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ABSTRACT

In New Zealand in the 1860s, wars were fought between Maori and Pakeha over issues of land rights and sovereignty. The traditional historiography of the period has concentrated on this inter-cultural conflict and written its accounts out of what can be termed official sources and a predominantly secular viewpoint. Yet to do so is to ignore another conflict that was fought concurrently over issues of the extent of secularization, over notions of sovereignty and of Pakeha colonial identity. It is this conflict between what can be termed the ‘Church party’ and colonial Pakeha society that is the subject of this thesis.

It is argued that this conflict has been marginalized and almost completely ignored by later New Zealand historians because it is not only a conflict involving issues of religion which conflict with the secular historiographical focus of this period, but also because the primary sources for understanding the scope and extent of this conflict are the distinctly unofficial ones of the colonial newspaper and the colonial memoir and journal.

This thesis is informed and underwritten by postcolonial and postmodern theory which stresses the need to recover and include those voices and narratives previously lost and discounted by the Modernist Grand Narrative. It is out of this theoretical analysis and approach that there has been the recovery of the marginalized narratives of the conflict between ‘Church party’ and settler which formed a bitterly contested, widespread and influential second-tier conflict to the prevailing Maori – Pakeha conflict of the 1860s.

This second-tier conflict is read as an expression of both competing Pakeha sub-cultures and as another version of the colonial Pakeha experience and situating of otherness that occurred within colonial Pakeha society. This conflict was led, promoted and most often fought within the pages of the colonial newspaper throughout the whole of the colony in the years 1860-1865. It resulted in vehement expressions of anti-clericalism, in calls for the exclusion of clerics from influence in issues of politics and raised questions over notions of what being “British”, ‘civilized’ and a ‘colonist’ were thought to entail.

It is out of this context that this thesis argues that the prevailing historiographical accounts of this 1860-1865 period have ignored a conflict that is to be found in the existence of competing narratives of ‘Church Party’ and settler as predominantly expressed in the colonial press that are crucial for understanding colonial Pakeha society at this time. This exclusion has reduced a complex period to the relative simplicities of an intercultural conflict to the detriment of the important ‘second-tier’ issues and debates of the nature and future of colonial Pakeha society and identity. It is these concerns that are
the focus of this thesis which is a re-reading of the period located primarily in the unofficial sources and informed by postcolonial and postmodern theory. The result is a new understanding of the conflicts that occurred within the colonial Pakeha society of the early 1860s and which have been excluded from the historiography of the period until now.
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Sir, there is an old saying that “it’s an ill bird that fouls its own nest.” I am not much acquainted with the natural history of New Zealand, but, if I were asked what bird in this colony is most given to this dirty trick, I should, from the information I have obtained, have no hesitation in replying that it is the parson-bird.

Captain Carling, Address to his Excellency, 30 August 1860, NZPD.
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

When using primary source material I have endeavoured to stay with the spelling of the period. This means that “Maori” (plural) is spelt “Maories”, and there is variation in other words and the use of capital letters. The only variation in name that is different to the current usage is that of Governor Thomas Gore Browne. I have used what appears to be the common form of the time: Gore-Browne.

AJHR: Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives, Wellington, New Zealand.


CMS: Church Missionary Society.

LMS: London Missionary Society.

“Fact? Fiction? No, I’m not sure where the line between them lies. Only, let’s say, that it was fiction in the service of what had once been fact.”

It is a central thesis of this thesis that today we find ourselves living, writing and thinking within a postmodern world, a situation that has profound implications for not only the pursuit of history, but also for the writing of history. It is a truism, but one well worth repeating, that the choice of a methodology will have profound impact not only on the findings of any research, but also upon the presentation of those findings. What therefore will be the impact of an acceptance of the postmodern argument upon a thesis written within the bounds of history?

For a start, the postmodern argument is, in this thesis at least, an understanding that the age of giving a privileged position to a single narrative over and above others as “The Truth” has passed. That is, no longer is it intellectually credible to claim a position of dominance for your narrative in a manner that refutes as false or even as secondary the narratives of other participants in the dialogue, or conversation. For there has been a tendency for historians to claim an objective Truth for their writings, conclusions and statements, in not only what they say, but just as importantly, in how they say it. What the postmodern world has engendered has been a realisation of the

---

2 While this might be seen as the creation of a modernist straw-man, it is often important to somewhat overstate so that the difference implied by the ‘postmodern turn’ can be fully appreciated. Otherwise
provisionality of all knowledge, of all understandings and importantly, of all of our
attempts to express and communicate them, the narrative. This has important
implications for that analysis of the past that is termed History, and indeed has
occasioned a crisis of self-confidence amongst many of its practitioners; for what is it
that they are attempting to do and what is the result of their endeavours? For
postmodernity has also forced a realisation of the political and partisan nature of the
text, and especially of the history that it narrates. If Modernism resembled a latter-day
Tower of Babel, building a Narrative of The West and of Progress towards a Western-
oriented Teleology composed of a single-voiced Grand Narrative, then postmodernity
is the experience of post Babel worlds.

Traditionally, historians worked under the protective covering of a Master Narrative,
or, as it was also known, a Grand Narrative. This involved a sweeping
certainty under an over-arching canopy in which not only were the Facts objectively
verifiable and available, but they also told the Truth about the Past, how We got to the
Present - and Narrated the Progress of Human Society. In this schema, History was
Western, if not in (total) focus (i.e. written about a non-Western people or nation),

3 A succinct discussion of these issues is to be found in K. Jenkins, On 'What is History' From Carr
4 Of course this meta-narrative was more in the realms of an ideal to be aimed for and approximated
rather than the all-inclusive, definitive state which could never be reached. The grand narrative is
thus often an unacknowledged implicit methodology that is often still expressed in an irritation with,
and the dismissal of, the implications of postmodern and postcolonial theory.
5 Part of this certainty involved the use of capitalization as a means to enforce the implied dominant
universality of the terms, ideas and beliefs. In this section that follows I use this Modernist
capitalization as a means of indicating those words which signified grand narrative discourse.
6 The best analysis of this situation, and one to which I am deeply indebted in this thesis is Robert
Young's crucial text, White Mythologies. Writing History and the West (London / New York:
Routledge, 1990). He investigates not only the history of "History", but also the place and
state of history in a postmodern, postcolonial world. This means that he discusses not only
then in manner of narration (their relation to the West). Under such a schema, their history was a narrative divided along the impact of the West; from pre-contact (Western that is), to Trade, Colonialism, Independence, Progress and the like. It was also written under a Western time frame, in which the method for the division of time and the past is reliant upon a Western Christian calendar and, ultimately, belief. Even the latter day compromise of substituting Common Era (CE) for Anno Domini (AD) ("in the year of the Lord"), and Before Common Era (BCE) for Before Christ (BC) betray a Eurocentric world-view that is proving very difficult for western historiography to cast off. So the Grand Narrative is not only a method of narration, but is also implicit in the method of historical dating.

The dissident Argentinean social critic and philosopher Enrique Dussel refers to the act of conquest as an extension of "the Self". A "conquest" may begin as a physical act, but it soon encompasses and includes cultural conquest with the imposition and favouring of the conqueror's civilization, religion and "deified cultural system in its ideological Totality". This is followed by the dialectical manner of the pedagogical domination, "...for it is the means by which the cultural Totality of the father, the empire, or the oligarchy establishes dominion over another by controlling his or her analytical horizon."8

To Dussel's lists of the "cultural Totality" must also be added the academic community, and especially, the historian, for writing History has too often involved the issues of theory and historicism, but also the implications of such mythologies in political and social (and cultural) applications and reactions.

8 Ibid.
creation of a Grand Narrative analytical horizon.\textsuperscript{9} What has tended to occur (and
indeed is [almost?] impossible to prevent) is the appropriation and refraction of the
experiences of others by ourselves. That is, the historian conquers the experiences of
those being written about, by choosing what sources will be consulted, what parts of
those sources will be used - and how. Will those voices be allowed to speak for
themselves by inclusion as direct quotation,\textsuperscript{10} or will they be remade by the act of
paraphrasing, in which their opinions are captured and re-written, yet are still
attributed to ‘them’ and not you? This results in a situation where even historical
events are created by the historian - as Michael Oakeshott noted, “Historical events are
themselves circumstantial convergencies of antecedent historical events; what they are
is how they came to be woven.”\textsuperscript{11}

\textsuperscript{9} There is also an acknowledgement that even postmodern historical texts can seem to be Grand
Narratives in their presentation of a thesis. There is considerable debate concerning this without any
conclusive conclusion being forwarded (see Ankersmit & Keeler [1995], Attridge, Bennington &
Young [1987], Chartier [1997], Doray & Samuel [1993], Foucault [1988], Hastrop [1992], Heller
[1993], Hunt [1989], Jenkins [1995], Kozicki [1993], La Capra [1985], Lyotard [1984], Norris
[1990]).

Perhaps in the end postmodernity is a theoretical and methodological schema that betrays, in its
textual presentation, its links to a modernist method of presentation. Such provisionality can of course
be attributed to the ever-present ‘post-modern angst’, yet it is important to set these issues out in the
introduction so that what follows can be understood as having grappled with the complexities
presented in writing out of a postmodern world and framework.

\textsuperscript{10} Having said this, I am well aware that quotation is as much a creation of the historian as any
other narrative method invoked. For all quotations are necessarily, to a greater or lesser
degree, taken out of context; for they are always plucked out of supporting material, often
condensed and fitted in to support a narrative or theory that is often (almost always?) different to
the (supposed) original intention. That said, they at least provide the illusion that the past is
speaking to us in the present - a view challenged by Barthes’ essay “Death of the Author” (1968).
Barthes stated that the author and text were simultaneous creations and a text has no meaning until it
is read. Therefore it is the reader who ‘makes’ the text and so there are as many texts as there are
readers who read it. In other words, there is no single, ultimate meaning in any text, despite the desire
of the author to present such a singular entity. R. Barthes, \textit{Image-Music-Text}, Essays selected and
l’auteur”, \textit{Minuit} V, 1968.

While I acknowledge the difficulties posed by such an understanding, and I am very sympathetic to
its conclusions and implications, I still prefer to include quotation as an attempt to at least attempt to
allow dissident voices to be read- even if, theoretically, they can never actually be heard.

At issue is not only the process of creating history but also those about and for whom this history is created. For while history might, in the end, actually be a narrative of "the Self", it is often written as the history of the 'us' in opposition to the other. The other is that which is positioned, relegated, moved, written, spoken, thought of and represented as existing outside (or at most, on the margin) of the dominant narrative. The other is defined as such by the act of narration, its voices are denied, repressed or excluded. If the other is included it is often in the manner of a narrative dualism, where the other is there as a method of oppositional (self) definition on behalf of and for the (dominant) narrators.

Traditionally, this other has been represented and defined as the result of racial, cultural, geographical, gender and socio-economic distinctions. These have been used by the dominant narrator to define them as aberrant, deviant, secondary, or inferior, and sometimes simply other. Recognition of the existence of otherness has likewise also recognized such distinctions as having been used to articulate, promote and enforce the situation of otherness. What this has engendered has been the creation of a vast array of other histories - 'histories of the other'. So History has become histories and in the process the other has become the narrator; and sometimes (ironically, but all too often without a sense of irony) the 'Narrator of History'. That is, there are dangers that the recognition of the other can sometimes result in a situation in which the oppressed can become a narrative or textual Oppressor in and of itself. Suddenly,

12 That is, history is, as all narratives actually are, autobiographical in that even though the topic is not the historian, the author is the text (as Barthes stated). However, the text then becomes the reader when it is read by someone other than the author, because of the personal interpretation, stresses and interpretation arising from such an act. So the reader's understanding of the text is their autobiographical reading of the autobiographical writing of a fiction (in the sense that it has been created) that is commonly treated as it were, and believed to be fact (or True).
having called for toleration of dissenting voices, the other can become a textual tyrant, shouting down the new alternative voices that have been occasioned by its rise - and especially, any question from what was (and conceptually can still be) the old dominant narrative. Such dangers however, are not to be taken as a call to limit the articulation of the other; rather as a salutary warning that the creation and existence of the other is not a situation that can be said to have stopped or ended, or even, been accounted for and rectified. For any voice attempting to articulate its own narrative will necessarily and automatically create an other by method of narrative weighting and exclusion.\textsuperscript{13}

What is at issue here is the recognition and promotion of an other that that has often not even been recognised as existing (see Chapter One: THE WRITING OF “THE PAST”- AN EXERCISE IN HISTORIOGRAPHY), especially within the competing narratives\textsuperscript{14} (let alone the still all too prevalent Grand Narrative)\textsuperscript{15} of the New Zealand Wars. For the history of the Wars has not only been almost exclusively concerned with the physical conflict between Maori and Pakeha, but is also predominantly secular in both tone and concentration. If religion or Christianity (the two being seemingly mutually inter-changeable terms of description and reference\textsuperscript{16})

\textsuperscript{13} The weighting of a narrative is the degree to which it focuses its attention and text upon certain topics, people, ideas and concepts, in comparison to other or competing ones. This results in narrative exclusion, the limiting or even refusal of a narrative to not only encounter, but represent the other. All texts, by virtue of a necessitated limit (no text can be all-encompassing or eternal) practice narrative weighting and exclusion; the question is rather do they acknowledge this situation and attempt to explain the ‘how of their why’ and the ‘why of their how’?

