than their demeanour and professions”. They expected reciprocity. “Indeed”, wrote Grey,

one totally new feature distinguishes their present representations to the Government, which strongly marks their advancing civilisation; they now invariably complain that their districts have never been visited by a Governor, and that the Government is consequently completely ignorant of their present state, and of their wants and grievances, which they maintain they have a right to discuss with me, and they therefore call upon me to visit them, to explain to their people the mode in which they will be expected to conduct themselves towards the Government, and the means by which I propose to secure to them the rights and privileges to which they consider themselves entitled. Sometimes these representations are made to me in the language of bold and open remonstrance as to the neglect with which they regard themselves as having been treated; at other time, in the language of flattery, they represent themselves as anxiously waiting to feel the warmth of the rays of the sun... Grey proposed to visit soon, but acknowledged that it was “not sufficient that the feelings of so numerous, well-armed, and warlike a population should be temporarily won over by personal attachment to the Governor”. He argued that the government must also take active, practical measures to secure their respect.

Māori continued to set personal terms for the exercise of British authority throughout Grey’s first governorship. Just as they had earlier invited missionaries into their midst, forming relationships of mutual exchange, so they invited the governor into their villages. In early 1847, unable to leave Auckland himself, Grey sent Captain Graham to ascertain the state of the northern north
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island. Graham reported widespread dissatisfaction among Māori due to crop damage from settlers’ cattle. They were “most anxious” to discuss the issue with Grey himself.92 In January 1848 Colonel Nugent reported on a visit to Moses Tawai at Waima, “who was much pleased with our visit, as he said that he thought he was forgotten by the Governor, not having received any letter or communication for some time”.93 Nugent wrote that the chiefs “attach great importance to a communication from Government, as it gratifies their vanity, and serves to give them a greater degree of consequence in the eyes of their countrymen”.94

Those Māori who supported British authority treated Grey with a high degree of personal warmth and regard. Colonel G. C. Mundy arrived in Auckland in December 1847 where he stayed as a guest at Government House. He was impressed with the impression Grey had made on local Māori, reporting that the “Kawana and the Mata Kawana (mother Governor), by which somewhat mature title the young and handsome lady of his Excellency is known, are greeted with smiles and shouts of salutation … in their excursions”.95 When Government House burnt down in June 1848, some tribes sent letters of condolences and offers to rebuild the residence.96 The letters of farewell marking Grey’s departure in 1853 convey deep affection. “O Sire, our Parent, the Governor!” wrote Honetana Te Tara of Ngati Tai, “Your children are here mourning that you are not”.97

Grey, in turn, farewelled Māori as “My Children”, signing his farewell address “from your attached friend, from your governor and father”.98 Their expectations of personal access and intimacy had shaped Grey’s behaviour as governor, leading to individual relationships of sincere attachment. As Catherine Hall writes, the relationships between coloniser and colonised were “mutually constitutive, in which both coloniser and colonised were made”.99 Māori had already engaged with missionaries and with previous governors in the parental paradigm. Their acceptance of Grey as another father figure made him what he was. Grey’s vision of himself as father was based on his belief that Māori currently occupied a lower position in the scale of
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civilisation, but were capable of elevation to the same level as Europeans. Māori understandings and expectations of authority formed the vital context for his performance of governorship. Hall argues that the mutual constitution of coloniser and colonised was hierarchical: “each was party to the making of the other, but the coloniser always exercised authority over the colonised”. Grey always exercised authority over Māori, but they too held power, defining, challenging, accepting and rejecting Grey’s kawantanga. In the middle of the nineteenth century many Māori remained untouched by European colonisation, while others opposed it violently. But those who did acknowledge Grey as governor formed a significant part of the international web underpinning his authority.

**Performing Authority**

Governor Grey’s authority was both attributed and performed. Birth and circumstance placed him in positions of power. Imperial and colonial networks supported those positions. And Grey himself continuously affirmed and enlarged the scope of that power in his activities as governor. He adapted New Zealand’s colonial infrastructure to his own ends, cultivated personal relationships with individual chiefs and tribes, and used official dispatches and ceremonies to enhance his own authority.

In June 1853 Edward Wakefield wrote to a friend in England “that in this country all things of a public nature depend on an individual. The Governor is the Government, legislative and executive”. Wakefield was right. New Zealand’s first system of colonial government was established under instructions from the Secretary of State for the Colonies in November 1840. The Governor was to rule with the assistance of two councils. The Executive Council was to initiate and administer policy. It was made up of the Governor, the Colonial Secretary, the Treasurer, and the Attorney-General. The Legislative Council, made up of the Executive Council plus three justices of the peace, was to pass local ordinances. During the Crown colony period both councils met only infrequently for brief periods. Neither wielded effective power. The Governor himself exercised substantive control over the executive and legislative functions of government. As McLintock writes, “every branch of the colony’s political life was subjected to
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the over-riding direction of autocratic authority which, no matter how benevolent in operation, was essentially a personal dictatorship”.103 In consequence, New Zealand’s Crown Colony government was highly personal in character. From 1840 to 1842 Hobson allied himself with the missionaries, and spent extravagantly, with little reference to the Executive or Legislative Councils. After Hobson’s death in September 1842, Colonial Secretary Willoughby Shortland assumed control of the colony. His fifteen month interregnum marked a period of inactivity, declining finances, and increasing disquiet among European settlers. From 1843 until 1845 FitzRoy leaned heavily on the missionaries.

In February 1845 FitzRoy wrote to Colonial Secretary Lord Stanley warning that the colony was “in a more critical condition” than ever.104 Māori were “becoming more and more disposed to question, or rather to defy, the Queen’s sovereignty”.105 FitzRoy believed that the “moral influence of religion” had “been much weakened by the bad example of depraved Europeans, and by the wearing off of its novelty”.106 He argued that the “only guarantee for the future – the only certain remedy for existing and threatening evils – is the presence of an overawing force of regular troops”.107 Fitzroy’s attempt to rule by moral suasion had failed. His desperate dispatch represents a call for military authority.

The Colonial Office sent Grey, who firmly believed in the need for moral and military authority, and also in his own personal authority. Grey was an autocrat by personality as well as position. Even the most laudatory histories acknowledge that he was “a poor collaborator” who worked best alone and brooked no opposition.108 This natural tendency was encouraged in his first New Zealand governorship by an “abdication of authority” at the Colonial Office.109 After failing to exert control over FitzRoy from afar, Colonial Office officials offered his successor “unfettered discretion”.110
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Paul Moon outlines three specific checks to the governor’s authority under Crown Colony government. First, unpopular decisions could be over-ridden, both by Māori and Pākehā. Second, policy decisions could be reversed by the Colonial Office (though this was complicated by distance and timing). Third, decisions could be invalidated by the geographical limits to British authority. With unfettered discretion from Home, Grey sought to address the colonial restrictions to his exercise of absolute power. He made the existing system of colonial government even more centralised and more personalised.

Most significantly (and controversially), he dismantled the existing system of native administration, abolishing the Protectorate of Aborigines. This was a highly politicised and popular move, reducing the impression of a government alliance with the missionary bloc. Māori had received negligible benefits from the Protectorate, while settlers had opposed it as a waste of colonial resources. Grey replaced the Department of the Protector (comprising a Chief Protector, sub-Protectors and interpreters), with one man. The new Native Secretary would watch over native interests and handle correspondence relating to native affairs. Grey himself assumed full authority of native policy.

His Native Secretary became one of only a few trusted officials. J. J. Symonds was appointed to the position in July 1846, and replaced by Constantine Dillon in May 1848. Dillon already occupied the position of Civil Secretary, responsible for assisting in the general government of the country. With the added responsibility of Native Secretary, he now had “plenty to do”, seeing himself as “a kind of ‘protector of aborigines’ tho that name is abolished”. Dillon’s loyalty to Grey was based on a personal connection. He liked the Governor “very much … I always liked him as a public man but I now like him very much as a private man”. Despite political disagreements over representative government, Dillon retained his respect for Grey, discerning “that tho’ in theory a liberal he is practically a great conservative. He is particularly fond of
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power and partly afraid of trusting power into the hands of others". The Native Secretary's loyalty and affection was reciprocated. In June 1853 when he heard of Dillon's death, Grey conveyed his condolences to Mrs Dillon, writing that he "was really sick at heart, and sadder than I have been for years, ... I never knew a man who I loved, and respected more". Grey's professional relationship with his Native Secretary was based on a deeply personal attachment.

Without the Protectrate of Aborigines, and with little meaningful recourse to the Executive or Legislative Councils, Grey referred to his Native Secretary and to a few other trusted advisers. These included Chief Justice William Martin, Bishop Selwyn, and missionaries such as Octavius Hadfield and Richard Taylor. He also looked to Māori for advice on Māori affairs, developing a particularly close relationship with Te Rangikaheke of Ngati Rangiwewehi. On his frequent travels he was accompanied by an entourage of European officials and Māori chiefs. In the summer of 1849-1850, for example, he travelled overland from Auckland to Taranaki. His party included Lieutenant Symonds, Staff Officer of Pensioners, Mr Cuthbert Clarke, artist, Mr G. S. Cooper, Assistant Private Secretary, Piri Kawau, a clerk in the Native Secretary's office, as interpreter, Peter Brady, cook, and Te Heu Heu with his wives and followers.

Ultimately, however, Grey reserved absolute authority over all aspects of colonial government to himself. When the Colonial Office sent him an assistant he balked. Under the 1846 Constitution New Zealand was divided into two provinces - New Ulster in the north, and New Munster in the south. Based in Wellington, Lieutenant-Governor Edward Eyre was to govern New Munster. He arrived in August 1847. Eyre had served under Grey as a Resident Magistrate in South Australia. He was eager to re-establish their relationship and share in the work of civilisation in New Zealand. He wrote to Grey in June 1847, saying "how anxious I am to be with you to take my share of what is going on and to aid you as far as my abilities will enable me to do, in the very difficult but noble task in which you are engaged".
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Eyre’s illusions were quickly dispatched. Grey refused to delegate his authority to a Lieutenant, and steadily undermined Eyre’s own authority.\(^\text{119}\) He exercised rigid control over his subordinate’s movements and expenditure and neglected to consult him on matters of importance to the colony in general or to the province of New Munster. Eyre complained at such mistreatment repeatedly, breaking Colonial Office rules on several occasions to put his case directly to the Colonial Secretary.\(^\text{120}\) The scandal rippled through colonial society, with many outraged at Grey’s abuse of power. In July 1850 Charlotte Godley wrote her mother that the “talk here, just now, is about the behaviour of the Governor-in-Chief, Sir George Grey, to our poor Lieut.-Governor, Mr Eyre”.\(^\text{121}\) Eyre had called a meeting of the Legislative Council of New Munster to legislate on various matters, including a salary rise for himself (promised by the Colonial Office, but refused by Grey). Grey then called off the meeting “making poor Mr Eyre look very foolish”.\(^\text{122}\) “They say that he has not any right to do it”, wrote Charlotte, “and that Mr Eyre has only to persist, and hold the Council in spite of him; but that would amount to an open declaration of war, and is not expected”.\(^\text{123}\) She observed that Sir George and Lady Grey “cannot bear Mr Eyre” and made every effort to avoid social contact with the Lieutenant-Governor, never losing “an opportunity of snubbing and annoying him”.\(^\text{124}\) Charlotte was outraged when Grey arrived in Wellington in 1851, ordering Eyre and his pregnant wife from the Governor’s residence for the length of his stay. “As soon as he arrived in Wellington he ordered that every single paper, and matter of business, should be brought before him; and the Lieutenant-Governor was to hear and see nothing, but sit with his hands before”.\(^\text{125}\) E. G. Wakefield concurred with Charlotte Godley, concluding that Eyre had “I think, been treated with singular cruelty and shabbiness … he has been systematically precluded from earning by usefulness one shilling of his £1200 a year, and otherwise systematically tormented into the bargain”.\(^\text{126}\) Bishop Selwyn concluded that “Sir George Grey & Mr Eyre are both good men, but uncombinable”.\(^\text{127}\)
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J. W. Cell explains that clashes between governors and their subordinates were relatively common. In a “small and claustrophobic community ... the governor was usually at odds with one or more of his subordinates”. In the case of Grey and Eyre it seems that the clash was more than personal. Grey was threatened by the dispersal of imperial authority and fought doggedly to reserve absolute control of the whole colony to himself.