\textsuperscript{14} The competing narratives in this case being the broadly titled Maori and Pakeha (both an oversimplification and reductionist approach) narratives for the narrationes) of the New Zealand Wars.

\textsuperscript{15} This is history that sets out to ‘simply tell the tale’, of which Cowan’s \textit{The New Zealand Wars} is the premier example within the context of this thesis. It could be argued that Belich’s \textit{The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict} is itself (although revisionist) in danger of becoming a new Grand Narrative - such has been its impact in the last decade.

\textsuperscript{16} It is interesting, and important, to note that in popular discourse, the generic term religion is often interchangeable with the description of and reference to a specific expression of religion: Christianity. On the one hand this signals the existence of a Christian Grand Narrative, whereby the particular becomes the representation of the universal. On the other, it also signals a certain degree of
are mentioned, then it occurs in a discussion of either how the Wars collapsed the Maori Church, or of how the wars created new forms of Maori religion such as Pai Marire. Occasionally there might be mention of how the action of Bishop Selwyn ‘and his missionaries’ in becoming army chaplains was responsible for Maori rejecting Christianity (itself a very simplistic and reductionist statement - but surprisingly common); and, very rarely, to Archdeacon Octavius Hadfield of Otaki writing some pamphlets to London opposing the conduct of the Government in the Waitara war. These presentations do however relegate such action to the marginalia of history, to the margins of historiography, and to footnotes of the dominant, secular, dualistic narrative of Maori and Pakeha.18

Yet this thesis is concerned with the narratives created by, and imposed upon, this hitherto marginalized and excluded other ‘other’. It is an attempt to articulate a suppressed and ignored narrative of ‘church and politics’, a narrative that played a far greater and influential role in the conflict of the Wars than has been acknowledged by later generations of historians. It is a narrative that includes at its heart the questions of land rights and sovereignty; the issues of freedom of speech and of critique; and the issues of the role, and expectations of that role, that Christianity and its public representatives (the clergy) were to play (and be allowed to play) in the new colony that was attempting to define itself.

---

17 A common misunderstanding since the Church of England missionaries were responsible to the CMS and not to Selwyn, which itself was often a source of some internal problems within the life of the Anglican Church in New Zealand.
It is therefore the narrative of the experiences of an other, but in a sense, of an 'other other' or a 'double other'. The reason for such a complex description is that New Zealand was a colony that was starting to articulate the beginnings of what could be termed a 'post-Christian' sensibility. This is not to say that Christianity had little or no impact within the Colony but rather that not only was there a separation of 'Church and State', but also a predominant indifference to organized Christianity, if not a total secularization, apparent in the attitudes and actions of the colonists. In this situation, Christianity, the churches, and the clerics (and missionaries) were a tolerable other. That is, as long as they supported and spiritually underwrote the colonial narrative and endeavour there would be little direct criticism of them or their activities. If however they raised their voices in opposition, then the critiques of this action, and of them, would occur. It is the contention of this thesis that the statements and actions of a small (but proportionally over-influential) section of this other (the 'Church Party'), not only created a situation where they were an intolerable other, but also unleashed dormant hostilities towards the tolerable other as a totality. It is in this context that the 'Church Party' can be termed an 'other other' (other to even the tolerated other of the churches, clerics and missionaries who supported the settler narrative), or 'double other' (in that their degree of otherness was doubled).

18 Chapter one investigates the historiography of this period and discusses in detail the many examples whereby both the 'Church Party' and the settler response have been both ignored and suppressed.
19 By New Zealand is here meant the entity created by the declaration of colonial status, and that created by the influx of European colonists.
20 The term 'Church Party' was interchangeable with 'Missionary Party', 'Episcopal' or 'the Bishop's Party' (referring to Bishop Selwyn) in the newspapers, reports and correspondence of the period. As it was predominantly composed of Anglican clergy and laity, the nomenclature 'Church Party' reflects residual notions, imported from the British context, of who 'the Church' were. I choose to use this most common term of reference, except in quotation when the other forms may be used.
In this situation, the 'Church Party' often appeared to take on the form of an enemy of influence to the dominant settler narrative; seen as a second enemy, conducting verbal, intellectual, and paper warfare against the settlers at the same time that actual warfare was being conducted with Maori. This second war was a home-front war, conducted in the pages of the public media (the newspapers), in pamphlets, in parliamentary speeches and reports, and in that ephemeral world of conversation, argument, gossip and innuendo. It also had a foreign front that was a “Home” front, in that the ‘Church Party’ used contacts and influence “back Home” in Britain to lay their narrative before the evangelical lobby- groups of ‘Exeter Hall’, before the Colonial Office and the British Parliament. This conducting of a war on twin fronts was of major concern to both the settlers and their government (and Governor), for they felt at a significant disadvantage to be able to counter what they believed were missionary stereotypes of “greedy, bloodthirsty settlers”. Allied to such concerns was what can be termed the settler’s sense of the tyranny of distance, in that the wars in New Zealand were being fought literally half a world away from those sectors of British society (parliamentary and evangelical) that attempted to dictate and control the situation in New Zealand - and to do so in a manner that appeared (to the settlers) to be overly-reliant on missionary misunderstanding and willful misrepresentation.

It was also a ‘war’ in which lay members of the Church of England fought with their clerical leaders and representatives, and a war in which clergy and missionaries fought amongst and against themselves, both within and across denominational boundaries. It was a war in which anti-clerical attitudes were given full and violent expression in the nation’s newspapers, and a war in which a small and informal body (the ‘Church Party’) appeared to possess an influence out of all proportion with its size. It was a
war that demanded and took a great deal of contemporary attention - and yet it is one that has been effectively written out of the histories of the period. It is also a war that, if reported in a later history, has been written with a view to promoting the correctness of the ‘Church Party’ view, yet has dismissed the scope and scale of this war - and its impact upon the wider issues. Therefore it has been a one-sided, simplistic representation, that has effectively silenced and ignored the reactions, views and opinions of the vast majority of settlers, to whom the ‘Church Party’ appeared to undertake the role of “traitors”.

As a counter to such ‘mis’- and under-representation, this thesis makes use of the notion of conflicting and competing narratives\textsuperscript{21} not only to represent the various responses to and out of the ‘Church Party’, but also as a way of attempting to express the multi-narrative nature of the Wars. These narratives reflect the diversity of opinions and responses that can be discerned at this time within the settler community, and sets them within wider narratives of the colonial background, a narrative backdrop of the Wars themselves, issues of churches and newspapers, and also within a narrative of theory. For these narratives only occur within both a narrative of theory and the pages of this thesis - the boundary of creation. As such, any collection of narratives have some self-imposed limits, and the one that is most obvious concerning this thesis is that of the other participants in the Wars: Maori.

\textsuperscript{21} It is acknowledged that the term narrative is one fraught with possible mis-readings and misunderstanding. That is, it could be read as signifying the existence of a unified body of opinion in a manner that just becomes another meta-narrative. However, in the understanding that history is the collision and discussion of competing points of view that may be collected together (for the sake of communal coherence) under the nomenclature of narratives, I use this term to indicate bodies of representative (if not closed and final) opinions. The term ‘competing narrative’ is a shorthand for naming the broadly delineated groupings that were opposed to each other’s interpretations of events.
It is one of the snares seemingly existent in New Zealand historiography that one cannot write a history today without having to include a ‘Maori component’. While I support and endorse the promotion of the inclusion of Maori history within the narratives of this country, (for history will only ever overcome its Modernist Grand Narrative limitations and become postmodern when it includes the narratives of others), I fear that there is a danger in making such inclusion a new orthodoxy and a new Grand Narrative that means such history is included not because it is needed but because ‘it has to be’. That is, history becomes ensnared in a dualism that can all too easily become as simplistic and narratively limiting as the old monism of Grand Narrative History. Take for instance the focus of this thesis, the suppression and exclusion of a narrative. The issues involved are actually those of and within the Pakeha community. This does not claim, nor does it want to be, a complete and inclusive history of the Wars or of New Zealand at this time. It is part of the postmodern hermeneutic of suspicion that such attempts are fatally flawed in that they incline too readily towards a Grand Narrative. Such references to Maori history as are made within these narratives are those situated in and from the Pakeha narratives that are of interest and focus to this thesis. For this is a thesis concerned with Pakeha narratives, and Pakeha otherness. There are important, crucial and still suppressed Maori narratives concerning the Wars, and the churches - but this is not the place, nor am I the historian, to narrate them. For as Dussel’s view of conquest makes clear, to create a history *for* Maori is to operate still within a colonial mind-frame.22

22 It is here that history ventures into the complex world of political correctness. This thesis does not ignore the existence of Maori in the issues that are discussed, but it is also a thesis that is concerned with issues that are between members of the Pakeha community. It is because the dominant historiography has been of such a dualistic focus that the issues of inter-Pakeha conflict in this period have been almost totally ignored.

23 This is not to say that Pakeha cannot be part of the process of narrating and creating Maori historical narratives. However, if they are involved in this process then this requires a high degree of
So I acknowledge that any references to Maori history in this thesis are both provisional and, by nature of my being Pakeha, a narrative of otherness. The same situation arises if, as a male, I make reference to women’s history, as heterosexual to gay or lesbian history, as middle-class to working-class or upper-class history. My attempts to write a narrative reflect and are reflective of my context (race, gender, sexuality, age, class and religion, and nationality). They are also reflective of both the theoretical age / context (postmodern) and date (late 1990s) in which I am writing. This is thus another articulation of the provisionality of this (indeed, I would argue, any) thesis. So there are two points at issue here. Firstly, the Maori history of the Wars does not fall within the (necessarily) self-imposed limitations of this thesis; but secondly, it is also not my history to tell. So I can include elements or portions of narratives written by other historians, but I cannot, in intellectual good faith, create a new totality of the other in today’s historiographical context. To include what I do is, I acknowledge, guilty of the appropriation of the other, but is unavoidable in the New Zealand historiographical context. What is avoidable however, is the still all-too-prevalent colonialist impulse to write a history of and / or for the other. For history is always enough of a fiction anyway, without those from the previously (and often continuing) dominant narrative writing a ‘fictive’ (i.e. created) narrative of those excluded by that dominant narrative.

It is also important to outline the theoretical underpinnings of the postmodern understanding of historical narratives that have informed the methodology of this thesis. The debate on the nature, form and function of a historical narrative has become...
a crucial area for postmodern historiography as historians seek to wrestle with the perennial question of "what is truth and how is it represented?" While the question may no longer be articulated in such a form in the current theoretical environment, it is the underlying issue that confronts historians when they not only encounter the sources from the past but also seek to represent their own opinions and conclusions in the present.

THE NARRATIVES OF THEORY

(AND THEORY OF NARRATIVES)

Among the many claims of the provocative French academic Michel Foucault was one that "History protects us from historicism - from a historicism that calls on the past to resolve the questions of the present." 24

As with most of Foucault’s claims, there is a certain initial frisson that occurs when one reads this - for surely history is involved in calling on the past so that we can better understand the now, the present? Is that not the raison d’être of ‘history’ - to understand how we got to the present ‘now’, by the actions of the past ‘then’? Yet the historicism that Foucault critiques is the belief that in the past there resides a Truth than can and will explain not only then but also, now. Rather, Foucault has stressed the need for “effective” history, that which introduces discontinuity, division, multiplication and instability. It is a history that “uproots” traditional foundations and relentlessly disrupts “its pretended continuity”. 25 As he states:

be told “this is your history”.
25 Ibid., p.89. “Nietzsche, Genealogy, History"
We want historians to confirm our belief that the present rests upon profound intentions and immutable necessities. But the true historical sense confirms our existence among countless lost events, without a landmark or a point of reference.\textsuperscript{26}

What this comes down to is the notion that there was not, and is no necessity of events, occurrences, actions and outcomes. That is, there is no pre-determined, pre-existent meaning - then or now, that can be read into what occurred. Indeed the whole notion of what occurred has to be open to critique; where both the “what” and the “occurrence” are recognized as highly personalized, subjective readings and narratives.

It is here that the influence of Derrida makes an impact, with both his stress on the metaphoricity of language and the metaphysical nature of history. The two are related in that metaphorocity is in itself a metaphor for the inability and impossibility of language to establish and express presence - “the unmediated expression of absolute, timeless, and determinate truth”.\textsuperscript{27} The other way in which they are related is, as Robert Young states, that “the meaning of history always relates to the history of meaning”.\textsuperscript{28} These statements have profound implications for historical narratives - the act of attempting to tell and explain the “past”. For what occurs when we write “history” - in what sense, to what degree can it tell or explain? What is contained within the history expressed; especially when one recognizes (and creates) the existence of competing narratives? For even the narrative itself, though one amongst

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Ibid.
\item R. Young, \textit{White Mythologies. Writing History and the West}, p.64.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
many, is itself a creation, a compression of disparate events, actions, peoples and perspectives into an attempted coherency.

Hayden White has defined historical narrative as

necessarily a mixture of adequately and inadequately explained events, a congeries of established and inferred facts, at once a representation that is interpretation and an interpretation that passes for explanation of the whole process mirrored in the narrative.29

Such a position involves the disavowal of the reality of anything that might be called History in itself; rather, it states that the historical narrative is the inferred creation of the historian - author. It is from the work of White and others in a similar philosophical strain that we arrive at the notion of the fictive nature and element of history.

At first this appears to be diametrically opposed to what History “is”. For History was / is (?) concerned with occurrences - that which happened. Of course traditional History was not so bold as to state that truth and facts of these occurrences are just ‘there’, readily available and waiting. Neither did it claim that there is a direct correlation between the “facts” of these occurrences and how the context /object / subject of these (i.e. the ‘nation’) ‘told’ them. Yet there were two underlying assumptions that traditional History did tend to perpetuate. The first was a general assumption that the events do / did possess “a certain transparency or privileged visibility” that could either be told in a ‘good’ or ‘bad’ “way”, depending on the interpretation.30 The second is that a definitive explanation could be written, an

understanding that would be a Grand Narrative that told the Truth of what occurred. This is the problem of single narrative history.

So while there was at least a recognition of the narrative element of historiography — there is still the problem, as Stanley Monas reminds us that

Most Twentieth Century historians, including those who exult in their story-telling abilities, are still telling Nineteenth Century stories... [compared to a Twentieth Century story such as James Joyce's *Ulysses*] (which means they lack)...a simultaneously layered sense of time.31

In other words, History still tends to lack an appreciation of the multi-contextual, multi-vocal, inter-subjective nature of existence - and of the sources used to narrate a history. There are still many examples of the single narrative history - “the story of...” school, that which presents events as Facts which serve a single narrative and interest group. There are two main elements to such a generic approach, the first is that it will privilege a perspective32 as a Grand Narrative; the second is that it gets the ‘events-facts’ relationship the wrong-way round. This can be explained by looking at the newspapers, perhaps the prime exemplars of “the story of...” school.33

In any reported situation, there is a dual tier of “events”. On the one hand, there is the occurrence, the action, the statement; this though, if it is to be known, has to be reported. In this stage it has become a cliché that ‘journalism is the first draft of history’ - and as Roger Chartier notes, the “construction of meaning” can as readily

---

32 Even ‘history from below’ can fall into such an Imperialist Narrative trap by making claims for its Narrative over and above, and to the exclusion of all other narratives.
apply to journalism as to history. This involves the plural determinations of strategies of writing and publishing, both the possibilities and constraints of the forms that carry the discourse and the competency, practice and expectation of each community of readers or spectators for whom this is constructed - and who construct it again for themselves. What this means is that selection and interpretation will take place and "we are dealing not with a world of unassailable facts but with provisional accounts." It is here that "the story of..." school misreads the 'events-facts' relationship. For while 'some-thing' has indeed occurred, this is actually a fact and not an event. It is a 'fact' in the sense that it can be verified or corroborated, in the most general or broad sense. But it is not an event until it is described, for it is important to remember that the fictive, imaginary dimension in all accounts of events does not mean that the events did not actually happen, but does mean that any attempt to describe events (even as they are occurring) must rely on various forms of the imagination.

The "story of..." school fails to take account of this, viewing and presenting the event as fact. Whereas the actual sequence of events is fact → event → interpretation. In the newspaper, the reporter may be involved at either event or interpretation stage - which is as involved as any of us can ever be. For even if we are personally caught up as a participant of the fact-occurrence, our viewing, our relaying of this, makes it into

---

33 This is not to equate history and journalism. However the role of newspapers in the creation and articulation of a modern historical consciousness is an important one. Their articulation of interpretation as fact is often read as a narrative of what actually occurred.
an event. A choice is then made - by an editor, a reporter, a writer, often to suit both the argument or viewpoint presented, and the perceived opinions of the receivers. If the work is presented as a voice or articulation of (an) authority, these interpretations often become “the facts”, or “the truth” that a community responds to or with; yet as Chomsky warns, the “choice of sources can shield extreme bias behind a facade of objectivity”.

This is not only a situation confronting the journalist, but one that challenges the historian, who often fails to recognise that the facts are constructed by the type of questions asked of the phenomena that they (choose to) encounter. It is also a situation confronting the reader of books and newspapers - to what degree do they read within a conscious hermeneutic of suspicion - or is it rather, often within a hermeneutic of confirmation - as the texts of the “imagined political community” we call a ‘nation’? For it is the newspaper that, in a pre-electronic age, acted as a form of imagined linkage, joining together those disparate communities and people, most of whom never knew, met or heard of each other. The newspaper(s) provides the “image

---

37 The American philosopher Richard Rorty writes of the distinction between acknowledging that there is a ‘world out there’ and that ‘truth is out there’. This is because, he argues, that only descriptions of the world can be ‘true or false’ - the world by itself, outside the descriptive sentences of humans, cannot.

R. Rorty, Contingency, Irony and Solidarity. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p.5. In arguing this, Rorty fails to acknowledge the provisionality of those ‘true or false’ descriptions. The contextual-communal discourse ‘truth’ may be there, but so will the contextual-communal discourse ‘falsity’ - that which is held, and believed by those in opposition. For the ‘fact’ itself is a creation of language, so it is a fiction. It is a ‘linguistic artifact’, a ‘verbal object’, the coherence and intelligibility of which is made, not found by our “exploiting the grammatical, syntactical and rhetorical capabilities of language.” (This is different from a Fictional invention)


39 H. White, Tropics of Discourse, p.43.

of communication"41 in their minds, an “extra-ordinary mass ceremony”42, that continual reassurance “that the imagined world is visibly rooted in everyday life...creating that remarkable confidence of community in anonymity which is the hallmark of modern nations”.43 In other words, it creates a level of public truth, or rather, a public narrative that a community can respond to and with. This may often differ quite markedly from the proto-fact - and even perhaps from the event - but it becomes the public narrative that provides a communal consensus and identity.

What is needed, from a latter-day historian’s perspective, is a realisation of the textual creation of reality - and history. This approach, arising out of the realisation of the post-modern condition,44 and strongly influenced by recent literary theory, can be called “The New Cultural History”.45 This has engendered a recognition of the active role played by “language, texts and narrative structure” in both the creation and description of what becomes “historical reality”.46 This is especially important when the historian considers the prevailing perceptions and interpretations, the conflicting narratives that circulate within a distinct historical time and place. For it is these contextual creations and interpretations that the communities (the narrative participants) act to, within, and upon. Indeed these narratives also create the context out of which they themselves are created: under-girding perceptions, supporting

---

41 Ibid.
42 Ibid., p.38.
43 Ibid., pp.39-40.
44 As Keith Jenkins states “…we now just have to understand that we live amidst social foundations that have no legitimating ontological or epistemological or ethical grounds for our beliefs or actions beyond the status of an ultimately self-referencing (rhetorical) question. K. Jenkins, On ‘What is History’? From Carr and Elton to Rorty and White (London & New York: Routledge, 1995), p.7.
45 This term arises out of a Conference on “French History, Texts and Culture” held at the University of California, Berkeley, April, 1987; and the subsequent volume: L. Hunt, ed., The New Cultural History.
46 L. Kramer, “Literature, Criticism and the Historical Imagination”. pp.97-98
preconceptions, illustrating and elucidating predominant opinion - that process which Chomsky calls "the manufacture of consent". Yet as Robert Young reminds us, Foucault brought to our attention that "where there is power, there is resistance: contrary to what is often assumed, it is the absence of resistance which is possible." This resistance is also textually-contexted and created - the opposing narratives to the dominant discourse, the differing fact→event→interpretation sequences, all occurring in a process very similar to that in which Roger Chartier describes and defends the use of quotation. For like quotation, the narratives of resistance (or competing narratives), by undertaking choice and comparison, give new meaning to speech from out of the archives. (These archives can be the latter-day repositories of textual collections - or the contemporary existence of alternative fact→event→interpretation sequences). This new meaning no longer illustrates a continuation (a regularity), rather it "indicates the irruption of a difference and a gap". It is in this difference, this gap that the "text", in a sense, often becomes / does become the event. As Kramer notes:

the text / context dichotomy radically de-emphasizes the fact that the context does not simply exist as a pre-linguistic reality that language faithfully describes. On the contrary, reality is "always already" situated in or shaped by textual processes that historians prefer not to remember.

---

47 N. Chomsky, Necessary Illusions, p.47. He makes the interesting point that the primary targets of such an operation are those who regard themselves as "the more thoughtful members of society", the 'intellectuals', the "opinion leaders". This fits into the stress given to the settler narrative in the colonial newspapers (linked, as Day states, to a colonial elite) - and, with the 'Church Party' lobbying of Parliament and pressure groups in Britain.

48 R. Young, White Mythologies, p.87.


50 L. Kramer, "Literature, Criticism and the Historical Imagination", p.114.
The situation is, as Keith Jenkins states, that "histories are fabricated without 'real' foundations beyond the textual..."\(^{51}\)

It is insights such as these that force historians to acknowledge both the fictional and creative elements of their narratives. What is stated as occurring \textit{never did}, except within the text of their narrative. The same applies to journalistic endeavour - and indeed, to any narrative. In discussing the past, historians are discussing \textit{their own} creation - for the past does not simply exist - and \textit{never} existed in that manner except in that particular presentation. Likewise, events do not simply exist. There is an occurrence (the fact), but the noting of this, which results in their existence is always an interpretation. Therefore, for the distanced public, as indeed for the historian, the existence of events and the past arrive in the form of "texts and textualized reminders" - memoirs, reports, published writings, archives, monuments and so forth.\(^{52}\) This relationship is also present in other narratives, such as those between newspapers and their readers. All are taking source information (that is itself an interpretation) - and interpreting it further themselves. This can either be in the historian's creation of a narrative - or the reader's response to the narrative presented in the newspaper. All of which results in a situation whereby "communication is a symbolic process whereby reality is produced, maintained, repaired and transformed".\(^{53}\) Yet all too often, this reality is either taken as being the same as the fact-event relationship - or not as important as the fact - both of which are unreachable from the present day. The fact-event relationship is unreachable because it only exists for the immediate creators of it; - for everyone else, there must be added the element of interpretation. Indeed, in the

\(^{51}\) K. Jenkins, \textit{On 'What is History'? From Carr and Elton to Rorty and White}, p.179.
act of change from fact to fact-event it has become a narrative. Likewise the fact is unreachable, because for the historian it can never occur without the qualifier of event being joined to it - otherwise we would not be aware of it. Therefore, the narrative is what constitutes the reality of an event for the vast majority of people, especially when they lack (access to) competing, authoritative voices. The narrative is therefore of vital importance for any attempt to understand the past, to articulate the present and to desire a future – for “histories are written with a desired future in mind; we do indeed always have the past we want because of the future we desire.”

However it is not only histories that are written with such an aim - narratives too have a future-indicative component; explaining the present in order to justify and (hopefully) induce a desired future.

So my focus is that of the interaction between the Pakeha churches and Pakeha society in colonial New Zealand during the Wars of the 1860s; specifically the years 1860-1865 and the conflicts in Taranaki and the Waikato. The narratives that follow are attempts to examine the issues of church and Pakeha society that arose, and the elements and examples of otherness that were expressed within the settler discourse of the period. I firstly set the boundaries by critiquing the examination of the issues central to this thesis in New Zealand historiography. This exposes an ignorance not only of the issues of ‘Church and State’ in this period, but also the tendency to write history out of official documents and so to ignore that issue which aroused considerable debate in colonial popular opinion, that of ‘priests in politics’. In order to

53 J. M. Carey, Communication as Culture, p.23.  
54 K. Jenkins, On ‘What is History’? From Carr and Elton to Rorty and White, p.61.
understand the New Zealand context an examination of the colonial background must occur. The state and place of Christianity in Britain is examined as well as the issues behind the colonial expansion to New Zealand. For the issues of the 1860s do not arise in isolation but are indicative and a response to a developing debate on ‘Church and State’ in both Britain and in the emergent colony. This is followed by a chapter outlining the theoretical underpinnings and methodology used in this thesis – particularly a discussion of the examples and implications of the analytical tool and term of ‘other’. Following this is a brief discussion of the two underlying influences crucial for this thesis; the emergent debates on ‘Church and State’ in New Zealand and the existence of an influential and widespread colonial fourth estate of the newspaper.

I then turn to what could be termed the scholarly consensus on the Wars of 1860-1865. This is provided as a background to the latter alternative readings of this period that follow. This means that the final chapters can be read within both a historical and theoretical framework. These chapters contrast two alternative readings of the events, issues and personalities involved in this inter-Pakeha conflict: the ‘Church Party’ and the settler. The aim is twofold: firstly the articulation of a body of material and opinion that has never before been represented in New Zealand historiography to this degree. Secondly, to examine the reasons why there was such a violent clash of opinions, yet a clash that has been steadfastly ignored in the histories of this period. The reasons for this are discussed in the conclusion.