The prospect of representative government posed an even larger threat. In theory, Grey supported liberal notions of democracy and self-government. In practice, he did not trust anyone but himself to rule the country. With a godly sense of mission, he delayed and postponed the introduction of representative government in New Zealand, determined to preserve as much personal authority as possible. In South Australia he had followed a similar policy, discouraging municipal councils and impeding the legal introduction of a representative assembly.

Self-government was the Colonial Office’s explicit objective in New Zealand throughout Grey’s first governorship, though Colonial Secretary William Gladstone conceived “it to be an undoubted maxim, that the Crown should stand in all matters between the colonists and the natives”. This was Grey’s own justification for his endless delays: a personal sense of duty to protect Māori from land-hungry settlers, and to prepare them for participation in colonial democracy.

In September 1848 a memorial from the Wellington settlers advocated the immediate introduction of representative government, arguing that “it would be much safer that the extensive powers of government should be accompanied by their usual salutary checks”. Grey responded disingenuously.

No person can regret more than I do the extent of the powers with which I have been entrusted, and the heavy weight of responsibility which has been thrown upon me, and this in relation to a subject which involves the welfare of two races, between whom but so recently collisions have taken place: which involves further the interest
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of so many settlements, and of Great Britain, and of the adjacent colonies, no less than those of the New Zealand settlements.132

The colonists quickly replied, praising Grey’s government and offering solicitously to “relieve” him “from these weighty responsibilities, by admitting the colonists to participate, by means of representative institutions, in the direction of their local and internal affairs”.133 Grey responded in turn, promising to establish a representative council as soon as practicably possible.

Grey was determined to preserve his own authority, at least until Māori were sufficiently elevated in the scale of civilisation to assert their own authority in European terms. When Earl Grey’s 1846 Constitution made the possibility of self-government an imminent reality, Grey opposed it as unjust and dangerous. Māori were effectively excluded from participation in the forms of representative government by a clause requiring voters to read and write in English. Grey argued that the constitution would “give to a small fraction of [the Queen’s] subjects of one race the power of governing the large majority of her subjects of a different race”.134 There was no reason to assume that the majority would submit to the minority. Indeed, warned Grey, they would be “exceedingly indignant at finding that they are placed in a position of inferiority to the European population”.135 Māori were “quite satisfied” with the existing form of government “and as the chiefs have already ready access to the Governor, and their representations are carefully heard and considered, they have practically a voice in the government and of this they are well aware”.136 Despite his protestations to the settlers, Grey was exceedingly loath to relinquish his personal authority, especially over Māori affairs.

In November 1848 he enacted the Provincial Councils Ordinance, setting in motion the first stages of representative government. But his councils were to be nominated rather than elected, with full representative government delayed another four or five years.137 In his correspondence with the Colonial Office Grey reiterated his concerns for Māori, who would contribute to the colonial revenue through taxes, but “have no voice as to the mode in which it is to be applied”.138
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This was “an evil which I confess I can never contemplate without a great degree of apprehension”.139

In February 1849 Grey wrote to the Colonial Office acknowledging growing discontent among settlers. He argued that representative government should be introduced to the whole colony at the same time, and only when the country’s military roads were completed and the interests of the two races amalgamated. He now believed this could be achieved within three or four years.140 Grey warned Earl Grey that even if instructed to do so, he would not introduce full representative government until he believed the country was ready:

... should Her Majesty’s Government think proper to declare that a representative government should be introduced into this colony ... I would neither shrink from the responsibility of declining to introduce such institutions into any province, until I believe they can be safely conferred upon it; nor will I on the other hand, unnecessarily delay obtaining for the inhabitants of the colony a boon which I am most anxious to see conferred upon them.141

Again, in March 1849, Grey reiterated his arguments for maintaining the status quo and preserving his own authority. Referring to population figures he argued that an aggravated native population might quickly rise to war, which the legislature was ill-equipped to finance. “What advantage”, he asked, “will be gained by immediately introducing representative institutions amongst so small a European population (many of whom do not desire that such a step should be taken), which would be at all commensurate to the risk incurred by such a proceeding”?142

In June 1849 Grey wrote to the Colonial Office concerned that the Provincial legislatures might amend or repeal legislation relating to Māori affairs, particularly to Māori education. He was apprehensive of the consequences if his own system of native administration were to be interrupted, arguing that “great discontent and dissatisfaction might arise”.143 Grey asked for a general instruction to reserve any ordinance amending or repealing laws concerning natives for Her Majesty’s assent or disallowance. In the meantime, with the clemency of distance, he proposed to follow his own recommendations.144
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The Colonial Office responded to such dispatches with deference to Grey’s local knowledge and authority. In December 1849 Earl Grey wrote to the Governor regarding a memorial from the inhabitants of Auckland. The Colonial Secretary had found nothing in the memorial to “impair the confidence” which he felt in Grey’s administration. He acknowledged that Grey’s reasons for delaying the introduction of representative government appeared “entitled to the greatest weight”.

The settlers themselves had increasingly little patience with Grey’s authority. They formulated numerous memorials and petitions in favour of representative government. In August 1849, for example, the Settlers’ Constitutional Association wrote to Earl Grey requesting immediate self-government and describing Grey as “one who sees in the colony, only a stepping-stone to personal aggrandisement or the gratification of ambitious schemes”. As well as memorials, the settlers also published pamphlets in favour of self-government and opposition to Governor Grey. Correspondence on New Zealand Affairs by William Fox, Grey and Responsible Government by Henry Sewell, A Letter to His Excellency Sir George Grey by E. J. Wakefield, and New Zealand and the Constitution Act by W. Brodie, all sought to expose Grey’s deceitful approach to the introduction of representative government. Grey’s Revelenta Arabica, or Food for Sinecurists, and ‘The Chaldee Manuscript’ by William Lyon took a satirical approach, pouring particular scorn on Grey’s nominated council members. Private letters and journals also reveal a high level of mistrust between governor and settlers. Henry Sewell represented Grey as “a Supreme Despot” with “a mortal horror of the General Assembly”. Charlotte Godley believed that “the mutual distrust and aversion” between Grey and the colonists had become “too deeply ingrained to be susceptible to reconciliation”.

Some settlers still respected Grey’s authority. When he left in 1853 the artisans of Wellington presented him with a gold and silver medallion and a memorial recording their “sincere respect to your Excellency as ruler of this colony, improver of our settlement, as an esteemed fellow-
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colonist, and as the civiliser of the native race".\textsuperscript{149} G. C. Mundy, who enjoyed an agreeable friendship with Grey, described the country’s government as “tolerably despotic in character—the best form for a young colony”.\textsuperscript{150} He noted, however, that it was almost impossible to please European colonists under such a form of government “however zealously and conscientiously he may labour for their good”.\textsuperscript{151}

Grey’s opposition to the immediate introduction of representative government was based on humanitarian as well as liberal principles, and a personal desire for power. He believed in self-government and democracy, but felt a heavy responsibility to protect Māori interests. Grey believed that his personal style of government was the best present means of maintaining peace and extending British authority over New Zealand. His successful attempts to delay representative government saw him vilified by the settlers as the embodiment of tyranny and personal corruption.\textsuperscript{152} In the battle over representative government, his clash with Edward Eyre, and his restructuring of native administration, Grey sought to secure and enhance his personal authority as Governor.

He exercised that authority through personal relationships. Collier writes that Grey did all it was possible to do for the Māori. “He gave them himself. With none of the repugnances which make wholesome contact with lower races impossible to most Englishmen, he moved among them as one of themselves”.\textsuperscript{153} Alan Ward is far more skeptical, arguing that Grey “used largess to try to detach the great chiefs from their provincial sources of power and … to seduce them into seeking honour in his service”.\textsuperscript{154} Grey certainly understood relationships as a source of power, but he also related to Māori with a typically liberal Anglican sense of their innate equality and improvability.

Immediately on arriving in New Zealand Grey wrote to Lord Stanley with a plan for restoring peace. By “firmness, prudence, and substantial benefits”, he hoped “to obtain a personal influence over the chiefs”.\textsuperscript{155} Before determining any specific policies he was anxious to satisfy
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himself “by personal inquiries as to the state of affairs” in the country. He proceeded to meet with the chiefs in person, asking for their personal loyalty and engaging with them on an individual basis.156

Having established himself as an accessible and authoritative governor, Grey continued to build and maintain relationships with Māori leaders throughout his governorship. He understood the imperative of free and open communication, finding exchanges through an interpreter slow and frustrating. He quickly applied himself to learning the Māori language and understanding Māori mythology and culture. Even in situations where he could offer no remedies, Grey was determined “patiently to listen to the tales of their wrongs or sufferings, and, ... to give them a kind reply, couched in such terms as should leave no doubt in their minds that I clearly understood and felt for them, and was really well disposed toward them”.157 Though the language was difficult and the culture complex, Grey believed that mastering it was “necessary to enable me to perform properly every duty to my country and to the people I was appointed to govern”.158

In practicalities Grey also took a directly personal approach. Over the first few months he played an active part in military engagements. Colonel Despard’s report on the fall of Ruapekapeka Pa is very brief because as he acknowledges, Grey had “been an eyewitness to all our operations, and I may say, actually engaged in the assault”.159 Despard expressed his thanks for Grey’s advice and observations during the campaign.160 The Chief Protector of Aborigines was particularly critical of Grey’s “being so constantly with the troops”.161 Grey was unremorseful, acting “from a sense of duty, and not from any personal motives”.162

Grey interacted with Māori on a personal level in many different settings. He often mediated in inter-tribal disputes, testifying to a growing influence among Māori. In March 1849, for example, he accompanied Te Whero Whero to the Waikato to mediate in a dispute over land at
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Grey also made personal loans and gifts to Māori. On his tours around the colony he made a particular point of developing Māori connections. In May 1847 he visited Richard Taylor at Wanganui. On 13 May Grey took coffee with Taylor and three of the local chiefs. The missionary recorded that “the kindness of the Govr & Mrs Grey is quite winning the heart so the natives”. The next day Taylor noted that “the Govr had my natives in to take tea with him” again. After breakfast on 27 May they went on board the government steamer with all the principal chiefs of the area “at the Govr’s request that they might see the steamer”. In G. C. Mundy’s travels with the Governor he observed that Grey seemed “to repose the most perfect trust in his brown subjects; going about unarmed and unattended, and constantly permitting chiefs and their followers, coming from the interior to encamp in the garden close to the Government-house”. Grey took every opportunity to avail “himself of the presence of the native chiefs to gain a further insight into the customs and traditions of the people”. G. S. Cooper’s journal of his 1849-50 tour with Grey records a similar eagerness to engage with Māori. Grey joined in native church services, watched Māori spearing eels, initiated conversations and settled inter-tribal boundary disputes.