It is important to state that these narratives and conclusions are provisional - and my re-creations. This is not to deny their importance for a new understanding of the 1860s, but to caution that they are not to be read as a new, alternative meta-narrative.
For they are one possible interpretation - the creation, articulation and suppression of otherness within the Pakeha settler community of the period. They are also the recreation of what I term a hidden and excluded history and a hidden and excluded war. That said, as always, a historical narrative is that of what *might have been* - but never of what was...
James Belich, in a typically assertive and provocative statement, recently remarked of the historiography concerning early missionary endeavours in New Zealand that “missiology and hagiography are still too closely related”.¹

The point of Belich’s critique is that historians have traditionally been over-ready to accept the missionary narrative as the best representation and account of the past. This has resulted in a willingness to privilege both missionary accounts and actions when writing the history of early colonial New Zealand up to the crucial juncture of 1840. That is, that missionaries were too often uncritically represented as ‘the good guys’ in a dualistic opposition to the ‘bad whaler / trader / settler’, with Maori often reduced to a paternalistically-created enclave of the noble savage, to whom and on whom these opposing forces of European extension impacted.

Yet it is an anomaly of New Zealand historiography that these missionaries, represented as crucial to any understanding of the history up to 1840, all too often suddenly seem to fade away after this date. As this investigation will show, the missionaries tend to be side-lined in the writing of the past, or, significantly, continue to receive the hagiography treatment from historians writing from within the Christian tradition. So for an interested reader attempting to gain some measure of understanding as to the
questions, events, issues and personalities arising from the topic of this thesis, two main approaches soon become clear. With the proviso that I am here concerned with historical works written this century, I have created a stock-pool of thirty-two texts that would, I feel, provide the basis of the majority of attempts undertaken to investigate this period. The two main approaches alluded to are that firstly, for ‘secular history’, the churches and religious functionaries played a minimal role in the events, opinions and narratives of the Wars; and secondly, for ‘religious/church history’, the role they played might have been greater, but the focus is on a clergy-driven history and lay opinion and reaction receive little, if any consideration.

My thesis is a refutation of these general approaches, a claim that churches and religious functionaries played a far greater and more important role in the events, opinions and narratives of the Wars than secular history has traditionally allowed. It is my contention that a crucial experience of articulating, debating and delineating ‘Church-State’ relations in New Zealand has been overlooked. As much of this debate occurs within the public realm of the colonial newspapers this means that there is a

2 While there are a large number of books written on the Wars and the colonial experience from the nineteenth century (see Early Published Works in the bibliography), my concern here is with twentieth century texts. These, having relied to a far greater extent on research and sources than previously-prevalent reminiscence/memoir/descriptive style, attempt to provide a far more detached, and less partisan approach. They are also far more readily available to my hypothetical average “general reader”.
3 By secular history I mean all that written from a non-church perspective. That is, the history by historians as compared to church historians, those histories not written about churches, denominations, or individual clerics and missionaries. In comparison, church history or religious history is often partisan, in that is often written by a member of the faith / church or denomination under review, and so is often underscored with a certain element of belief. Of course there are always secular historians who have written about elements of church history and vice-versa, which create an interesting third category of work. But for this investigation the delineations are that secular history is that not concerned with religion or religious personages, while church or religious history is that which is - whether written by believers, agnostics or atheists.
need to focus on the lay opinion and reaction to a far greater extent than that with which Church history has traditionally concerned itself.

To set the scene for the investigations and conclusions of the following chapters, I propose to examine my thirty-two texts with the general aim of considering what they say about clerical/missionary involvement and settler reaction to this during the New Zealand Wars 1860-1865. To do this, I have divided up my texts into three groupings: general historical works, church / religious histories, and war histories. This will be followed by reference to the two main texts concerned with the history of newspapers in New Zealand. Of course any choice of texts is, to a greater or lesser extent arbitrary, however I have attempted to include both the authorities or ‘greatest hits’ of the historiography of these areas, and some lesser works that are still readily available. I shall work through each grouping in chronological order and then attempt some preliminary comparisons and conclusions of the general themes that become apparent.

1: the “History” of “New Zealand”.

Keith Sinclair remarked in his autobiography that when he was commissioned to write *A History of New Zealand*, the Australian historian Keith Hancock advised him to ‘write it under an apple tree’. As Sinclair states, it was “good advice. Such a book, for the general, educated reader, should not be based upon detailed research notes”.

---


The result was a text that created a history. As Sinclair wrote, at this time "there were virtually no books based mainly on New Zealand sources"; rather there was "imperial history", created out of British sources on New Zealand, such as New Zealand Company Records, or Governors' despatches held in the Public Record Office. What Sinclair did was to create a history "seen through New Zealand eyes".

This is a telling comment, for his "New Zealand eyes" appear to have little time or interest in the issues or impact of either Christianity or religion once the State is founded (1852) and the Pioneers arrive. In the chapter concerned with "The Pioneers", religion is granted a ten-line paragraph, but is hastily dismissed as being basically too "difficult" an issue, and anyway, of "doubtful" influence. This is underscored with his conclusion that the humanitarians (linked into English evangelicalism) failed in the New Zealand context, despite their "noble aim", because they could not offer a solution when settler and Maori aims proved to be incompatible. Such a sidelining is reinforced when, in discussing the conduct of the Wars, there is an extremely brief, passing mention of "a vocal minority of dissentients", of whom Sir William Martin and Octavius Hadfield are mentioned by name, but that is all. So for forty years, readers dependent on Sinclair, could draw the conclusion that there basically was no church opposition to 'the Wars', that religion had no place to play in that narrative. In fact, both "Christianity" and "Church" receive no mention in the index, and "Religion" is only mentioned in the reference discussed. Therefore,

---

7 Ibid.
9 Ibid., p.130.
10 Ibid., p.134.
Sinclair’s history was an extremely secular one, and appears to have set the tone for most works that have followed.

However, all have taken their own slant on the issue of the churches and the Wars. The year after Sinclair’s ‘Ur-Narrative’, Bill Oliver published The Story of New Zealand. Sinclair attempted to put it in its place, stating in his autobiography that “His book was not more popular than mine” and that it had “a different emphasis” of British origins, compared to his own cross-comparison of New Zealand with Australia and North America. Oliver however does make passing mention to the strength of resentment that Hadfield, at least, raised amongst the settler community, and notes also the influence of Hadfield’s mission upon both Wiremu Kingi and two unnamed “spiritual children of Hadfield’s” who, it is claimed, “conceived the notion of the Maori King”. Yet in line with Sinclair’s work, the general reader could easily gain the impression that the Wars elicited little, if any, church involvement or controversy, and that the Christian influence and impact upon New Zealand society was basically limited to the early days of missionary activity.

This is an impression unchallenged by the third text, one in which there could be expected some expression of ‘Church Party’ existence and opposition, J. Rutherford’s

---

11 Such a designation is my own description of the role Sinclair’s text seems to have played in popular consensus. It achieved an unrivalled status as both a university and school text for decades and underwent many reprintings and revisions.
14 W. H. Oliver, The Story of New Zealand p.83: “Hadfield, who was to become a clerical traitor in the eyes of inflamed settlers, had urged the need for Maori to keep his lands.”
15 Ibid. Oliver appears to be referring to Tamihana Te Rauparaha (1785-1876) and Henare Matene Te Whiwhi (?-1881). Following Te Rauparaha’s journey to England in 1851-2, he and Te Whiwhi traveled the North Island in 1853 urging the adoption of the idea of a Maori king so as to protect Maori land. However, both men became opposed to the movement they had helped to create when it turned from pacifist protest to violent conflict. This resulted in their opposition to the raising of the Kingitanga flag at Otaki in 1860.
Sir George Grey. This is old-style imperial history, an exhaustive (709 pages), in-depth, somewhat pedantic and pedestrian chronicle of Grey’s life and times; yet one in which the missionaries and clergy / church appear to have a minimal impact and role to play in the conflicts of the 1860s. This is somewhat surprising in that Rutherford’s text is subtitled A Study in Colonial Government. For the Colonial Government in New Zealand at this time was strongly lobbied by both the ‘Church Party’ and various church organizations during his second term as Governor. It does however help to perpetuate both the trend towards a strongly secular interpretation of New Zealand’s history and the predominant view that the only period of religious influence of note in New Zealand life (apart from the issues of women’s suffrage) was the pre-pioneer period up to about 1850.

This being noted, it is interesting to contrast this imperial history (written by an Englishman), with one written by a New Zealander, W. P. Morrell’s British Colonial Policy in the Mid-Victorian Age. In his preface, Morrell provides an indication as to the focus of his investigation, referring to an interest in how colonial policy was affected by the personalities of British officials, colonial governors, “British public opinion” and “the developing self-consciousness of the colonies themselves”. This reference to “public opinion” and “self-consciousness” is to prove crucial, for Morrell takes seriously the issues of ‘Church Party’ involvement. This is expressed in his discussion of the opposition of both Selwyn and Hadfield to the Government’s

---

18 Ibid., p.viii.
19 Morrell was a member of the Anglican Church and later wrote a history of that Church in New Zealand.
policies. Morrell not only mentions the infamous Otaki Petition of 1860, which called for Gore-Browne’s recall, but is also prepared to state that though Hadfield denied being its originator “it is difficult to believe that he was not cognizant with it and known to be in sympathy with it”. He also mentions Hadfield’s pamphlets and includes a reference to his role in effecting the committee of inquiry into the Waitara dispute. This opposition by the “missionary party” is investigated in greater depth further on in his book. Reference is made to Hadfield’s and Martin’s pamphlets, and the fact that the New Zealand Government felt it necessary to respond. Mention is also made to the “missionary party” venture of privately publishing extracts from their letters, and he concludes this section by stating

...the main point the critics were seeking to make had undoubtedly been made. The British public were made aware that the justice of the war was challenged in New Zealand.

This statement exposes the focus of Morrell’s work. For although he takes seriously the issue of “missionary party” opposition (and by the use of such a term acknowledges its existence), the focus of his thesis is such that the reaction amongst the general New Zealand population is ignored.

It is important to note in passing a text from the 1970s that although contributing to the investigation and general historiography of the Wars added little to the religious knowledge of those times. This is a somewhat guarded criticism, for the author

21 Ibid., p.247.
22 Ibid.
23 Ibid., pp.258-61.
24 Ibid., p.261.
obviously believed that his focus lay elsewhere. Kerry Howe has elsewhere written with understanding and sensitivity on issues of colonial Christianity,\textsuperscript{25} but he fails to really address the issues of religion in his *Race Relations Australia and New Zealand*.\textsuperscript{26} While he does stress the importance of “amalgamationist” thinking for the humanitarian / missionary world-view,\textsuperscript{27} he claims that humanitarians failed because of “their lack of influence and opportunity to combat public opinion and the demands of the settler dominated legislatures.”\textsuperscript{28} While this may well apply to the Australian experience, the New Zealand situation was rather more complex, especially up until the invasion of the Waikato and the subsequent rallying of the majority of the ‘Church Party’, in an albeit resigned manner, behind the banner of civilization. In many ways, it was the actions and opinions of the ‘Church Party’ that created the vociferous deluge of public opinion during the Waitara campaign - and their influence not only contributed to the committee of inquiry into that dispute, but also helped press for Governor Gore-Browne’s recall, the return of Grey, and the hardening of British opposition to the Wars.

We now turn to what could be called the second stage of New Zealand historiography, the publication in 1981 of *The Oxford History of New Zealand*.\textsuperscript{29} Described as “a social history”, its limitations and secular bias are observable in the introductory statement that

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{25}This includes his Auckland MA thesis on the missionary John Morgan, and a consideration on the possible martyrdom of Volkner. See P. Lineham’s *Religious History of New Zealand: A Bibliography* (Palmerston North: Department of History, Massey University, 4\textsuperscript{th} edition, 1993), pp. 76 - 77 for references.
\item \textsuperscript{27}Ibid., pp.31-35.
\item \textsuperscript{28}Ibid., p.51.
\item \textsuperscript{29}W. H. Oliver with B. R. Williams, ed., *The Oxford History of New Zealand* (Oxford: The
a broader principle pervades the book: the principle that a society reveals itself in those activities commonly classified as political, economic, technological, intellectual, and artistic.\(^{30}\)

While I have no quibble with the inclusion of these categories (though I would also include sport amongst such self-revelatory activities), it is the exclusion of religion from this list that I find (perhaps somewhat naively) surprising. Of course religion, Christianity and the missionaries are not missing from this text, but what is missing is any in-depth analysis of what religion / Christianity entailed for colonial New Zealand. As always there is a plentiful examination of the issues and impact of Christianity of, on and for Maori; yet in the chapter on “Settler Society”, Jeanine Graham discusses settler religion without entering into the specifics of what this entailed, and fails to mention the settler - ‘Church Party’ conflict of the 1860s.\(^{31}\) M.P.K. Sorrenson’s chapter “Maori and Pakeha” provides a different response, mentioning the collapse in the unity of Maori-Pakeha Christianity, the existence of Protestant missionary opposition to annexation, then their acceptance of it - and attempts to protect Maori interests.\(^{32}\) However he then follows this with what can only be termed an understatement of startlingly minimalist proportions:

> With the outbreak of war in 1860, several missionaries defended Wiremu Kingi’s claim to the Waitara. But as the war intensified and spread, the missionaries fell silent or supported the European side, they had to withdraw from war-torn districts, and their missions collapsed.\(^{33}\)


33 Ibid., pp.171-2. While it is an educative experience to see one’s area of focus and topic of thesis
Such fleeting reference is repeated later in his chapter, this time Martin and Selwyn are granted the honour of personal mention, unlike Hadfield who becomes merely one of “several of his missionaries”; thereby misrepresenting the complex relationship between Selwyn and the CMS. Again there is the minimalist summary, this time mentioning the spying of Morgan and Volkner (and Volkner’s death), Morgan and Selwyn’s duties as army chaplains, the “strenuously pro-government” Wesleyans and the death of Whiteley in 1869. This death seems here a direct result of the Wesleyan position, ignoring the circumstantial complexities of the issue. The Catholics, it is stated, were (correctly) unjustly suspected of spying for Maori. Yet all this takes up little more space or reference than this (almost unnecessary) paraphrase. Again the general reader could be excused for believing that religion / Christianity played little role in pioneer society and was not an issue (let alone an issue of note) in the wars of the 1860s - except, perhaps, for Maori. Pakeha history it seems, is secular.

Claudia Orange, in her seminal work, *The Treaty of Waitangi* provides an alternative view. In her impressive and wide-ranging investigation of the history of interpretations and expressions of the Treaty from 1840, she takes seriously the existence of ‘Church Party’ opposition (although she does not use that term) to the Government over Waitara. She views such opposition as an attempt to safeguard the principles of the Treaty. This was the underlying aim or focus, although ‘treaty-

---

reduced to an aside of 44 words, Sorrenson falls into what seems to be the representative New Zealand historiographical trap of basically denying the importance and impact of religion / Christianity / the churches on and in New Zealand society once the first few decades of the nineteenth century have been passed.

34 Ibid., p184.
35 Ibid.
language' was a very distant second to that of 'land rights'.\textsuperscript{37} While stating that Hadfield spoke before the House of Representatives in 1860,\textsuperscript{38} she does not mention that he was ordered to do so - and why (the accusations that he had knowingly withheld letters from Kingi to Gore-Browne). Likewise, while mentioning in detail Martin's \textit{The Taranaki Question}, one could easily gain the impression that he was acting independently, for there is no mention of his involvement in the 'Church Party'.\textsuperscript{39} Orange does however mention the existence of a "missionary campaign" of opposition, both in New Zealand and in Britain. Significantly, she mentions the opposition of the settlers to 'priests in politics', the questions they raised concerning the focus of missionary loyalty and their criticisms of the encouragement such action gave to the Maori opposition.\textsuperscript{40}

In 1990 there appeared another attempt to provide a comprehensive (a 'Grand Narrative' ?) History. This one was the representation of two histories, those of Maori and Pakeha between 1820 to 1920. Like so many other general histories, any mention to the 'Church Party' is fleeting in \textit{The People And The Land Te Tangata me Te Whenua},\textsuperscript{41} but at least Judith Binney's summary is succinct (if somewhat limited in its geographical scope). Mentioning an Anglican missionary "campaign" in support of Kingi, she states

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid., pp.153-55. While the 'Church Party' might have preferred the terminology of 'land rights', that of the settlers (and increasingly of Maori) was that of 'sovereignty'. That the missionaries were to later fall in behind the settler rhetoric raises an interesting question regarding such terminology. For while the 'Church Party' viewed Waitara and Waikato as completely different issues and conflicts, the majority of settlers and Maori appear to have viewed them as part of one, on-going conflict of sovereignty - as Orange states on p.3.

\textsuperscript{38} Ibid., p.153.

\textsuperscript{39} Ibid., pp.154-55. Martin was certainly the most prominent lay-member of the 'Church Party' and he and Selwyn could be described as co-leaders. Hadfield, although the most out-spoken and prolific member, was too independent in his actions and opinions to ever be called a leader.

\textsuperscript{40} Ibid., p.154.

\textsuperscript{41} J. Binney, J. Bassett, and E. Olssen, \textit{The People And The Land Te Tangata me Te Whenua. An
Local feeling in Taranaki was outraged at the clergy for interfering. Politics and religion, they said partisanly and when it suited them, should not mix. 41

However the text fails to follow up this point. Again, an issue that caused widespread controversy is relegated to a passing mention. 43

In 1996 there appeared the first of a projected two-volume ‘New Zealand History’. James Belich decided to widen his area of expertise from that of Maori-Pakeha interaction in the nineteenth century to a general history of New Zealand from the advent of Polynesian settlement to the present day. His first volume Making Peoples, 44 covers the period from that settlement to the close of the nineteenth century, all in his typically lively style, and is concerned with the notions and actions that construct both Maori and Pakeha - and that fabled creature, ‘the New Zealander’. It is important to consider this book for, if any book will (or at least aims to) knock Sinclair’s classic A History of New Zealand off its popular pedestal it will be this text. 45

43 At least that is more than is included in two other texts that the “general reader” might consult. Miles Fairburn’s The Ideal Society and its Enemies. The Foundations of Modern New Zealand Society 1850-1900 (Auckland University Press, 1989), is so concerned with the promotion of his thesis as to the ‘atomized’ world of colonial New Zealand that the issues of the wars of the 1860s fade into the background, while any clerical opposition fails to gain any mention at all. Hadfield’s only mention is in reference to his use of the term ‘vagabond’ (p.246), while Selwyn, for this history, did and said nothing of note and so fails to gain any mention.

The situation is reversed in The Oxford Illustrated History of New Zealand, 2d. ed., ed. K. Sinclair, (Auckland: Oxford University Press, 1996). Here there is no mention of Hadfield, while Selwyn is apparently only worth mentioning for his founding of the Melanesian Mission (p.296). As far as James Belich is concerned, in his contribution to this text, “The Governors and the Maori (1840-72)”, there was either no Pakeha opposition to the Government’s policies during this period, or rather, it does not rate a mention. I shall comment further on this bias in Belich’s work.
45 There are a couple of reasons that I make this claim. Firstly, Belich, through his work on the New Zealand Wars has achieved that very rare position of both popular and academic distinction. He is
My concern with this book is an echo of what I will discuss when looking at his *The New Zealand Wars*. That is, his interpretation of these conflicts is a (almost) completely secular one. It is important to note that in amongst 450 pages of text, Selwyn receives only a single mention (p.438), Hadfield does slightly better with two (pages 168 and 231), while Sir William Martin is also reduced to a solitary reference (p.323) and that is in reference to ‘keeping up appearances’. In other words, these major players of the conflicts of the 1860s are again reduced to fleeting shadows on the sideline. When he does turn to a discussion of the wars (Chapter Ten: *Conquest?*) there is only a fleeting mention of role and impact of the missionaries and the ‘Church Party’. In discussing those who supported the war but were not primarily motivated by a desire for Maori land, he includes “most missionaries”; while Hadfield gains a mention as a notable member of the “few dissenting voices” to the invasion of the Waikato. This is somewhat perplexing in that there was a far greater level of opposition (including that by Hadfield) raised to the Waitara incident and the first Taranaki war, yet this is not mentioned by Belich. So yet again, the general reader would be left with the (false) impression that there was little, if any church opposition to the conduct of the New Zealand Wars - or that the churches had any significant involvement in and on the struggles of nineteenth century New Zealand. There is only a brief mention of the colonial churches under the sub-heading “Ties That Bind” towards the conclusion of the book. Here it is in the context of a proposal that

most probably the best known historian to the person in the street - or classroom - especially since his television series on the New Zealand Wars was screened in 1998. Secondly, *Making Peoples*, although scholarly, has a lightness of touch, an obvious enjoyment of history that is all too rare. Thirdly, in reducing the whole history of New Zealand to two (attractive) volumes, Belich has produced a work that people will buy because they want to- in that it is making claims (perhaps inadvertently) for a certain ‘definitive’ status.

46 J. Belich, *Making Peoples*. p.230. Also on this list are South Island settlers, the governors, the Australian colonies and the imperial government. This is part of his thesis that myths of Empire and settlement provided a dominant, driving motivation.(pp.230-231).
“organised religion was not enormously strong in colonial New Zealand”,\(^{48}\) and only serves to reinforce the strongly secular nature of Belich's narrative.

Belich's work therefore does replicate the exclusively secular stance of Sinclair's work. This is an oversight for in writing such a text, Belich is, to a certain degree, 'writing a new country' in that just as Sinclair's "history" became changed in the popular view from the personal ("a history...) to the public ("the history...), so most probably will occur a public acquisition of this personal narrative. What this means is that the past becomes as secularized as the present, with any mention of the impact of the churches relegated to those church histories that are all too often regarded as the institutional variations on family histories.

The "New Zealand" histories are thus strongly representative and indeed supportive of a secular reading of the history of New Zealand. In these, the Wars were purely, it appears, a conflict between Maori and Pakeha, and were only physical battles. For our hypothetical general reader then, these texts provide a narrative that excludes the churches, that provides a reading of New Zealand as a secular country and reflects a state of mind (at least amongst the 'historical academy') that is indifferent, if not hostile to the input, impact and impressions that organized religion had upon settler society. Yet there must surely be an 'alternative narrative', one that takes, or at least considers, the role of the churches in a more serious and detailed investigation.

\(^{47}\) Ibid., p.231.
\(^{48}\) Ibid., p.438. The discussion covers pages 437-439 and is a rather hurried and uneven précis that seems to want to say that the churches are really of little consequence to the overall history of New Zealand, though perhaps most noteworthy for the impetus they gave to regionalism especially for Otago and Southland.
Therefore a decision was made to refer to those texts that come under a general heading of church history - those narratives of and by the churches in New Zealand.

2: "...a minor aspect of social history..."?

In his review of New Zealand's religious historiography, Peter Lineham concludes that

Too easily religious history has been seen as a minor aspect of social history with no significance in itself. On the contrary it has been a powerful and influential factor in the lives of people and of the community.\textsuperscript{49}

In these two sentences he effectively critiques the historiographical past of New Zealand - the blinkered approach that relegated and still does relegate religion to the historical margins and its writing to a historiographical ghetto. Yet, as he is keen to state, the problems for religious history are also partly the result of the approach of religious historians\textsuperscript{50} who under-conceptualize the position of religion in a society founded "on an explicitly secular basis".\textsuperscript{51} This has meant that religion has tended to occupy its own space, unrelated to social and political history, even though "in both instances the overlaps are significant".\textsuperscript{52}


\textsuperscript{50} There is a difference between a religious historian and a historian of religion. The first implies a historian writing from within a faith or church and who was the predominant writer of religious history. Theirs was a (necessarily?) partisan approach, of the "story of..." school, that most often wrote denominational histories and biographies. The second implies most of those working within the realms of academia today. This is not to say that they are not, or can not possess a religious faith or belong to a church (it is rare to find any that do not); but rather their concern is to avoid the partisan approach and the ghetto mentality of the past. Their history is rather one branch of that conceptual ‘hold -all’ called History, and is concerned with the issues of, and engendered by, religion.

\textsuperscript{51} C. Davis and P. Lineham ed., \textit{The Future of the Past. Themes in New Zealand History}, p.5.

\textsuperscript{52} Ibid., p.4.
So while the historiography on religion in New Zealand is large, the published focus of this still tends to be rather exclusive in both topic and focus. That is they are all too often in-house works, that might fulfill the function of partisan narrative, but tend to shy away from an evaluative critique. This is because such an evaluation falls outside the nature of their self-imposed critique. That is, they are histories of the minutiae and the mundane, of great interest to those who wish to see names in print, fulfilling a function of community narrative and mythology, but of little interest to those outside that immediate community. So there are many histories of churches and clerics, but all too few of the religion and society interface and interaction. This is compounded when our "general reader" decides to investigate how religious history chooses to tell its side(s) of the New Zealand Wars.