Much has been made of Grey’s ‘flour and sugar’ policy. In reality, the “substantial benefits” he hoped would attach Māori to the Crown were political stability, economic opportunities, hospitals and schools. Practical gifts, such as those discussed in chapter four, gave him a tangible presence in Māori communities. But perhaps Grey’s most significant means of attachment was the respect he displayed in his interactions with native peoples. Relating to Māori as individuals, he acknowledged their innate equality with himself and maintained a pervading consciousness of their capacity for civilisation. John Gorst observed that Grey’s approach to Māori was different to the disdain assumed by most Europeans. He treated them with “kindness and respect ... as ‘gentlemen’”. In August 1853 Te Rangihaeata of Ngati Toa wrote to thank Grey for the “considerate manner with which you treated me in times gone by”. Recalling his earlier
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rebellion, he considered that it was Grey who had sought him out “and through your kindness it is that I am at this time enjoying your confidence, and surrounded with peace and quietness”.

Grey particularly cultivated friendships with senior chiefs. David Cannadine argues that social ranking was just as important as colour for Englishmen contemplating the “extra-metropolitan world”. Archbishop Whately advised his clergymen to “select the best informed and best disposed – improve these, and use them as your instruments in reforming their neighbours”.

“If you had a promiscuous pile of wood to kindle”, asked Whately, “where would you apply your light, to the green sticks, or to the dry?” Grey adopted the same approach in New Zealand. In 1848 when awarded his knighthood, Grey chose Tamati Waka Nene and Te Puni, both high-ranking chiefs with wide-ranging authority, as his esquires. For him it was a means of identifying the Māori people with a reward from the Queen, and of cementing two significant relationships. When John Dorsett, the head of the Settlers’ Constitutional Association, suggested that Te Puni had not been justly encouraged by the government, Grey was outraged. “I can only state that between Te Puni and myself the most friendly intercourse has always existed, and that I believe the old man regards me with greater feelings of personal esteem and affection than he does any other European in New Zealand”. Grey maintained an especially close friendship with Te Rangikaheke, who lived with his family at Government House, serving as language tutor, historian, scribe, and adviser, and presumably exercising his own influence over the Governor. Ranganui Walker writes that the chiefs, for their part, “regarded the Governor’s confidence in them as the right and proper exercise of their rangatiratanga as guaranteed by the Treaty of Waitangi”.

When he left New Zealand in 1853 Grey maintained at least some of those relationships. Piri Kawau travelled with him. In March 1856 Grey wrote to Donald McLean enclosing “a whole number of letters for my old friends various native Chiefs ... I love the Māori race much”. Grey’s personal friendships with Māori were a political tactic designed to extend his authority.
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His respect for individual chiefs and his efforts to maintain those friendships, as well as the mana with which many Māori still regard him, suggest that he also formed genuine attachments.

Grey also used rhetoric to enhance his authority. In his first instructions to Grey as Governor of New Zealand, Lord Stanley was vigorously critical of FitzRoy's infrequent and inadequate dispatches. He urged Grey to report more regularly and thoroughly.¹⁸⁰ Two weeks later he wrote again, "I cannot conclude without impressing on you in the strongest manner the necessity of keeping me constantly and fully informed of your proceedings".¹⁸¹ After the problems with FitzRoy, Stanley was sure that "a more than ordinary share of attention will be directed to New Zealand; and I am sure you will feel it is no less due to yourself than to the Government, that I should have the earliest and amply means of explaining your conduct and your motives".¹⁸²

Grey obliged with full and frequent reports. As soon as he assumed the governorship he wrote to explain the difficulties of colonial communication and outlined the measures he would take to ensure that important news reached Britain as quickly as possible.¹⁸³ In June 1846 he asked for the Colonial Secretary's indulgence, pointing to the difficulties of his position, and espousing a contrived sense of inadequacy.

No efforts upon my part shall be wanting so to administer the affairs of the Government as to ensure your cordial support; but, at the same time, looking to the extraordinary difficulties of my present position, and to the fact that, at Her Majesty's desire, I assumed the administration of this Government at a most critical juncture, when, had I consulted my own convenience, I would gladly have shrunk from such a task, I trust that you will be disposed to make large and liberal allowances for any errors of policy which I may appear to you to commit".¹⁸⁴

Gladstone responded with assurances that all Grey's measures had met with the entire approbation of the Colonial Office.¹⁸⁵ With regard to self-government Grey assumed full responsibility and authority. "I think your Lordship will allow", he wrote to Earl Grey in April 1849,

that when the whole responsibility rests upon me of not bringing about a state of things which might lead to renewed war, and to the destruction of a race now rapidly advancing in civilisation, as also to a large cost of men and money to Great Britain, I
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must be expected to move with a slowness and caution which may appear unnecessary to those who are very anxious to obtain a thing they great desire, and upon whom no responsibility whatever rests.\textsuperscript{186}

This consistently self-conscious sense of literary performance pervades Grey’s official communications.

Many of the settlers, particularly those in favour of self-government, regarded Grey’s dispatches with utter disdain. The Settler’s Constitutional Association referred to his “cunning, artifice, and misrepresentation”, and specifically alluded to the “utter untrustworthiness” of his official dispatches.\textsuperscript{187} David Burn referred to “Sir George Grey’s artful dodges” and his use of the natives as a “bogie” with which to frighten the Colonial Office and charm them into acquiescence.\textsuperscript{188} E. G. Wakefield declared that Grey’s “whole aim, most steadily pursued in his own crooked way, has been to further his immense personal ambition by means of puffing himself up in Blue-books and cultivating the favour of important people at home”.\textsuperscript{189} He accepted that this was the norm. At a distance from Europe, colonial governors had the power to perform their own paper truths. “It is the old story over again. All Colonial Ministers are more or less deceived by all Governors; but Grey excels in the art of deceiving them”.\textsuperscript{190}

The Colonial Office recognised some of Grey’s embellishments and understatements. In a private minute written on 28 September 1847 James Stephen wrote that “no one entertains a higher esteem or regard for Capt Grey than I do”.\textsuperscript{191} But he hoped it was not incompatible with these feelings to say that he is something of an alarmist and croaker – one of the bravest men living in the presence of danger but possessed by a very grave, not to say melancholy temper, which always induces him to magnify an approaching evil and to depict it in dark colours. He always begins with gloomy predictions and hitherto, at least, has always ended with success.\textsuperscript{192}

Stephen still trusted the substantial truth of Grey’s dispatches, and his superiors continued to affirm his authority. In July 1848 Earl Grey wrote that Grey’s success had “thoroughly justified

\textsuperscript{186} George Grey to Earl Grey, 7 April 1849, GBPP 1850 (1136), p.117.
\textsuperscript{187} Enclosed in George Grey to Earl Grey, 24 September 1849, GBPP 1850 (1280), p.35.
\textsuperscript{188} David Burn to Serle, 23 October 1850, David Burn Letters, Rhodes House Library, ATL.
\textsuperscript{189} E. G. Wakefield to R. S. Rintoul, 16 April 1853, E. G. Wakefield letters, ATL.
\textsuperscript{190} Ibid., 22 June 1853.
\textsuperscript{191} James Stephen to Mr Hawes, 28 September 1847, CO209/51, pp.280-1.
\textsuperscript{192} Ibid.
the confidence which Her Majesty’s Government has reposed in you”, and had “no hesitation” in leaving Grey free to act according to his own discretion.193

Colonial ceremonies provided further opportunities for Grey’s performance of authority. Although he took a relatively understated approach to the rituals of colonial government, this was a deliberate policy designed to distance himself from previous governors and set a particular tone of assured competence. Mark Francis argues that ceremonial procedure played a major part in colonial society, assuming an equal importance to policy and efficacy."On the frontiers of the British empire authority was better seen than reasoned about.”195 Grey used both European and native ceremonies to enhance his authority.

In the early stages of his governorship Grey used imperial ceremonies to distinguish himself from the widely-hated FitzRoy. When FitzRoy landed at Auckland in December 1843 he had disembarked in high spirits, crying aloud “I have come among you to do all the good I can”.196 The crowd cheered and the band took up the tune of “King of the Cannibal Isles”.197 FitzRoy quickly earned a reputation for impolite manners and intemperate enthusiasm. Governor Grey used his own arrival in Auckland in November 1845 to create a dignified impression. He disembarked silently to a military salute and calmly made his way to Government House. Though the waiting crowd expected an address, Grey offered only “a silent salutation”.198

Despite his general disregard for the Executive and Legislative Councils, Grey also used their meetings as a chance to perform as governor. Under Hobson and FitzRoy the opening ceremonies for both councils had remained quite simple. Grey initiated a regimental guard of honour and band to receive the Governor and his suite. In 1849 he introduced prayers at the start of each council meeting.199 The meetings were usually “crowded to excess”,200 the public ever eager to see the flimsy shades of Crown authority actualised before their eyes.

193 Earl Grey to George Grey, 13 July 1848, GBPP 1847 (1002), p.177. Internal memos also indicate a high level of confidence in Governor Grey. See for example Mr Elliot to Mr Merivale, 26 November 1849, CO209/72, p.151; J. A. Gairdner to Mr. Merivale, 22 April 1850, CO209/75, pp.46-50.
194 Francis, p.30.
195 Ibid.
196 McLintock, p.112.
197 Ibid.
198 Ibid., p.113.
199 Ibid., p.103.
200 Ibid.
The most impressive ceremony of Grey’s first New Zealand governorship was probably his investiture as a Knight Commander of the Order of Bath on 18 November 1848. Grey was one of the youngest ever nominated for the award, and received it as a mark of the Queen’s esteem. Te Puni and Tamati Waka Nene played an important role in the ceremony, but unfortunately, specific details are lost to time.

Grey also participated in the theatre of Māori ceremony. Francis asserts that he was one of only a few nineteenth century governors “to surmount the ethnic divide between ceremonies within the British community and those intended for the consumption of native inhabits”.201 He refers particularly to Richard Taylor’s description of Grey on hands and knees at worship in the midst of a group of Christian Māori. G. S. Cooper’s journal of 1849-1850 reveals the Governor eagerly partaking of Māori food and participating in Māori customs.202 On Thursday 3 January he and his party attended the tangi of Te Heu Heu (brother of the paramount chief of Taupo). After the tangi they slept in the pa.203 For Grey, these rituals were just as significant as official government ceremonies. They offered the opportunity to perform his authority in an understated and accessible manner. On one occasion during the trip, a party of Māori approached asking where the Governor was. They could see “neither cocked hat, feathers, sword, nor silver lace on any one of the party”.204 Cooper records that they seemed surprised, and almost disappointed to have Grey pointed out “in a common shooting jacket, a Jim Crow hat, trowsers rather the worse for wear and a pair of moustaches”.205 “‘Is this the Governor?’ they all exclaimed, ‘why we thought he certainly would have come to visit us attired in his full gubernatorial costume’”.206 Bishop Selwyn similarly based his authority on the simple rituals of Māori life.

Here am I, a mediator for New Zealand. My work is mediation. I am not merely a Pākehā, or a Māori; I am a half-caste. I have eaten your food, I have slept in your houses; I have talked with you, journeyed with you, partaken of the Holy Communion with you. Therefore I say I am a half-caste .... therefore let us dwell together with one faith, one love, one law.207
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Governor Grey used official colonial ceremonies to impress both Māori and settlers with his dignity and authority, and native rituals to enhance his authority through personal connections.

**Authority Contested: the CMS Land Claims**

Grey’s Blood and Treasure dispatch marks his most controversial performance as autocrat. It is a major focus of nineteenth and twentieth century historical literature. Most historians see the Governor’s treatment of missionary land claimants as evidence of an insincere humanitarianism and an over-riding lust for power. Over a series of years Grey consistently misrepresented the issue in dispatches to the Colonial Office and in correspondence with the CMS. The episode certainly highlights Grey’s determination to establish and protect his own personal authority. But placed in political and religious context, his actions also exemplify Grey’s commitment to the principles of liberal Anglican humanitarianism. He believed that large-scale missionary land-ownership was a threat to the advance of Christianity and civilisation, and that missionary authority should be maintained, but subordinated to his own authority as a Christian governor.

The Blood and Treasure dispatch has troubled historians from the mid-nineteenth century to the present. In 1854 Henry Williams’ son-in-law, Hugh Carleton, published *A Page from the History of New Zealand* constituting a series of newspaper articles in defence of the missionary land claimants. Carleton judged that Grey had been motivated by the desire to assign a “fictitious origin to the native war”, and to promote European immigration. He concluded with an address to the Governor; “I am ignorant, Sir, of your motives and provocations: I only know, that you have acted like a man who cuts off his right hand with his left”. His bemusement typifies the tone of subsequent histories. The official history of the CMS, published in 1899, presents George Grey as an outstanding pro-consul whose attack on the missionaries was an unfortunate anomaly stemming from the undue influence of the New Zealand Company.

Grey’s biographers, though still bemused, sought rational explanations for his behaviour. Henderson acknowledged that although Grey’s language was “open to the charge of ...
exaggeration”, he had acted from a genuine conviction that the large missionary land claims were illegal. Collier saw this as the high point of Grey’s career; he “stood between the helpless natives and his own conscienceless countrymen; should he not stand between them and those of his fellow-countrymen who ought to have been the living embodiment of the conscience of their race? We shall not condemn him”. Rutherford found much to condemn. “Making all possible allowances for an overworked Governor who felt keenly his personal responsibility for the safety of the colony”, he found Grey’s actions “unwise and unworthy”, the behaviour of “a petty tyrant”.

For McLintock, the Blood and Treasure dispatch was the perfect vehicle for exposing Grey’s megalomania, and deposing his façade of evangelical humanitarianism. McLintock argues that Grey attacked the missionary land claimants “in the hope of humbling a faction whose ascendancy over the native mind was an impediment to the full extension of his personal authority … the methods he employed were mean and despicable, their only virtue being the success they attained”. This view persisted through the later twentieth century. Allen Davidson’s 1968 thesis describes Grey’s accusations against missionary landholders as “absurd”. Ian Wards argues that Grey deliberately reduced the power of the missionaries and transferred their influence to the military. Biographical analyses of George Selwyn and of Henry Williams concur: Grey was determined to augment his own authority by curtailing that of the missionaries.

In his 1992 analysis of colonial authority, entitled Governors and Settlers, Mark Francis called for a halt to such prejudicial interpretations. Showing that Grey’s attack on CMS landholders
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was untypical of his attitude to clergy in general, Francis concludes that although “Grey’s views sit uncomfortably with twentieth century sensibilities, there is no evidence that he lacked sincerity”. Francis successfully establishes a disjunction between the Blood and Treasure episode and Grey’s prevailing positive disposition to missions, but still fails to provide an adequate explanatory model for resolving that disjunction. His discussion of the similarities and differences between Grey and FitzRoy are suggestive, but undeveloped. Francis’ insights serve as an invitation to reassess Grey’s entanglement with the CMS land claimants in the context of mid-nineteenth century politics and religion.

The story itself is far from simple. In June 1846 Grey addressed a secret dispatch to Colonial Secretary William Gladstone warning of dire consequences if a powerful group of individuals, including members of the press, the public service and the CMS, were upheld in their claims to large tracts of land in the north of the North Island. Grey was convinced that the claims were “not based on substantial justice to the aborigines or to the large majority of British settlers in the country”. He further argued that the claimants could not “be put in possession of these tracts of land without a large expenditure of British blood and money”. Grey’s dispatch was grossly exaggerated. The missionaries and others held legal Crown grants for their lands.

In 1841 Hobson’s Land Claims Ordinance had established a limit of 2,560 acres for all Crown grants, with provision for extended grants according to the Governor’s discretion. The limit was subsequently abandoned, but then reinstated in September 1842. Under Governor FitzRoy Land Claims Commissioner R. A. Fitzgerald awarded twenty four increased grants, of which ten were in favour of CMS missionaries and associates.

Grey was fiercely opposed to such large grants. He built up to his Blood and Treasure dispatch with a series of lesser insinuations and accusations. On 12 June 1846 he forwarded to the Colonial Office a letter from George Clarke constituting a major criticism of George Grey’s governorship. Clarke suggested that the government’s mistreatment of European land claimants was a major source of Māori suspicion. Grey appended a note to the opposite effect;

---
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warning that all Clarke’s views on land “must be viewed with much caution”, for Clarke and his CMS missionary associates were themselves large land purchasers.\(^{224}\) “I believe”, wrote Grey, “the large pretended purchases of some of the missionaries to have been the chief cause of the disaffection of the northern chiefs”.\(^{225}\) On 21 June Grey wrote to the Colonial Office lamenting the terrible effects of FitzRoy’s pre-emption waiver. He warned that the natives would eventually find themselves impoverished by “improvident sales of large tracts of country”.\(^{226}\) Given his own role in large scale government land purchases, his concern seems somewhat ironic, particularly the prediction that disputes over land would “ultimately be found impossible to settle, except by an enormous expenditure upon the part of Great Britain, and by the introduction of an overwhelming force in to the country”.\(^{227}\) Grey drew particular attention to “some few influential members of the Church Missionary Society” who were “largely interested in extensive land claims” and supported pre-emption.\(^{228}\) On 23 June he addressed the extended land claims, arguing that any grant over 2560 was illegal.\(^{229}\) “I myself entertain no doubt”, he assured Gladstone, “that the recent dissatisfaction in the north was in a great degree to be attributed to the large land claims made in that quarter”.\(^{230}\) Two days later he restated his case in even more emotive terms with the famous reference to “British blood and money”.\(^{231}\)

In fact, the individuals referred to in the Blood and Treasure dispatch had considerably extended, but perfectly legal, Crown grants. Moreover, they had occupied their lands without dispute for many years, and were supported by the original Māori owners.\(^{232}\) Even the missionaries’ strongest critics had not suggested that their land claims were responsible for the war.\(^{233}\) In Rutherford’s words, Grey’s connection between missionary land claims and Māori rebellion was

\(^{224}\) Ibid., p.15. Grey had already made major criticisms of Clarke in an earlier dispatch, 10 May 1846, CO209/43, pp.137-44.

\(^{225}\) Ibid.

\(^{226}\) George Grey to W. E. Gladstone, 21 June 1846, GBPP 1847 (837), p.27.

\(^{227}\) Ibid.

\(^{228}\) Ibid., p.28.

\(^{229}\) George Grey to W. E. Gladstone, 23 June 1846, GBPP 1847 (837), pp.32-4.

\(^{230}\) Ibid., p.34.

\(^{231}\) George Grey to W. E. Gladstone, 25 June 1846, GBPP 1848 (1002), p.106. As well as grants over 2560 acres, this dispatch also referred to claims under the penny an acre proclamation waiving pre-emption. The two issues were really quite distinct, but by addressing them together Grey created the impression that missionaries were involved in both. The confusion was not cleared up at the Colonial Office until more than a year later. George Grey to Earl Grey, 7 August 1847, GBPP 1848 (1002), pp.114-15.

\(^{232}\) On 12 October 1847 Tamati Waka Nene wrote to Henry Williams from Kororareka, saying “Let not your heart be dark, as if it were a saying of mine ‘that it is through the Missionaries the land is gone’. We ourselves sold the land; let it not be said it was taken without payment”. Cited in H. Carleton, The Life of Henry William, Archdeacon of Waimate, Wellington, 1877, vol.2, p.200.

\(^{233}\) Davidson, p.80.
"sheer speculation". The Governor offered no real evidence of this connection other than personal conviction. Referring vaguely to the "number of disputed claims which are now brought before me, and ... the possibility that they will soon cause disturbances", Grey justified his decision to act immediately without waiting for Crown instructions. In April 1847 he notified the Colonial Office that all disputed claims would be referred to the Supreme Court where illegal claims would be annulled. In February 1849 Grey wrote again of the negative effects of large missionary land claims, assuring Earl Grey "from personal observation, that the natives in that part of the island where these missionary land claims are situated, are more impoverished, discontented, and wretched than those in any other district I have visited". In conversation with James Busby Grey asserted that this discontent had caused the recent war; "he had heard it not from one native but from forty". As Henry Williams observed, no such natives were ever produced. In September 1848 when Grey travelled to the Bay of Islands to secure land for a pensioner settlement, accusations began flying again, with rumours that Grey had used the trip to elicit complaints against missionary land claimants and provoke discontent. Captain FitzRoy wrote to Earl Grey refuting Grey's charges against the missionaries, and suggesting that Māori would rather rise up if the government tried "to dispossess the legitimate and undisputed owners of those lands, namely, the missionaries and their numerous children". In 1853 Busby published A Picture of Misgovernment and Oppression in the British Colony of New Zealand arguing similarly that Heke's war in the north had arisen not from Māori opposition to missionary land holdings, but from fear that the government would treat Māori as badly as they had Pākehā.