Again the emphasis is on those readily available texts, published in the twentieth century. Of these the most obvious starting point, if only for the extreme self-confidence of its spine title (New Zealand Church History) is H.T. Purchas' *A History of the English Church in New Zealand*. This is a narrative of the Church of England, not, as the author warns, a constitutional history - "it seeks rather to depict the general life of the Church, and the ideals which guided its leading figures". Purchas divides his narrative into short blocks of time, within which he narrates the concerns, issues and personalities of that period. His style is gentlemanly and elegant, yet concerned to tell a good story. This results in his devoting two separate chapters to the period of the

---

55 Ibid., p.v.
Wars: Chapter XIII, “Trouble and Anguish (1859-1862)”, and Chapter XIV, “Ruin and Disaster (1862-1868)”.

Both these chapters are shot-through with a sense of regret and sorrow, yet, allowing for the partisan perspective, these were, for seventy years the most readily-available in-depth narrative of the involvement of the ‘Church Party’ in the Wars available. His discussion of the Waitara begins with his use of the Naboth (Kingi) and Ahab (Gore-Browne) analogy, in which he implies that Whiteley (unnamed) acted as ‘Jezebel’; a role he attributes to “the ugly serpent of sectarian jealousy”.\(^{56}\) Purchas mentions the opposition and “indignation” of Selwyn, Hadfield, Martin and “others”, and the effect that their actions engendered (pages 177-78). He also quotes Henry Williams on the vehemence of opposition to this grouping:

> Of the feeling of the old ministry and their partisans, there was no mistake: ‘Hang the missionaries and bishops for having caused the rebellion’.\(^{57}\)

When Purchas turns to the Waikato campaign, he is careful to state his high opinion of “the high moral character of the king-movement”.\(^{58}\) The reason for this soon becomes clear when he introduces a discussion of Pai Marire, which he alludes was very similar in its beginnings to Islam.\(^{59}\) This leads to a detailed narrative of the Volkner incident,

\(^{56}\) Ibid., p.174.  
\(^{57}\) Ibid., p.179.  
\(^{58}\) Ibid., p.185.  
\(^{59}\) Ibid., p.187, “Like the Arabian Mohammed, Te Ua was considered to be a person of weak intellect; like Mohammed, he claimed to have received his revelation from the Angel Gabriel; like the Arabian prophet again, he put forth a mixture of Judaism and heathenism which sanctioned polygamy, and whose propagation was to be carried on by the sword”. Purchas actually begins his book with a preface which traces the rise of Western Christianity to the “Moslem barrier” (p.1), which “drove the faith of Christ from Asia and from Africa, but it kept it ‘white’”. As such, Purchas is presenting a notion of double otherness; not only were Hauhau not like the ‘good’ Kingitanga, but they were also similar to the other of the “Mussulman”
which stresses the heroism of T. S. Grace. This section (pages 188-194) is couched in the language of the other. So we are immediately presented with the contrast between the “fanatics” and the “fair-haired, blue-eyed German”(p188); with Hauhaus who indulge in “wild orgiastic dances” and were “working themselves up in the Roman Catholic chapel to a devilish frenzy” (p.188). Volkner goes quietly to his death, the aftermath of which is described in shocked detail. Grace meanwhile stoically endures, until the arrival of Selwyn and a mysterious Captain Freemantle on H.M.S. Eclipse (p.192-3). Of Captain Levy, who actually owned the Eclipse and was at the time credited, as now, with effecting Grace’s rescue, there is no mention.60

Purchas’ text is an admirable attempt to provide a Grand Narrative, right from the wording on the spine to the sweeping narrative covering church life in New Zealand from 1805-1914. He certainly provides a greater concentration on the issues and concerns of the Wars than Morrell’s ‘history’ some sixty years later. What is interesting and important is that in many ways Puchas’ text is (using Lineham’s critique) ‘related to both social and political history’ in a fashion not replicated (in a national critique) until Davidson’s Christianity in Aotearoa of 1990; and how it relates religion (admittedly that of the Church of England) into the issues of ‘social and political history’ in a manner and comprehensiveness that no secular text has yet attempted, let alone accomplished.

(as he terms them on p.2).

60 Freemantle receives no mention of any kind in Scholefield’s two-volume Dictionary of Biography (1940), or in any volume of the DNZB. Yet in S. J. Britain, G. F., C. W., and A.V. Grace, ed., A Pioneer Missionary Among The Maoris 1850 - 1879 (Palmerston North: G.H. Bennet & Co, 1928) which is composed from the “Letters and Journals” of T.S. Grace, not only is there mention of a Captain Freemantle (who appears to operate a steamer, and not a schooner such as the Eclipse was) but also a photograph of this man (p.148) who, in the text occupies only two passing references on
A similar, though more specialized and localized account of religious history is Eric Ramsden’s *Rangiatea*.61 This is first and foremost a ‘biography’ of the church built at Otaki between 1848 and 1851 and which was destroyed by fire in 1995. It forms part of our survey because one of the principal members of the ‘Church Party’, Octavius Hadfield, was based as a missionary in the Otaki area from 1839 until 1870 (excepting five years of ill-health spent in Wellington 1844-49). *Rangiatea* deserves the designation of a classic,62 and it is also an important historiographical work because Ramsden was the first to publish extracts of Hadfield’s correspondence with the CMS and to his family.63 It was also an attempt to ‘write a wrong’—to rescue Hadfield from “among New Zealand’s forgotten men”,65 for, as Ramsden wrote in 1951 (yet could have been written in the present day), “New Zealanders of today (including the Maori people) know little of what they owe to Hadfield”.66 Ramsden devotes fifty-four pages and three chapters to the issues and events of the Wars, not only quoting heavily from Hadfield’s correspondence, but also, and somewhat uniquely (especially for a religious history) consulting, quoting and referencing newspaper sources from the period.67 He uses the *Wellington Independent*, the *New Zealand Spectator and Cook’s Strait Guardian*, and the *Australian and New Zealand Gazette* to back up his narrative. These chapters provided the best secondary source on Hadfield until Lethbridge’s (partisan) biography of 1993, and it is still one of the few texts that takes seriously and examines in detail the aim, focus and method of Hadfield’s opposition to
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62 Lineham in his *Religious History* (1993) calls it “an outstanding classic” (p.131)
64 That is, to write a history that corrects a contemporary mis-interpretation.
65 Ibid., p14. Reading secular history I have the impression that for most of the New Zealand public, and even for many historians, Hadfield is still “forgotten”.
66 Ibid.
the Government’s policies, and the response this aroused amongst the settlers. That stated, Ramsden’s account is, while acknowledging Hadfield’s somewhat difficult character, still very much a partisan history. This is the result of not only the book’s focus, but also the time in which it was written. The chapters on the Wars are very strongly clerically-driven; lay opinion, let alone lay opposition, is rarely mentioned. The biography of Rangiatea becomes, to a predominant extent, the biography of Hadfield; while the narrative of the Wars is really a combination of the narrative of Hadfield’s wars, interspersed with Hadfield’s narrative of his wars. This is not a criticism, for the “general reader” has much to thank Ramsden for. Yet it is important to note this in light of other biographies of Hadfield that were to follow, for they follow the same presentation. What this means is that Hadfield is all too often presented in hagiographical form, and so, in a somewhat strange manner, the only pervasive Grand Narrative across both secular and religious historiography appears to be the allusions to “St. Octavius”. That said, Ramsden’s work is important for presenting a particularized church narrative of the period - and for giving ‘Church Party’ opposition a level of recognition that it had not enjoyed for almost a century.

It is certainly a quite different work to the partisan ‘family history’ by Hadfield’s great-granddaughter, Barbara Macmorran in her Octavius Hadfield of 1969. This is an example of the Hadfield the lone defender thesis. From reading Macmorran’s

---

67 This extremely rare occurrence of quoting the public opinions of the press is most probably the result of Ramsden’s employment as a journalist on newspapers in both New Zealand and Sydney.
68 This is because Hadfield’s actions and opinions support the revisionist opinions of both secular and religious historians. That is, his opposition is presented as being how any intelligent and brave person should have responded and acted at that time. This has resulted in a concentration on Hadfield and his supporters, with any mention of opposition being attributed to the ‘greedy, bloodthirsty settler’ or ‘thick-headed Gore Browne’ of popular mythology.
69 B. Macmorran, Octavius Hadfield (Wellington: David F. Jones Ltd. 1969).
70 In reference to his opposition to the Wars, Hadfield was apparently ‘an almost lone voice in the
book one could be excused for believing that opposition to the Wars consisted of Hadfield alone, with little and occasional support from others. She is also overly reliant on long verbatim quotations from Hadfield’s writings and correspondence and so provides an exercise in humanitarian apologetics that, although important for a primary-sourced clerical history, continues the problem of the under-representation of any dissenting views.

The other biography of Hadfield likely to be consulted by our “general reader” is also a hagiographically-inclined work. Christopher Lethbridge’s *The Wounded Lion*[^1] is a detailed work that divides up his life into a chronological description of periods of years. He takes seriously the opposition to Hadfield, including the differing sympathies of the Methodist and Anglican clerics, but replicates the ‘man alone’ thesis.[^2] For him to state that Hadfield “was the first man to act as ‘the conscience of the nation’”[^3] is to severely discredit Maori - and to express a surprisingly Eurocentric concept of nation.

While Lethbridge provides a good running commentary on Hadfield’s writings, he is somewhat inclined to understate the degree of opposition that this writing aroused from the New Zealand colonists. Thus we read that in 1860 “Octavius was having a difficult year” (p.191) and that “Many people called him a traitor” (p.191). That said, it is still a useful text for the “general reader” in that it provides a detailed history of the ‘Church Party’ line and arguments. But, again, there is the clerical emphasis entangled...
with the belief that the liberal humanitarian narrative is the only correct one, and that any opposition has been so proved to be wrong that it is not worthy of considered investigation.

To fail to adequately note, investigate and represent this competing narrative of Pakeha settler dissatisfaction and anger is a major problem for New Zealand historiography, both secular and religious. It may resurrect attitudes and actions uncomfortable to the liberal academy but these are voices and narratives that have contributed to our present-day narratives of nation. As such they need to be properly acknowledged and critiqued in both an academic and a popular context. The alternative is to have a division into two competing histories with the academic concentration on a particular reading leaving the populist field open for the race-baiting bigotry of a Stuart Scott, who is as guilty of one-sidedness as most latter-day academics and authors on this period. The result is that too often historians present the liberal humanitarian argument as a fait accompli, which, ironically is the same attitude that so distressed the settlers when they were attacked, both in New Zealand and in Britain, by the ‘Church Party’ and ‘Exeter Hall’. For, too often the writing of New Zealand history has presented a certain degree of smug superiority favouring the present over and against the past in a manner that expresses a Modernist notion of progress and social evolution and is too often represented in what can be termed the ‘Progress of New Zealand Grand Narrative’. That is, with hindsight, these academics

73 Ibid.
74 Stuart Scott achieved a certain notoriety with his two muddled and historically naive attacks on the Treaty of Waitangi and race relations in New Zealand found in The Travesty of Waitangi (Dunedin: The Campbell Press, 1995) and Travesty after Travesty (Christchurch: Certes Press, 1996). These proved popular amongst a certain aggrieved constituency in New Zealand, who were offered simplistic interpretations and statements in an attempt to disprove and attack the findings of the Waitangi Tribunal.
are writing a history that is intensely moralist in tone and reducing the settlers to the status of unacceptable other, in the process comparing them extremely unfavourably to the current opinions and attitudes of the academy which are often presented in a fashion than appears to invalidate competing views.

Such a selective interpretation of the past is evident in John Evan’s biography of Bishop Selwyn, *Churchman Militant.* In his introduction, Evans states that his aim is to “deal with his life in detail [and] to assess his significance to the Church today”. Such an attempt was deemed necessary for, since Tucker’s two volume biography of 1879 those works which had been written had not measured up to a competent biography. Evans’ work is certainly competent, written, as he says, by a “warm admirer of Selwyn”. This however somewhat limits his overall representation of the situation encountered in the period of the Wars. There is a separate chapter devoted to a discussion of this period, entitled “CHAMPION AND PEACEMAKER” which, from the start, propounds an attitude of paternalism towards Selwyn’s relationship to and defence of Maori rights: he was “the champion of the race in its struggle for survival in a contest in which they were ill fitted to take part...” This is followed by the recitation of a number of instances when Selwyn took it upon himself to act as a “mediator” and “conciliator”, while the settlers are reprimanded because they “did not

---

76 Ibid., p.9.
79 Ibid., p.78.
pay more attention to their bishop’s words”. Evans’ practice in this chapter is to quote in detail from a number of sources as a method of advancing his narrative. In the main these are all highly partisan in support of the bishop; for example, in presenting an evaluation of the “Maori Wars”, Evans quotes half a page from Sarah Selwyn’s reminiscences, which only briefly mentions “much obloquy” and the throwing of “real as well as abusive stones” because “We were all highly unpopular”. But it all worked out for the best in the end: “All things come to him that waits” and “It was amusing to see how mistaken opinion came round…” This is important for it points to a body of potential evidence that has been ignored in the historiography of the wars.

Evans’ account is a highly selective and positive one. In his presentation, there might have been opposition, but all were eventually won over by the irredeemable goodness and character of this episcopal hero. In a sense it reads like a boy’s own annual version. Evans’ stated concern to relate Selwyn’s life and work to “the Church today” led him to conclude this chapter with a call for “those who revere the memory of Selwyn” to “turn their attention to the needs of a race” (Maori) amongst whom “The Church is losing ground” (“Mormonism and other strange faiths have to a great degree ousted the influence of the Church”), yet is showing “a tremendous increase in numbers” and “to whom the Welfare State now seems the greatest boon that the European has brought with its vast accession of material prosperity”.

80 Ibid., p.85. This is in reference to his Pastoral letter to the New Plymouth settlers in 1855. As many of the New Plymouth settlers were actually Methodist (in background if not practice), the sweeping nature of Evans’ reference to “their bishop” betrays a certain perspective at work.
81 Ibid., p.87.
82 Ibid., p.98.
After encountering such a selective text, it is evident that there is a need for a more balanced evaluation of the life and work of Selwyn. Luckily for our "general reader", such a text is at hand, the excellent collection of revisionist essays *Bishop Selwyn in New Zealand 1841-68*. Of these, of special note and interest to this thesis is Kerry Howe’s comprehensive "‘The Bishop Alien’: Selwyn and the New Zealand Wars of the 1860s.” This investigates not only the events, but also the attitudes of the period, including those of both the humanitarians and the settlers. This is perhaps the first detailed account of the strength of opposition encountered by Selwyn and the ‘Church Party’, mentioning their being labeled as “traitors” and also how the Church of England and CMS missionaries “were represented as pro-Maori and anti-settler, opposed to European colonisation, and disloyal generally”. Howe is also able to provide the first real critique of Sewlyn’s linking of his humanitarian ideals to the pursuit of the ‘war for civilization’ undertaken in the Waikato. Therefore Howe’s is a revisionist critique, and is the most thorough examination of the ‘Church and the Wars’ currently available. It forcibly and ably sets out the views of Selwyn and the ‘missionary party’. That said, it is naturally not so strong on settler opposition to such views and actions, nor does it express just how determined this was - or why.

An alternative is W. P. Morrell’s thorough and official history: *The Anglican Church in New Zealand. A History*. Morrell devotes a chapter to “The Church and the Maori Wars” and notes that "the Bishops and almost all the missionaries espoused the

---

84 K. Howe, "‘The Bishop Alien’: Selwyn and the New Zealand Wars of the 1860s.” in *Bishop Selwyn in New Zealand 1841-68*, p.104.
85 Ibid., p.109.
Maori case...", but after a brief discussion states "The points at issue cannot be discussed here" and refers the reader to his *British Colonial Policy in the Mid-Victorian Age*. There is mention made of the incident on New Plymouth beach in 1861 when Selwyn was verbally attacked by a mob of settlers, and he does compare Selwyn's attempt to eschew politics "as far as possible" favourably against Hadfield "who had no such inhibitions" and who "with a touch of arrogance,...claimed the credit when Browne was superseded". Morrell's work on colonial policy is evident with his mention of the impact the 'Church Party' agitation made upon "public opinion in England and even on the Colonial office," yet as to public opinion in New Zealand there is only passing mention. There is also the impression that Morrell thought such action by Bishops and clergy somewhat injudicious, as he states:

This political intervention of the Anglican clergy is unique in New Zealand politics, but it is doubtful if it increased their influence on the destiny of the Maori people.

He does note the greater division in clergy opinion once the Waikato campaign commenced, and the growth of Maori opposition to them and their action as army chaplains. But, being an official history, it is far more concerned with the effects of the Wars upon the Maori church than it is in investigating and representing the strength of the nation-wide disapproval and upset that the political actions of the church leaders evoked amongst their own Pakeha laity, and the settlers at large. This is a common omission and approach and must, I conclude, arise from a lack of familiarity with those
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87 Ibid., p.73. He does at least mention the differing perspectives on the conflict between those of the Government ("about sovereignty") and Maori and Church Leaders ("a quarrel about land").
88 Ibid.
89 Ibid., p.74.
90 Ibid.
91 Ibid., p.75.
sources of Pakeha public opinion, the colonial newspapers. For Maori disapproval is evident in the collapse of their church during and after the Wars, the attacks on missionaries and the rise of alternative religious expressions. The strength of settler opposition (as distinct from the official opposition easily found in Parliamentary reports and records, and Governors' despatches) is, in the general frame of New Zealand historiography, only ever really alluded to. This is a symptom, dare I say it, of an unwillingness for historians to not only read widely in the newspapers of the period, but to also acknowledge the important (I would say crucial) role that they provide in representing the common (or day-to-day) concerns and opinions of the 'settler in the street'.

A text that is concerned with settler opinion is Hugh Jackson’s *Churches & People in Australia and New Zealand 1860-1930.* However, the nature of this book, focusing upon the experiences and variations of religious *practice* mean that though it is interesting and informative as background reading, it contains no mention of the role or involvement of the churches in the New Zealand Wars of the 1860s. So it is an entirely social Church History concerned rather with immigration, revivalism, identity, Sunday doctrine and the family. The omission of the Wars is somewhat surprising, especially given the starting point of the text’s historical investigation. It could, I suppose, be argued that politics lies outside the brief of what is a social religious history, yet that is to perpetuate the common perception that church involvement in the Wars was only the result of a few missionaries and bishops complaining and acting as

---

military chaplains; and which anyway had little impact upon settler society. So while Jackson’s is an important work, it is also very disappointing in its self-limitations.

The perception of our “general reader” as to the general quality of church texts that are available will be forced to undergo a revision by Allan Davidson’s *Christianity in Aotearoa.* Because its ‘first call’ is as a tertiary text, this employs an over-arching Grand Narrative approach to ‘Christianity in New Zealand.’ Its frame of reference stretches from pre-contact Maori religion to issues of Church and Society from 1966-1990. It does become somewhat a roll call of names and issues, yet is also the most comprehensive text yet available, and in its breadth of issues and concerns outweighs many general, secular histories. Davidson includes a separate chapter on “The Church And The New Zealand Wars” which has a two paragraph discussion of “An Anglican lobby” opposition and settler reaction to this. This mentions a settler sense of “betrayal” and the “Considerable hostility towards both the Church and these individuals” that occurred. There is also noted the criticism in England towards “what was seen as interference in politics by church leaders”. The reader is directed to a later chapter, “Women’s Contribution To Missionary And Colonial Christianity” where mention is made not only of the involvement of Sarah Selwyn, Caroline Abraham and Mary Martin in the ‘Church Party’ with their husbands, but also of the inclusion of their letters in the 1861 volume *Extracts of Letters from New Zealand on the War Question.* This is contrasted with what is given as representative opinion of the majority of settler women, Maria Atkinson’s scathing critique of ‘Church Party’

93 A. K. Davidson, *Christianity in Aotearoa. A History of Church and Society in New Zealand* (Wellington: The New Zealand Education For Ministry Board, Wellington, 1990). Specifically commissioned as a tertiary text on New Zealand church history, the paucity of general material on this issue available to an interested public resulted in its more general availability.
94 Ibid., p.41.
95 Ibid.
96 Ibid.
views and actions. Davidson's text also provides mention of the general change in church opinion towards Kingitanga, the impact of the Waikato War on the churches and the various Maori religious responses.

Yet valuable as this book is, it is not designed to be read alone. As well as a comprehensive selection of texts for "Further Reading" supplied at the end of each chapter, the reader is directed to the primary source documents contained in Transplanted Christianity, a collaborative effort by Allan Davidson and Peter Lineham. As well as an in-depth array of selections from primary source documents, there are also important introductions provided to each section of selections that attempt to set the scene for the documents that follow. In chapter three "Christianity And The Maori 1850 - 1985", there are four sub-sections and seventeen documents relating directly the 'Churches and the Wars', while their introduction mentions "the irreconcilable division between the settler and the missionary points of view". There is also mention of the Wesleyan support for the settlers, to Hadfield and his pamphlets, and to the existence of a "missionary party". The other introductions are also fine, succinct summaries, while the documents themselves are an extremely valuable resource for not only the "general reader" but also for any historian concerned with this period. However the problem arises again that, for period of the Wars at least, the documents provide a church view. That is, they tend to be clergy-driven narratives while the

---

97 Ibid., p.76.
98 All discussed in Chapter Five of his text.
99 Those for the chapter on the Churches and the Wars would provide a very useful general understanding of the issues, although again they fail to adequately express and discuss the full extent of lay and public opinion as to church involvement. Kerry Howe's essay in the important Bishop Selwyn in New Zealand 1841-68 is a notable and curious omission from Davidson's list.
opinions and critiques of a lay-settler response are lacking. That said, if read in tandem with *Transplanted Christianity*, then our “general reader” would have a detailed and broad understanding of the church account of the issues of ‘religion and New Zealand.’

The final text that our hypothetical “general reader” might turn to under a church history banner is a collection of essays on the CMS in New Zealand, entitled *Mission And Moko*. 103 Published to mark the centenary of the Church Missionary Association (now Church Missionary Society Council) of New Zealand, nine historians offer a series of essays, ranging from the minimalist exercise of Stuart Lange’s four page overview, to the brief mention of Hadfield’s attitude to the wars in Jenny Murray’s “Moving South with the CMS” and Brian Gilling’s “Caught Between the Mere and the Musket. B.Y. Ashwell and the Waikato War.” This latter essay is the most relevant for our “general reader” and is informative on the situation that Ashwell encountered as well as providing an interesting distinction in critique of Belich’s interpretation of the ‘philo-Maori’ attitude towards the confiscation of Maori land. Gilling counters Belich’s assertion of CMS missionary support for such an action, stating that their support was for the “police action” of the army and needs to be kept clearly separate from support for any government confiscation that was to occur. Gilling, I believe, overstates his case. The ‘Church Party’ were not so naïve as to fail to realise that the “police action” would necessarily involve some measure of land confiscation. For the ‘Church Party’, the aim of this “police action” was the imposed return of civilization and Christianity to the area; as part of a crusade for sovereignty it entailed far more, both physically and mentally, than what the clumsy designation of “police action”

103 Ibid., p.115.
102 Ibid., p.116.
would imply. There was of course a sense of regret that such measures (and any
confiscation) had to be attempted, but the predominant 'Church Party' feeling was that
such action was necessary and justified.

The other point of interest is that in a publication specifically concerned with the
activities of the CMS in New Zealand, there is no chapter concentrating upon the
period when it and its representatives were discussed, abused and attacked in the
newspapers through-out the colony. This may have been a time of great distress to the
CMS, but in a sense their public profile and the level of public debate about them has
probably never been so high. Yet, as seems all too prevalent in New Zealand religious
historiography, the concern with the 'churches and the wars' is with 'the churches and
Maori'. While this is an important issue, it does tend to reduce a complex time and
issue to a simple dualism. It is also too often a part of a mythologising of clerical
heroes and part of a mindset that 'clergy knew best'. The result is the exclusion of the
laity from the more controversial areas of church history as their silenced voices
provide a discomforting counter-narrative.

It is now time for our "general reader" to turn to those texts specifically focused on
the narratives and issues of the Wars. The question must be, to what degree do these
texts acknowledge and represent the involvement of the churches and the 'Church
Party' as part of their narratives? Is there a place for religious issues in narratives of
war? And, to what degree do they represent the dissent led by the 'Church Party'? These are the questions that are to be asked as we examine the 'history of the Wars'.

103 R. Glen, ed. Mission And Moko. The Church Missionary Society in New Zealand 1814-1882
(Christchurch: Latimer Fellowship of New Zealand, 1992).
3: ‘writing about fighting’

That Alan Mulgan included a chapter in his *Great Days In New Zealand Writing* on James Cowan’s two volume history, *The New Zealand Wars and the pioneering period* is a measure of the reverence with which this work was once held. According to Mulgan it “may have done more than any other book to re-shape the thinking of New Zealanders on historical, and consequently national, lines”. Likewise, Michael King, in providing the introduction to the reissue of Cowan’s history in 1983 stated “If any books deserve to be called New Zealand classics, it is these two volumes…” However as King notes, Cowan’s work was also an exercise in mythologising, an attempt to relate the New Zealand experience to the glamour and excitement of the history and tales of the American frontier that were rapidly filling popular imaginations. That said, it was a valiant attempt to historicize the imagination from ‘there’ to ‘here’, but as Belich argues, the conflicts were too often not clear-cut enough, or involved British defeat or stalemate too often for it to become a popular text.

---

105 Ibid., p.75.
107 Ibid., p.x. “His history was designed to serve a contemporary function: to reassure New Zealanders that qualities of enterprise, ruggedness and bravery were part of the tradition of their past and therefore (by implication) a feature of their present.”
Our “general reader”, coming to this text, will note what King refers to as Cowan’s “preoccupation” with “how” history, not “why” history. That is, these are first and foremost narratives rather than analysis. Therefore they are very strongly of the ‘story of...’ school of historical writing, very much a rollicking good read of a type reminiscent of a sort of boy’s own frontierism. The concern is with events and personalities, rather than reasons and causes. The result is that there is very little mention of the role or participation of the churches in the conflict. There is a photograph of St. John’s Church, Te Awamutu, the caption of which informs us that Rev John Morgan “introduced civilization and English methods of agriculture among the tribes of the Upper Waikato”, but fails to mention his role in spying on local Maori for the Government. Then, in the appendices concerned with “The Maori King Movement”, note is made of Selwyn’s 1860 memorandum to Gore-Browne in support of “home rule” for Maori.