Despite his lack of substantive evidence, Earl Grey concurred with Grey's opposition to extended Crown grants. The CMS Parent Committee in London also accepted Grey's authority,
resolving that no missionaries be allowed to hold more land than determined suitable by the Governor and Bishop.243

On 1 September 1847 Selwyn wrote to the missionary claimants conveying Grey’s proposal that all extended grants be surrendered to the Crown.244 Some of the claimants complied. James Kemp, for example, was eager “to act strictly according to the wishes” of the CMS Parent Committee.245 Others, including Henry Williams and George Clarke refused to submit. The CMS sacked them.246 In December 1847 Grey announced his intention to institute legal proceedings to annul their “illegal and objectionable” grants.247 Earl Grey indicated his “entire approbation”.248 In January 1848 the government laid charges against four of the missionaries, choosing George Clarke for the test case. The Supreme Court validated his grant.249 Grey appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council where the decision was overruled. In the meantime Grey passed the Crown Titles Ordinance in a final attempt to settle all disputed land titles. The Ordinance declared all land grants valid, allowing the missionaries and other large land claimants to retain their land. The Judge of the Supreme Court was charged with issuing compensation to natives in any case where native title had not been fully extinguished.250 G. S. Cooper wrote to Andrew Sinclair that the Privy Council’s ruling was “a triumph for Sir George Grey”. Even though the Crown Titles Ordinance had settled the claims, the appeal had settled “the question as to the power of the Govr”.251

Political pressures formed the vital context for Grey’s attack on extended land claims. As Cooper perceived, the debate over land was really a struggle for power. Grey arrived in New Zealand in November 1845 to replace the evangelical Robert FitzRoy who had been unceremoniously sacked by the Colonial Office and burnt in effigy by the settlers.252 The settlers’ main grievance was FitzRoy’s heavy reliance on missionary advice and perceived neglect of settler interests. In a
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petition for the Governor's recall they described how he had thrown "himself into the arms of the missionaries" giving Government House "the air of a conventicle". The settlers particularly objected to the influence and cost on the government of maintaining the Protectorate of Aborigines, headed by ex-CMS missionary George Clarke and staffed chiefly by the sons of missionaries. Even those who supported FitzRoy opposed the Protectorate. William Brown regarded Clarke "as a kind-hearted, amiable man, and a most worthy member of society; but ... neither by education, nor by mental endowments, at all qualified for the arduous and difficult duties that devolve upon him". During FitzRoy's governorship Chief Protector Clarke, referred to by settlers as "Chief of the missionaries", regularly attended the Executive Council. William Fox reported that FitzRoy had told his Legislative Council that he relied more on Clarke "than upon any five of the other officers of government". In the process of handing over the governorship to Grey, FitzRoy acknowledged that Clarke could inform the new governor of "any matter relative to the Natives - with which I am acquainted". After the Protector, FitzRoy recommended CMS missionary Thomas Buddle as the next best source of information and advice on Māori affairs. Led by Alfred Domett, the Nelson settlers questioned whether Clarke and his brother missionaries were "the persons best fitted by birth, talents, station, or education ... to be the virtual rulers of a colony of Englishmen, many of them of the higher and middle classes at home". Domett also criticised FitzRoy's financial policies, particularly his excessively extended land grants.

Though Grey shared FitzRoy's humanitarianism, he opposed such heavy reliance on missionaries, and particularly objected to the Protectorate of Aborigines. His abolition of the Protectorate signalled a determination to centralise colonial authority, but also marked a significant shift in native policy. George Clarke and Robert FitzRoy both believed in gradual
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assimilation, in re-establishing the power of chiefs, and in legalising some native customs.\(^{262}\) Grey believed in rapid amalgamation, British authority and British law. In early June 1846, as part of the build up to his Blood and Treasure dispatch, Grey wrote to the Colonial Office outlining his concerns about the Protectorate. Alluding to the “unusual” manner in which the Protector conducted his business, Grey observed that all information connected with the office was “shrouded with studious mystery”.\(^{263}\) Under this system the Protectorate had “produced jealousies, quarrels, distrust, and animosity amongst the public servants and Her Majesty’s subjects of both races”.\(^{264}\) A week later Grey forwarded a letter from Clarke criticising Grey’s native policy and advocating gradual assimilation and the gradual introduction of British law. Grey used the opportunity to annotate the letter with criticisms of Clarke and FitzRoy.\(^{265}\) In February 1847 Grey wrote a more extended critique of the Protectorate system, justifying its abolition and outlining his own more successful measures for native protection and improvement.\(^{266}\) Towards the end of 1848 Grey majored on another Protectorate scandal, accusing Clarke and his subordinates of acting as agents for Europeans in land sales with Māori.\(^{267}\)

Settler opposition to FitzRoy and his intimates formed the immediate local context for Grey’s approach to native policy in general, and to land claims in particular. Imperial influences were just as important. The Colonial Office had been consistently frustrated by FitzRoy’s failure to resolve the northern war, his failure to implement imperial instructions, and his painfully infrequent dispatches.\(^{268}\) Ian Wards argues that despite these concerns there was really no reasonable explanation for FitzRoy’s recall. The Colonial Office wanted a fresh start with a new governor pursuing more aggressively pro-settler policies.\(^{269}\) Although Wards overstates the case, there had certainly been a shift in imperial attitudes. The New Zealand Company had become a powerful player in imperial affairs. Colonial Secretary Earl Grey was a prominent supporter of
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Wakefield and the Company. The Company saw itself in opposition to the CMS who had consistently objected to their plans for systematic colonisation. Wakefield’s hostility to the missionaries formed part of a wider strategy designed to gain political concessions for the Company. The first criticisms of large missionary land purchases were made by John Flatt, an ex-missionary who had left New Zealand in May 1837, and been taken up by Wakefield as soon as he arrived in England. Wakefield published an expose in December 1837. Later revelations came out in the Select Committee on New Zealand which sat in April 1838. The Company continued to keep the issue alive with further petitions to parliament.

The settlers regarded Grey’s appointment “as a certain indication of an entire change in the system which has hitherto been equally disastrous to the two races” of New Zealand. They expected major changes. Grey delivered, making a concerted effort to distance himself from FitzRoy’s unpopular administration. The settlers who had been offended by FitzRoy’s haughty manners and public religiosity were reassured by Grey’s air of calm, capable reserve. Though courteously acknowledging FitzRoy’s initial assistance, Grey criticised the general approach and specific measures of his predecessor’s policy, and failed to concede that some of those measures formed the basis of his own policy. Though distancing himself from Williams and Clarke, Grey kept on some of FitzRoy’s other main advisors, developing close relationships with Colonial Secretary Andrew Sinclair, and with Bishop Selwyn, for example. Most significantly, Grey distanced himself from FitzRoy by addressing the public perception that missionaries controlled the government. Establishing his own authority depended on winning the settlers’ favour in New Zealand and allying himself with the forces of power in England.

These political pressures were closely intertwined with religious ideas and influences. Victorian notions of erastianism are particularly important to understanding Grey’s attitude and approach to
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missionary land claims. Liberal Anglicans like Grey typically believed that the state should have supremacy over the church. Grey’s liberal Anglican mentor Archbishop Whately was an exception, who believed strongly in the authority and autonomy of the church. But like other liberal Anglicans he was highly suspicious of evangelicalism, and particularly of the evangelical CMS. On at least two separate occasions his letters to Grey reflect serious reservations about the powerful CMS influence on New Zealand affairs.

During the 1830s and 1840s the CMS did wield huge influence over New Zealand politics, at both local and imperial levels. In the 1830s evangelicals dominated parliamentary and permanent positions in the Colonial Office. “Small wonder”, writes McLintock, that for Dandeson Coates, president of the CMS, “the Colonial Office was an open door through which he could enter freely on terms of intimacy, if not equality”. He was trusted completely, free to come and go, with access to official documents and an unofficial authority as government advisor. Lord Normanby’s instructions to Hobson described the missionaries as “powerful auxiliaries”, urging him to rely on them and to support them. CMS missionaries, including Henry Williams, subsequently played a central role in formulating and promoting the Treaty of Waitangi, asserting their religious authority for undeniably political purposes. In May 1840 Hobson wrote to Richard Davis, Secretary of the New Zealand Committee of the CMS, “to acknowledge in the most ample manner, the efficient and valuable support I have received from the resident Members of the Church Missionary Society, in carrying into effect with the Native Chiefs the views and objects of her Majesty’s Government”. FitzRoy had established a firm and friendly relationship with the CMS missionaries several years before his appointment as governor. He had visited New Zealand in as Captain of the Beagle, and been profoundly impressed by the missionaries at Waimate, observing “the prevalence of true missionary spirit”. His published record of the journey vigorously defended these new found friends against accusations of land-grabbing, suggesting that government officials concerned with New Zealand should look first of all to the
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missionaries for advice. With FitzRoy as governor between 1843 and 1845, CMS members occupied both unofficial and official positions of authority. Regardless of FitzRoy’s favourable attitude, their influence was almost inevitable. Only missionaries and their children had the requisite linguistic skills and cultural understanding to offer competent advice on Māori issues and to explain government policies to Māori.

In June 1845 the CMS invited Governor FitzRoy to take over the management of the New Zealand mission, a clearer indication than any, of just how closely church and state were allied in early colonial New Zealand. FitzRoy declined the invitation. In September 1846 the CMS Parent Committee wrote to Governor Grey with a lesser invitation, asking for any suggestions or advice on their operations in New Zealand.

Northern Māori perceived Governor FitzRoy and Henry Williams as a joint force of British authority. In September 1845 Kawiti addressed the pair from Ruapekapeka Pa: “Friend Mr Williams ... O friend, O Governor ...”. FitzRoy’s reply frankly acknowledged Williams’s role in government. Acknowledging receipt of Kawiti’s letter he observed that it “was addressed to myself and to Mr Williams, who, I can plainly see, has been giving you good advice. You have done well to hearken to him ...”.

Clergymen continued to exercise political power under Grey’s governorship. But where FitzRoy had shared power, Grey delegated, reserving ultimate authority to himself. His relationships with missionaries such as Octavius Hadfield and Richard Taylor were crucial to the development and implementation of native policies, as discussed in chapters three, four and five. When he left New Zealand in 1853 he wrote to Anglican clergy with thanks for their support, remembering with pleasure “that it was in close and friendly co-operation with so many other men that all my duties in New Zealand have been performed”.

Bishop Selwyn was one of Grey’s closest advisers. In March 1846 newly appointed Colonial Secretary W. E. Gladstone wrote to Grey that Selwyn was “an old and much valued friend”
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whom he hoped would provide the Governor with valuable assistance.\textsuperscript{288} Grey replied in September 1846 that he and the Bishop were agreed on many issues and promised to consult his Lordship “regarding all those subjects upon which I can with propriety take his opinion”.\textsuperscript{289} The Governor was careful to reserve some subjects to his own authority. Over the next decade the pair developed a firm working relationship characterized by loyal support and the occasional quarrel.\textsuperscript{290} Selwyn exerted significant political power as a member of the Legislative Council, and informal influence as the Governor’s friend. As Bishop he worked hard to augment his religious authority, particularly over the missionaries.\textsuperscript{291} Governor Grey, Chief Justice Martin, and other upper class leaders of lay society supported that authority.\textsuperscript{292} Selwyn also worked to maintain the separation between colonial church and state, seeing the church’s independence as a great benefit.\textsuperscript{293}

In the 1840s and 1850s religious and political authority was still shared between government and mission, with Grey’s arrival marking the first serious attempt to centralise power in New Zealand. The official separation of colonial church and state, and unofficial alliance of church and state form the crucial context for understanding Grey’s approach to land claims. He wished to maintain mission influence over Māori but exert his own authority over the mission, to support Selwyn’s authority over the missionaries, but again, to exert his own authority over Selwyn.

While the political and religious climate of mid-nineteenth century New Zealand formed the crucial context for this controversy, it is not in itself a satisfactory explanation for understanding Grey’s actions. He was also motivated by a conviction that such large land grants were immoral, if not illegal, and that missionary involvement was hindering rather than hastening the process of Māori civilisation and conversion. With an eye to Grey’s sense of performance, there is little reason to doubt these basic convictions. His aversion to large missionary landholdings lines up with Grey’s other native policies, and was shared by many contemporaries.

\textsuperscript{288} W. E. Gladstone to George Grey, 17 March 1846, GNZ MSS 38(8), APL.
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Grey had developed an abhorrence to land monopoly as a soldier in Ireland, and was determined to guard against its evils in the New World. 294 He believed that grants over 2,560 acres were unfair to Māori and settler because they tied up too much land and power in the hands of too few. 295 Grey’s native land purchases and his cheap land policies were designed as an inducement to immigration. He believed that without the capital or inclination to develop their large estates, missionary landholders “destroyed their utility as a field of emigration”. 296 Māori, moreover, were shut off from a potential market for their produce, thereby retarding native civilisation and stimulating discontent. 297

Grey also believed that extended land grants constituted a breach of the Treaty of Waitangi. He wrote to Earl Grey that nothing would justify him in maintaining Europeans in possession of illegally extended grants. War was sure to erupt and Māori would “be merely acting in defence of those rights which were expressly secured to them by the Queen, when they ceded the sovereignty of these islands to Her Majesty”. 298 In pursuing the claimants through the courts Grey believed he was pursuing a course “of truth and justice to an oppressed people”. 299

Most importantly, Grey feared that large missionary land claims were a threat to the mission itself. His letters to the Colonial Office allude frequently to his high opinion of the CMS mission and his reluctance to tarnish its reputation. “I am so very sensible of the incalculable benefits which some of the missionaries of that Society have conferred, and may yet confer, upon this country”, he wrote in August 1847, “and I am also so desirous to promote, to the utmost of my power, the high and laudable objects contemplated by the Society, that I very unwillingly again revert to this subject...” 300 As governor, however, he was bound to address illegal land claims, and as an individual felt personal objections to “missionaries purchasing large tracts of land from the natives they are sent out to instruct”. 301 He dreaded that the “disputes and difficulties”

296 George Grey to Earl Grey, 2 August 1847, GBPP 1848 (1002), p.110.
297 Ibid.
298 George Grey to Earl Grey, 17 April 1847, GBPP 1847 (892), p.28.
arising from the issue "would seriously injure the cause of religion and civilisation". He assured Bishop Selwyn that he had only ever referred to missionary land claims with reluctant pain, and had "omitted no means ... to adjust this affair in a manner which may secure the permanent tranquillity and prosperity of this country, and may enable the missionaries to maintain that holy influence amongst the native race which is so essential to secure the successful issue of their labours". In asking Selwyn's help to persuade the missionaries to relinquish the extended portions of their claims, Grey warned of the "the dangers which are likely to ensue to Christianity from the measures I must pursue, if the missionaries refuse to accept this offer". If the claims were proven illegal in court, as Grey believed they would be, the mission's influence over Māori would be greatly reduced and their efforts towards native civilisation and conversion thwarted.

In the debate ensuing from the publication of his Blood and Treasure dispatch Grey adopted a tone of righteous indignation. He claimed he had "only done that which was necessary for the interests of the natives and for the ends of justice". "I merely stated the simple truth", he assured Earl Grey, "and that nothing done by British subjects has ever made me feel more concern than the conduct of some few missionaries in reference to their large alleged land purchases". Again and again he reiterated the point: "I can only declare that I have made no statements regarding these land claims that I did not and do not conscientiously believe to be literally true .... In that cause I am still prepared to undergo and degree of misrepresentation, of unpopularity, or personal discomfort". He was not only defending the cause, but also himself. In September 1847 he referred to "party attack" against himself over the issue, and in December 1847 wrote more forcibly:

I have only to state that I have neither read in history nor met in real life with a case such as the present, in which a few individuals who were sent out to a country at the expense of a pious people, in order that that might spread the truths of the gospel, have acquired such large tracts of land from ignorant natives over whom they had acquired a religious influence, and who, being themselves missionaries, have then assailed with such violence and obloquy a person who has endeavoured to protect the rights of the suffering and complaining natives.

---
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Others shared Grey's concerns about the missionaries' land purchases. Bishop Selwyn maintained a strong aversion to clerical land dealings, seeing land ownership as a temptation to neglect spiritual dealings. He had written to the CMS in 1843 protesting the "evils" arising from their members' land speculations, and to Governor FitzRoy in 1845 protesting against land grants over 2,560 acres. When Grey raised the issue, Selwyn offered his full support, acting as mediator and ally in the Governor's struggle with Williams and Clarke. The episode also served as a chance for Selwyn to establish decisive authority over the evangelical missionaries.

The Parent Committee of the CMS in London was also troubled by the land purchases of their New Zealand missionaries. In 1838 they asked for an explanation of local land purchases. The missionaries replied with a detailed description of land purchased according to CMS regulations for the provision of missionary children, and land held in trust for Māori. But the issue had only just been sparked. Many of the Society's supporters were deeply concerned, and some withdrew their support. In mid 1846, as Grey's Blood and Treasure dispatch travelled to England, the Parent Committee received still more letters of concern over their missionaries' misconduct.

Discontent ranged well beyond the church authorities. As Allan Davidson notes, travellers to New Zealand in the 1830s "invariably commented on the extensive missionary estates". The 1838 and 1840 Committees of Inquiry into the Condition of New Zealand heard a mass of evidence claiming that excessive land holdings had prevented missionaries from converting...
Māori to Christianity, or elevating them in the scale of civilisation.316 In 1839 the Australian clergyman J. D. Lang published a pamphlet explaining how the New Zealand missionaries had unsuccessfully tried to “serve God and Mammon”.317 Instead of protecting and civilising Māori they had “actually been the principles in the grand conspiracy of the European inhabitants of the island to rob and plunder the natives of their land!”318 In the early 1840s a flurry of travel narratives relating to New Zealand kept the issue to the fore of public debate. J. C. Bidwell’s *Rambles in New Zealand*, published in 1841, was positive about the mission in general but warned that it “would be ridiculous” to recognise the enormous claims of some missionaries.319 Charles Heaphy’s 1842 *Narrative of a Residence in various parts of New Zealand* sought to expose the CMS mission’s failure to civilise or convert Māori and their “rapaciousness” in land-dealings.320 E. J. Wakefield’s *Adventure in New Zealand, from 1839 to 1844* makes missionary “landsharking” a major theme.321 He writes that the CMS missionaries “became enraptured with the fertile soil and productive climate” of New Zealand, abandoning their spiritual mission to temporal interests.322

Concerns over improper missionary land holdings had plagued the CMS mission in New Zealand for years before Grey’s arrival in the colony. Pressured by the exigencies of settler and imperial politics, concerned to maintain state authority over the church, and opposed to land monopoly, Grey believed the large land claims of CMS missionaries were a threat to racial amalgamation and his vision of New Zealand as a civilised Christian nation. His authority as governor gave him the power to express widespread concerns through formal channels.

---
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In all other matters Grey offered the mission full support. His partnerships with missionaries are a major theme of this thesis. Grey routinely sought missionary advice in formulating native policy and used missionaries to implement many of his most significant measures. He was determined to establish his personal authority as Governor of New Zealand, but avowedly fearful of reducing mission authority over Māori. Before, during and after the CMS land claims debacle he maintained strong working relationships with many missionaries. Richard Taylor sought Grey’s advice about his land claims, and defended the Governor in conversations with Henry Williams. In 1849 when the local CMS established a Branch Association in New Zealand they invited Grey to be one of the Vice Presidents, regarding him “as a warm friend of Missionary work”. Apart from those dispatches concerned with land, Grey’s correspondence abounds with positive references to the New Zealand missionaries. In a general report on the state of the country in March 1848 he concluded with a tribute to the mission and its powerfully positive effect on Māori. A year later he asserted that the rapid improvement of Waikato Māori was “in a great degree to be attributed to the exertions of the missionaries residing amongst them”. In July 1849 his rhetoric soared in a summary of the colony’s history.

There existed in this country three missions, established by different Christian denominations, amongst whom there is, perhaps, an emulation as to which should achieve the greatest amount of good, and it may reasonably be doubted whether at any period of the world there has existed in one country, amongst so large a number of men who had devoted themselves to the holy calling of a missionary so many persons who were eminently qualified by piety, ability and zeal to discharge the functions of the office upon which they entered: the result has been that these gentlemen, scattered throughout the country, have exercised an influence without which all the measures adopted by the Government would have produced but little effect. Won by their teaching, the natives have almost as an entire race embraced Christianity, and have abandoned the most revolting of their heathen customs. Instructed by the missionaries, probably a greater proportion of the population than in any country in Europe are able to read and write; and encouraged by the precept and example of the same gentlemen, they have, in all parts of the islands, made considerable progress in the rougher branches of civilised life.

At the end of his first New Zealand governorship Grey addressed the CMS Committee in London with praise for their missionaries and encouragement to continue their work in New Zealand.
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Grey’s Blood and Treasure dispatch was not motivated by a desire to reduce missionary influence. He certainly wished to augment his own authority, and pursuing large land claims was a means of increasing his popularity among European settlers and enhancing his reputation in Britain. But he also believed it would protect Māori interests, and in the long term help preserve missionary influence. It would allow for closer European settlement in the north, bringing Māori and European into closer contact, and so furthering God’s plan for civilisation. Ultimately, the Blood and Treasure dispatch was consistent with Grey’s liberal Anglican project of Māori improvement and racial amalgamation. With a powerful sense of himself as God’s servant on earth, Grey believed it was his Christian duty to expose the immorality and illegality of large missionary land purchases.

The Breakdown of Authority

During his first governorship of New Zealand Grey exerted authority over mission, Māori and Europeans with varying success. Yet personal rule was an unsustainable style of government. Grey’s extreme centralisation of power in New Zealand had dire ramifications.

In December 1853 as Grey prepared to leave New Zealand Wiremu Te Rangikaheke presented an address on behalf of the chiefs of Rotorua. “The Chiefs and people of New Zealand, especially those of Rotorua, let you go forth bearing their love. Suppose not O Governor that this affection for you is merely an outside thing, no; it comes from the inward recesses of the heart”.328 There can be no doubt that Governor Grey successfully fostered many intimate relationships with Māori individuals and tribes. G. C. Mundy wrote to Grey in November 1848 that his “personal treatment” of Māori had “done more to subdue their hostility, and to give them a relish for European habits than all the troops and all the protocolising in the world could have accomplished [sic]”.329
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Other contemporaries recognised the potential dangers inherent in Grey’s ‘personal treatment’. William Fox warned that Grey’s personal rule threatened “the great disaster of fresh collision between the races”.

[Grey’s] object (in which he has been partially successful) has been to ingratiate himself personally with the natives, and to excite in their minds towards himself, individually, a favourable feeling. But he has purchased this at the cost of the colonists, by holding himself up in favourable contrast with them, and rousing feelings towards them of jealousy and distrust. To the alleged existence of these feelings he appeals, as his principal plea for retaining to himself arbitrary power.

One of the more obvious costs of Grey’s personal approach was the consequent alienation of European colonists. His style of government also posed a threat to subsequent governors. Henry Sewell concluded that Grey’s “great personal influence” was extreme – “so much so that he positively endangers the positions of his Successor whoever he may be, nor would he at all scruple to light a fire behind him, if he fancied that burning his Successor would help to illuminate himself”. In a conversation with Sewell in 1856, that successor, Governor Gore Browne, made “a total renunciation of Sir George Grey’s principle of governing by himself”. As Treasurer in the colonial House of Representatives Sewell blamed Grey for the colony’s ills. He argued that Grey had left chaos behind him rather than order and done nothing towards Māori civilisation or racial harmony. Gore Browne was inevitably unable to maintain government authority, when that authority, and the government’s native administration, had relied on Grey himself. The colony sped towards war.

In 1861 the Colonial Office recalled Grey to New Zealand, desperate to re-establish British authority in the colony. But Grey’s authority was dramatically diminished. He found himself in the odious position of sharing power with an elected House of Representatives. And his personal power, based on personal relationships, had waned. In 1864 J. Gorst argued that although Grey had attached the greatest chiefs to himself in his first governorship “by exercising his extraordinary power of persuasion in personal intercourse”, he had never made much impression on “the mass of the people”. By the early 1860s many of the old chiefs were dead, and Māori “had contracted a passionate desire for nationality which overwhelmed the personal predilections
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of their chiefs, so that Sir George Grey found his own friends either unwilling to sacrifice their patriotism to personal friendship, or powerless to persuade their tribes to follow them". Grey's second governorship was characterised by a series of wars, followed by land confiscations, and long-term racial discord. After struggling for authority with the government and the military, he was dismissed from the Governorship of New Zealand in June 1867 and relinquished his official authority in February 1868. In the 1870s he exercised formal power as a Member of the House of Representatives and as Premier, determined that nothing would prevent him "from serving New Zealand". But neither Grey nor any other political or religious leader would ever exercise so much power over New Zealand as in his first governorship of New Zealand between 1845 and 1853.

Conclusion

Governor Grey implemented his liberal Anglican programme of civilisation in New Zealand with a distinctly personal approach. Influenced by his mother's evangelicalism and by liberal Anglicanism, Grey developed a strong sense of natural authority and Christian duty early in his life. As Governor of New Zealand his authority was supported by an imperial network spanning the globe, and accepted by large sections of Māoridom. Grey's official authority was dramatically enhanced by his 'performance' of authority. He centralised the colonial administration to consolidate power, developed personal relationships as tools of government, and employed official dispatches and ceremonies as forums to display and augment his authority. The CMS land claims scandal was embroiled in issues of personal and political authority, but ultimately arose from Grey's liberal Anglican sense of duty. Following a course consistent with his overarching vision of Māori improvement and racial amalgamation, Grey sought to preserve Godly authority - both his own and the mission's - in New Zealand.
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Conclusion

George Grey’s first governorship of New Zealand was a liberal Anglican mission of native civilisation and racial amalgamation. Supported and informed by an international web of scientists and humanitarians, he developed racial policies based on religious and scientific ideas about race. Grey’s evangelical upbringing, liberal Anglican influences and ethnographic experience all pointed to the ultimate unity and improvability of mankind. With a powerful sense of personal authority and imperial duty, Grey sought to discern and promote God’s plan for human civilisation in New Zealand. His political, economic and social policies aimed to elevate Māori and join them with the European settlers to form a progressive society of equals.

Grey’s policy of racial amalgamation was informed by imperial intellectual influences and local colonial context. Biblical tradition and early nineteenth century ethnography both emphasised man’s common humanity. Monogenism was the starting point for all Grey’s thinking on race. Though assured that all races were originally and innately equal, Grey believed that some had fallen in the scale of civilisation, and some progressed. Like other Victorian humanitarians, he ranked Anglo-Saxons highest on his scale of civilisation, and Māori higher than most other indigenous peoples. Grey’s liberal Anglican mentor Archbishop Whately argued that natives could not ascend the scale without civilised assistance. Grey concurred. Personal encounters in Australia and New Zealand attuned him to the negative aspects of Anglo-Saxon culture, but ultimately, Grey saw it as a powerful force for improvement. He believed that all mankind was capable of further improvement, but that those at the bottom of the scale deserved most assistance. He identified the best means of civilisation and conversion as racial amalgamation.

At the end of his Australian explorations, Grey developed a basic plan for elevating indigenous peoples. Based on the principle of amalgamation, Grey’s 1840 ‘Report on the best means of promoting the civilisation of the Aboriginal inhabitants of Australia’, set out guidelines for a programme of prescriptive inclusion. Grey believed the Aborigines should be joined with the European population according to British cultural priorities. He recommended a range of legal, educational, industrial and personal measures to elevate them in the scale of civilisation and prepare them for amalgamation. Though firmly based on notions of Anglo-Saxon superiority, Grey’s plan was also premised on respect for native peoples, and an understanding of
amalgamation as a two-way process in which European settlers bore responsibility for accepting and assisting native peoples.

Grey’s 1840 report was heavily informed by principles of liberal Anglican humanitarianism, but its real strength lay in personal experience. As an explorer (and later as governor), Grey was a passionate, assiduous collector, taking every possible opportunity to gather ethnographic information and specimens. Dominated by humanitarians, the Colonial Office was physically remote from its sphere of responsibility and necessarily relied on local experience and expertise such as Grey’s. Colonial officials received Grey’s report with enthusiasm, sending it straight back out to the colonies, and appointing Grey to the governorship of South Australia. In bureaucratic and cultural terms, London was the centre of empire. But the colonial peripheries also served as centres of power, relating to the metropole and to each other as part of an international web focused on gathering information to extend British interests and improve native peoples. They exercised imperial influence by means of specialised local knowledge, a valuable commodity and cultural force made more potent by physical distance and communication delays.

Backed by the Colonial Office, Grey implemented his racial policies in South Australia, and later, New Zealand and South Africa. His plan altered to accommodate local exigencies, but retained its same basic shape. Grey’s local experience reinforced his liberal Anglican faith in the unity and improvability of mankind. In New Zealand he was particularly struck by some Māori tribes’ eager acceptance of British culture, commerce and religion. Grey interpreted positive Māori responses to his policies as evidence of amalgamation in action, God’s plan for humankind unfolding before him. He was keenly prescient of his common humanity with Māori, drawing analogies between ancient British and contemporary Māori society. His comparative approach drew attention to early British rebellions and romanticised Māori rebellions as the natural reaction of a proud warrior race confronted by a superior culture. In general terms, however, Grey emphasised positive responses to his policies, bolstering his own liberal Anglican ideas about race, and feeding back in to the Victorian humanitarian discourse on racial difference, degeneration and progress.

In Grey’s first New Zealand governorship, 1845 – 1853, he used political, economic, social and personal measures to promote Māori civilisation and amalgamation. With substantive control his most pressing problem, Grey legislated to enhance the authority of British government and
deployed military force to enforce that authority. At times, his political methods were dubious, with ongoing negative ramifications for Māori society and for race relations. But Grey's use of war and law formed part of a broader strategy. Peace was vital to securing British sovereignty in New Zealand, it was cheaper to maintain than war, and reflected favourably both on Grey and the imperial government. Most importantly, it was the necessary pre-condition for establishing Grey's other native policies. His economic measures also served a range of inter-connected purposes. By re-imposing pre-emption Grey sought to protect Māori under the terms of the Treaty of Waitangi. By purchasing Māori land he sought to broaden the economic base of the colonial economy, finance further European colonisation, and hasten Māori civilisation by bringing them into closer contact with British neighbours, and providing them with the financial resources to participate fully in the elevating processes of British commerce. In reality, Grey's aggressive approach to native lands alienated some tribes and formed the context for continuing racial discord. Grey's labour policy complemented his lands policy. Employing Māori on public works exposed them to the British work ethic and industrial skills, helped open the country to British settlers, and, through wages, offered Māori greater financial opportunities. His loans policy similarly encouraged Māori participation in the colonial economy, while simultaneously stimulating national production and economic growth. Grey's education, health and cultural policies sought to promote Māori social development. His national system of government-funded mission schools emphasised Christianity, industry and the English language as the most effective forces of civilisation for the young. Like his schools, Grey's hospitals were open to both Māori and European, encouraging active amalgamation through personal relationships. They were also a means of extending British authority and tying Māori more securely to the Crown. As a liberal Anglican ethnographer Grey was fascinated by native cultures. But he objected strongly to native customs opposed to British law, and encouraged Māori to adopt the best aspects of Anglo-Saxon culture. With a liberal Anglican understanding of national history and racial degeneration, Grey also took measures to protect Māori from the worst aspects of British culture. He hoped to build a new society in New Zealand, based on Anglo-Saxon culture, but free from its vices. Together, Māori and European would progress ever further up the scale of civilisation, a new and better society standing in the south as a beacon of hope and progress to the rest of the world. Grey's autocratic style of rule also served as a tool of government and a force of civilisation. He reorganised the structures of colonial authority and developed personal relationships to enhance his own authority and promote Māori civilisation at an individual level.
Grey’s network of imperialists, scientists, humanitarians and indigenous informants were vital to his programme of racial amalgamation. Spread across the empire, these men and women provided each other with practical and spiritual support. As they gathered and shared information, they also helped build the imperial archive, extending and cementing British authority in foreign lands. Grey’s correspondence with humanitarians in the APS and the Colonial Office, with Archbishop Richard Whately and with scientists like Hooker and Darwin, gave him a sense of imperial connection, purpose and authority. They provided the intellectual context for exploring ideas about race and developing racial policies. In New Zealand, local Anglican, Methodist and Roman Catholic missionaries were his most important sources of information about Māori and his most effective means of reaching Māori communities. In many ways, Grey’s first New Zealand governorship was a partnership with missionaries, based on a shared sense of mission. Māori, and other native peoples, also played a crucial role in the web. They shared and collected information about themselves, and through their responses to their native measures they helped to shape evolving colonial and imperial priorities. There were times when Māori rejected, challenged or ignored Crown authority, but in other cases their positive responses to his native policies reinforced Grey’s understanding of human improvability and his commitment to racial equality.

Many Māori accepted Grey as a father in the ways of the Pākehā. In doing so, they augmented a natural sense of authority based on family history, evangelical and liberal Anglican notions of activism and duty, his experiences in Ireland and Australia, and his commission from the Queen and Colonial Office. Grey’s sense of authority was profoundly religious. His policies often bore the influence of political pragmatism, financial expediency and personal interest, but Grey was also motivated by a Christian commitment to God’s plan for advancing human civilisation. His sense of mission was acute, directly exposed in his disobedience to particular imperial instructions, and his pursuit of amalgamation at almost any cost. Informed and supported by missionaries and Māori in New Zealand, and scientists and humanitarians around the empire, Grey believed he had uncovered God’s natural laws for human development, as laid out in his 1840 report. His sense of imperial authority and liberal Anglican duty inspired Grey with a personal mission to implement those laws through policies of racial amalgamation. For Grey, as for many nineteenth century humanitarians, devotion to God and personal ambition went hand in hand. He conducted his career in a manner designed to glorify his Maker and promote himself, understanding these processes as mutually constitutive and complementary.
Through traditionally depicted as his most successful term of public service, Grey’s first governorship of New Zealand serves to highlight strengths and weaknesses displayed throughout his career. After leaving New Zealand in 1853 he travelled home to England where he was appointed Governor of Cape Colony and High Commissioner for South Africa. Over the next eight years Grey implemented the same principles of racial amalgamation in Africa as those conceived and practised in Australia and New Zealand. He believed that the natives of South Africa occupied a lower place on the scale of civilisation than Māori, but were just as capable of improvement. In March 1856 he wrote to Donald McLean “I have plenty of work to do here—much more than in New Zealand. The Kaffirs are a fine race, black with ugly features, but with splendid figures, and I think that much may be done with them”. To hasten their amalgamation with the Dutch and British settlers Grey encouraged Christianity, embarked on public works using native labour, established and supported native schools and hospitals, appointed Resident Magistrates, created a native police force, regulated native land titles, insisted on equal treatment of black and white citizens, and fostered personal relationships with individual chiefs. As in New Zealand, he worked closely with the Anglican Bishop, particularly on native education. Grey’s efforts to improve native health and education were partially successful, but ancient tribal hostilities, tensions between Boer and British, and imperial politics served as major constraints to imposing his authority. Despite political opposition and personal suffering, Grey retained his sense of mission “to establish civilisation and Christianity in this continent, and to spread their blessings through the boundless territories which lie beyond our borders”. His sense of assurance was just as strong—“we do not doubt that we shall succeed, for the cause we labour for is the promotion of truth and knowledge, and the carrying out of God’s service upon earth”.

But two years after arriving in South Africa Grey still yearned “for New Zealand with a loss I can hardly describe”. He loved the Māori race and found his heart “wandering back to New Zealand

---
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– the Rivers and Lakes and Mountains”. In 1860 he sounded out the Colonial Office about a possible return, and in January 1861 wrote to the Secretary of State for the Colonies to confirm his desire to be reappointed to New Zealand. His request was accepted, and on 15 August Grey sailed from Cape Town for New Zealand.

Under Governor Gore-Browne and a settler parliament largely hostile to Māori interests, racial tensions had escalated dramatically. As in his first governorship of New Zealand, Grey sought to implement policies of prescriptive humanitarian inclusion. In the troubled Waikato, he established district runanga to legislate, judge local disputes and organise schools, hospitals, road-building and land sales. Grey saw the runanga as harbinger of civilisation that would convince Māori of the benefits of British rule and lure them from the King Movement. But the ‘new institutions’ failed – Grey had underestimated the strength of Māori grievances against the Crown and their growing desire for self-determination.

His other main focus was road-building. The road south from Auckland to the Waikato was hugely controversial. Historians have routinely described Grey’s road-building as a policy of war designed to facilitate the quick deployment of British troops and guns against Māori living in previously isolated territory. Realistically the road was a precaution against the possibility of war, but it was also an integral part of Grey’s plan for native civilisation. As in his first governorship of New Zealand he saw roads as the key to opening Māori land and Māori communities to the benefits of British rule. To Grey, the Waikato road was both a military strategy and a tool of amalgamation. To Waikato Māori, the road was a threat to independence and a statement of Grey’s intent to war. They refused to submit to the Queen’s sovereignty and by mid-1863 war was inevitable. For the next year British and rebel forces attacked and retreated in a series of miserable engagements with no decisive victor.
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11 Ibid., pp.133-200.
While war staggered on Grey and his ministers bickered over peace terms. They agreed on the principle of confiscation, but Grey changed his mind as to scale on several occasions and was eventually forced to accept parliament’s sweeping plans for widespread confiscation and British settlement. Understandably, historians have judged him harshly. Yet confiscation was consistent with Grey’s humanitarian plans for Māori improvement. In his first governorship of New Zealand he applied a vigorous policy of native land purchase and road-building designed to open the country to European settlement and offer Māori the advantages of British commerce and culture. In South Africa he confiscated Xhosa land for the same purpose. His Proclamation to the Chiefs of the Waikato on 11 July 1863 specifically warned of his intention to confiscate rebel land as punishment and as a precursor to peace and civilisation:

Those who wage war against Her Majesty, or remain in arms, threatening the lives of her peaceable subjects, must take the consequences of their acts, and they must understand that they will forfeit the right to the possession of their lands guaranteed to them by the Treaty of Waitangi, which lands will be occupied by a population capable of protecting for the future the quiet and unoffending from the violence with which they are now so constantly threatened.  

The Chiefs of the Waikato surrendered in August 1864 and in mid December parliament confiscated 1 200 000 acres of Māori land. Earlier in the year Grey had written to the APS to explain his position. He argued that confiscation was necessary as an example and deterrent to future wars, and as a means of ensuring ongoing peace and security for “non-warring natives” and Europeans. Though loyal tribes were promised protection, in effect confiscation was illogically applied to both loyal and rebel areas, and in many cases the staunchest rebels got off most lightly. Confiscation remains a highly controversial issue, serving to highlight the differences between nineteenth and twenty first century notions of humanitarianism. Grey’s humanitarianism was inextricably bound up with British imperialism and with notions of advancing Christian civilisation. It represents a particular cultural moment when faith and imperial concerns coalesced, finding powerful expression in a potent individual of strong convictions.

12 Governor Grey’s Proclamation to the Chiefs of the Waikato, Auckland, 11 July 1863, The New Zealander, 16 July 1863, p.3.
13 George Grey to F. W. Cheeson, 7 April 1864, APS Records 1838-88, ATL.
Far from solving racial tension, Grey’s native policies in his second New Zealand governorship set the scene for future disputes. He wrote to his brother-in-law in 1864: “I find it hard work to stand between the two excited races, and to force them each to do what is just to the other”.15 Grey still believed strongly in amalgamation, but felt the limits on his powers much more keenly than in his first New Zealand governorship.

Frustrated by his autocratic and peremptory mode of government, the Colonial Office dismissed Grey in June 1867. He returned to England in 1868, campaigning as an independent Liberal in the Newark by-election. He stood on a platform of emigration, free education, disestablishment, and Irish Home Rule, promising “to support, not merely a Liberal Government, but Liberalism in its truest, widest, and noblest sense. I desire … to advance the morality, welfare, and commerce of this vast empire”.16 Eventually Grey pulled out of the race to make way for a fellow Liberal candidate, returning to a life of seclusion on Kawau Island.

In 1874 Grey emerged from retirement to fight the abolition of the provinces. In March 1875 he was elected Superintendent of Auckland Province and Member of the House of Representatives for Auckland City West.17 Between 1877 and 1879 he held office as Premier of New Zealand. But Grey’s autocratic style was woefully unsuited to parliamentary politics. In government and in opposition he seemed unable to work as part of a team, delaying and complicating parliamentary process, and ultimately failing to pass many of the Liberal measures for which he campaigned. Grey’s parliamentary agenda was an extension of his policies of native improvement and racial amalgamation. “Give equal rights to all – equal rights in education, equal rights in taxation, equal rights in representation … equal rights in every respect”.18 As Premier, just as Governor, Grey conducted an aggressive policy of native land purchase. He was determined to shut out speculators and to continue the process of opening Māori regions to European culture and commerce.19 In 1882, with the Māori Representation Bill before the House, Grey argued that Māori should be on “precisely a similar footing to ourselves”.20 In 1888

15 George Grey to Ormus Biddulph, 8 June 1864, GL:AST:198, APL.
16 George Grey, Manifesto, 25 March 1870, cited in Rutherford, pp.582-583.
18 George Grey, 21 August 1877, NZPD, 24, p.552.
20 George Grey, 28 June 1882, NZPD, vol.42, p.82.
he joined the Māori members in opposing the Native Land Bill. Describing Māori as “a very
great nation indeed”, he emphasised the partnership agreement implicit in the Treaty of Waitangi
and denounced the settlers and the government for their greed and their unfair treatment of
Māori.21 In 1892, his last year of active participation in politics, Grey introduced a Native
Empowering Bill. Drafted with advice from a deputation of chiefs, the Bill proposed abolishing
or limiting the Land Court, restoring Crown pre-emption and establishing tribal municipalities.
Like most of Grey’s other measures, it failed to pass.22

As colonial governor, Grey had promoted Christianity as the harbinger of civilisation among
native peoples. As radical politician, he broadened the concept to apply to society in general. “If
all were Christians, the reformation of the world would be accomplished, the happiness of
mankind assured”. In age as in youth, Grey believed that God had chosen him to act for the good
of mankind: “What we are really all working for, is to secure to our fellow men their fair share of
all those blessings which our Maker has given for the use of all His creatures”. As a politician,
he sought “to establish on earth, by human laws, the actual practice of the precepts taught by
Jesus Christ, and which He laid down His life to promulgate amongst mankind.” The laws and
regulations he put before parliament were the means of “giving practical effect to those sublime
precepts”.23

In 1893, too ill to attend parliament himself, Grey endorsed Richard Seddon as the country’s new
leader. Over the next two decades ‘King Dick’ and several of Grey’s other protégés achieved
many of the Liberal reforms Grey himself had failed to pass. In 1894 he sailed for England,
leaving New Zealand for the last time.

Grey died in London on 19 September 1898, confident of God’s goodness and of “life in
death”.24 He felt comfort in the knowledge that he had worked “according to the way of my
Maker, so far as I could comprehend it”.25 Grey was buried in St Paul’s cathedral where his tomb
and bust can still be found surrounded by other British heroes of empire.

24 Milne, p.211.
25 Ibid.
Grey is the dominant character in nineteenth century New Zealand historiography. With a complex personality and a controversial career he is a polarising figure, depicted in some histories as ‘Good Governor Grey’ and in others as ‘Bad Governor Grey’. Both models amplify Grey’s agency, attributing colossal powers to an imperial official caught up in powerful structures and forces outside his control. In his first New Zealand governorship, Māori, settlers and imperial directions all imposed limits on his authority. This thesis has sought to understand Governor Grey in context, exploring the intellectual milieux in which he formed ideas about race, establishing the networks of scientists and humanitarians within which he operated, and discussing the implementation and reception of his political, economic and social measures for promoting Māori progress and enforcing Crown authority. It has shown that Governor Grey’s conception of racial equality differed radically from twenty-first century standards. He believed in the unity and potential equality of all mankind, seeing it as his mission to elevate native peoples in the scale of civilisation and achieve true equality through racial amalgamation.

In a broader sense, this thesis goes beyond the ‘Good’ and ‘Bad’ Governors to understand Grey as he saw himself, as ‘God’s Governor’. It shows that Grey’s religion cannot be ignored, minimised, or explained away. In fact, his liberal Anglican faith explains many of the controversies and apparent contradictions in Grey’s first New Zealand governorship. Grey was a Christian imperialist in an age of “imperial religions”. Recent international scholarship places religion near the heart of imperial culture. Andrew Porter argues convincingly against the twentieth century tradition which represented religion as “the flimsiest of ideological stucco on the imperial edifice”. For Grey, religion was far more than stucco, far more even than bricks and mortar. It was the animating force of his career. Future assessments of Grey, and of nineteenth century New Zealand culture, politics and race relations, must account for religion.

Grey was a Victorian hero, a Victorian ethnographer, a Victorian governor. He can only be understood in the context of Victorian social and intellectual networks, and Victorian ideas about race. His policies of racial amalgamation in New Zealand were based on liberal Anglican principles of human unity and improvability, and motivated by an overriding sense of Christian duty.
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