In Volume Two, passing mention is made to the “just protests” of Martin and Selwyn to the 1863 Native Land Settlement Act, but it takes the murder of Volkner for the churches to return to the narrative. Yet this is a very secular history. As so often occurs, religion only seems to be of interest to New Zealand historians when it either involves death or rejection and / or the creation and expression of the otherness of Maori religious responses such as Pai Marire. Reading Cowan, one could easily be led to believe that there was no such body as the ‘Church Party’ (Cowan does not mention
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110 Ibid., p.362.
111 Ibid., p.444.
112 Ibid., p.2, vol. II.
113 Ibid., Chapter seven, vol. II.
anything even approximating such a group), or, that if there was, then it was of no consequence.

It is interesting that this impression is reversed in an expatriate text, A. J. Harrop’s *England and the Maori Wars* of 1937. Harrop, historian, journalist, author and London representative of The University of New Zealand, wrote a limited edition (1000 copies) investigation that originally set out “to fill a gap in the history of New Zealand by giving the results of the first examination of England’s policy during the Maori Wars based on the original documents”. He then decided to widen his brief into an investigation of the wider issues of colonial policy that the wars engendered. As such this is an important book, yet one rarely acknowledged in New Zealand historiography. What is exciting about this work for the contemporary historian is Harrop’s use of newspapers, the *Times* in London and the *Taranaki Herald* in New Plymouth, as sources for his narrative. Harrop also takes the church seriously in his narrative, providing a British perspective on the ‘Church Party’ and its activities.

Harrop’s method is to include as many (often quite lengthy) quotations and references from original sources as he can. These include a mention of clerical opposition contained in a letter by Sir Frederic Rogers, Permanent Under-Secretary of

---

115 Ibid., p.13.
116 It is interesting to note that the copy held by the National Library in Wellington was heavily borrowed in the 1940s (especially a run of 8 renewals July 1944 - August 1945) and had consistent, periodic use up to 1970. Then, apart from once in 1973, it was not borrowed until twice in 1989, and then another period of use from 1996. While there was a reprint available from 1971, it does suggest the marginalization of this text. This use is inconsistent with the quality of information contained within it - if the reader is patient.
State for the Colonies, dated 17 June 1860, the opposition of the Aborigines’ Protection Society and its positive reviews of Hadfield’s and Martin’s pamphlets, Selwyn’s 1860 protest against martial law in Taranaki, and the Government’s response, and how the conflict between Gore-Browne and Hadfield in New Zealand drew their respective English-based brothers into action and writing in their defence.

He also quotes from the correspondence of Gore-Browne and Chichester Fortesque, Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, on the existence of opposition to Government policy from clergy of the Church of England in New Zealand. This is followed by an interesting quotation from a private letter that the Duke of Newcastle (Secretary of State for the Colonies 1859-April 1864) sent to Gladstone in 1861 criticizing Selwyn, and, while admitting martial law was a mistake and that other mistakes had been made, expressed the desire that:

...the Clergy would do better for all parties if they did not shew (sic) their almost bitter partisanship for the natives against the Governors and the settlers.

Harrop also includes a four-page discussion of Sir William Martin’s Memorandum, that includes responses to it by Gore-Browne, Rogers and the Duke of Newcastle, the later two being somewhat more impressed with the document than the Governor.

---

117 Ibid., p.68. “The clergy of the English Church out there think us [the English] in the wrong, I fear.”
118 Ibid., pp.68-70
119 Ibid., pp.81-82.
120 Ibid., pp.96-98. Harrop includes a lengthy quotation from the Times (London) 21 November 1860 which mentions the opposition of Selwyn and Hadfield “with the support of a party in the colony”. (p.97).
121 Ibid., p.100.
122 Ibid., p.110. The letter is dated 21 January 1861, and follows the publication of the 4 January 1861 CMS Memorial to Newcastle requesting the recognition of tribal rights and chiefly land titles.
Harrop's text therefore fulfills a useful function of presenting, for the first time since the period of the Wars, detailed reference not only to the existence of a 'Church Party', but also to the concern it created amongst colonial officials. Unfortunately the limited nature of its run (1000 copies) combined with its Imperial emphasis clearly limited its impact. In a sense, New Zealand had to wait a further twenty years before the first real attempt to analyse the Wars and their impact was made.

In 1957, Keith Sinclair's *The Origins of the Maori Wars* was published, which, in its division of contending viewpoints into Settler, Maori and Humanitarian appeared to resurrect the dominant discourses and narratives of the conflict. Unfortunately, Sinclair's model was not followed by later historians who seemed to prefer a simplified reduction of the "brown and white" dualism of Settler and Maori to Sinclair's more sophisticated trinitarian thesis. Of course the humanitarians and the 'Church Party' were two different groups, but it would be fair to say that the 'Church Party' fell within the realms of the humanitarian camp. This is not to say that all humanitarians were even supporters of the 'Church Party' or its actions, but they did possess a common philanthropic concern with regard to Maori. Sinclair recognized this and was prepared to take them and their influence seriously, in this book at least. But he was also prepared to entitle a chapter on the outbreak of war in Taranaki as "The Failure of Humanitarianism" which tended to verge rather on attempting to find a historical scapegoat, yet at the same time saying of them:

123 Ibid., pp.136-140.
124 K. Sinclair, *The Origins of the Maori Wars* (Wellington: New Zealand University Press, 1957). In his autobiography, Sinclair related how he had attempted to get the book published by Oxford University Press in 1953 and was rejected, partly, it seems because Sinclair's "partisanship" was, "from a position of perfect ignorance", contrasted with the "magnanimity" of Martin's pamphlet.
They were so righteous, and on the whole so right, that their failure commands our attention as a Promethean gesture in the face of fate.\textsuperscript{125}

Sinclair is prepared to take seriously the dislike with which the settlers held the humanitarians,\textsuperscript{126} and he provides what is still the most perceptive and succinct analysis of Hadfield and his character: “brilliant, fearless, highly educated, snobbish” and “intellectually arrogant”, all of which made him “in 1860, the most unpopular man in the Colony after Wiremu Kingi”.\textsuperscript{127} Sinclair discusses the issues of Hadfield and Kingi’s letters (he supports Hadfield), the involvement of ‘priests in politics’ and crucially, in an emphasis that has yet to be fully repeated in other published works, the acknowledgment that “The battle of words was fought parallel with the physical war” and that “their reward was to be called traitors and Jesuits, to face overt public hostility and persistent attempts to blacken their names.”\textsuperscript{128}

Sinclair’s chapter is probably the most complete published analysis of both the existence of a ‘Church Party’ and of what they attempted and encountered currently available. While mention has been made in other works, this is still the most comprehensive analysis that our “general reader” could find.\textsuperscript{129} Yet like all investigations and references to this subject, the emphasis is strongly clerical; the responses of the general public receive only a passing mention. It is still ‘history from above’. He is also somewhat too ready to conclude that

\textsuperscript{\begin{footnotes}
\item K. Sinclair, \textit{Halfway Round the Harbour}, p.129.
\item K. Sinclair, \textit{The Origins of the Maori Wars}, p.208.
\item Ibid., See pages 208, 218-225 for a discussion of what this entailed.
\item Ibid., pp.218-219.
\item Ibid., p.221.
\end{footnotes}}
The humanitarians were exotics even in a colony of exiles. They did not belong to the frontier. Their opinions were brought ready made from abroad...they could not be adjusted in any quick or rough-and-ready fashion to the new environment.\textsuperscript{130}

Sinclair’s blind-spot here (and throughout this chapter) is that he does not connect the settlers’ annoyance to their wishes being opposed to the fact that this opposition was created and led by members of the clergy. For the settlers too had opinions “brought ready made from abroad” and these involved a suspicion of clerical attempts to involve themselves in politics. Also, it was not just humanitarians who were “exotics” and “did not belong to the frontier”; in a sense all clergy (for not all supported the humanitarian line) found themselves in this situation in one way or another, and the support of clergy for the Government and the settler position and interests was a very strong move to de-exoticize themselves. So Sinclair’s text is one that provides satisfactory information, but incomplete conclusions, providing a much-needed humanitarian narrative, yet one that is rather reductionist in its blanket coverage. That said, of all the ‘war histories’, this is still the best discussion of the all-too often missing, third narrative of the ‘Church Party’.

Our next text falls within the description of a popular history by an old school narrative historian. An Englishman, Edgar Holt was also a journalist and novelist who wrote well-reviewed accounts of the Boer War, the Irish Troubles, the Chinese Opium Wars and the Carlist War in Spain. The fact that in later life he was chief press officer for the Church Information Office in London reveals his sympathy towards religious issues, an attitude that is expressed by the serious approach he displays towards the

\textsuperscript{129} That this text was written more than forty years ago exposes the extremely secular nature of the more recent New Zealand historiography.

\textsuperscript{130} Ibid., p.225.
involvement of Selwyn, Hadfield and the ‘Church Party’ in the Wars. His book, *The Strangest War*[^131] is named after the description of the conflict by Sir Frederic Rogers, the Permanent Under-Secretary to the Colonial Office. Holt’s bibliography mentions his debt to (amongst others) Sinclair, Harrop and Cowan, and indeed he quotes from the same letter of Rogers concerning the colonial clergy that Harrop did (see footnote 115). The popular nature of his text means that it is written without footnotes and references, yet this is a book that is still informative.[^132] Holt includes a laudatory chapter on Selwyn (“one of the most picturesque figures of mid-nineteenth-century New Zealand”[^133]) in which he states that he was

...a bishop who was politician as well as pastor and for a time was to make himself the best-hated man in New Zealand because of his fearless championship of Maori rights.[^134]

Holt’s debt to Sinclair is obvious in his discussion of the ‘Church Party’ opposition, the differing sympathies of the churches to the Wars and the “indignation” of the settlers to Selwyn’s “attitude”.[^135] Holt also discusses Selwyn’s role as chaplain to the forces in the Waikato campaign, and how his care for Maori during this period led to settler belief and comment that he was really on the side of Maori, a charge Holt states “was obviously absurd”.[^136]

[^132]: Even Belich includes as many references to it in his *The New Zealand Wars* [albeit twice] as he does to Sinclair’s *Origin of the Maori Wars*.
[^133]: Ibid., p.53.
[^134]: Ibid., p.56. Other candidates putting in just as strong a claim at this time would have to include both Hadfield and Wiremu Kingi. Hadfield probably had the edge because of his somewhat abrasive personality - and the length of his opposition, continuing on through the Waikato War.
[^135]: Ibid., p.148.
[^136]: Ibid., p.198.
Holt's book is limited by his style and his reliance on secondary texts, yet as a popular narrative it definitely has its place in the education of any "general reader", for his interest in and promotion of the roles of Selwyn and Hadfield in the conduct of the Wars. It is certainly a far more balanced text than our next consideration, Harold Miller's *Race Conflict in New Zealand 1814-1865* which is prepared to describe Maori encountered by early missionaries as "warring savages", Pai Marire as a "hideous compound" and to conclude of Maori:

> Here was a simple people, low in the scale of civilization but of great intelligence, who had accepted the Christian religion, who had welcomed the first settlers, and who in a single generation had made a notable advance. Under the guidance of missionary teachers they had turned from tribal war to agriculture.

This text has only brief, passing mentions of 'Church Party' figures and publications, while the second half of which is composed solely of "supporting material" (justified by reference to von Ranke's *History of the Popes*). While including snippets of missionary opinions it fails to provide any wider context or analysis, nor does it make any mention of the existence of a 'Church Party' and the important and provocative role it was to play in any discussion of "Race Conflict" in the Wars. It is a book that must have seemed already dated in both approach and focus when it appeared in 1966, and today is of less use than of any other text discussed in this section.
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138 Ibid., p.xiv.
139 Ibid., p.120.
140 Ibid., p.126.
141 See page 61 where Hadfield's first pamphlet is described as "very able", while Martin's memorandum is apparently a "masterly review", yet without further evidence given to back up such claims.
Appearing in the same year, but in a different historical, conceptual and academic 'universe' was B. J. Dalton's *War and Politics in New Zealand 1855-1870*. An expatriate academic (Professor of History at the University of Townsville), Dalton's concern is primarily with those issues of officialdom - a study of the "experiment and consequences" of the Governor's decision in 1854 to retain native affairs under his personal control, excluded from the Ministers of Responsible Government. The result of such a focus is that there is little detailed mention of either public sentiment or the 'Church Party' during these years of investigation. Yet in his introduction, he does describe Selwyn's decision in 1863 to become a chaplain to the Army as "symbolically", a "decisive cleavage" in both race relations and notions of amalgamation. Certainly it was viewed as such by Maori, if not so definitely by settlers who still tended to view the Bishop with suspicion. That suspicion is extended somewhat by Dalton to all missionaries, with his somewhat dismissive statement concerning the issue of native affairs that

As for the missionaries, little guidance was to be had from them in either practice or in theory. Outside the field of religious and secular education, missionary practice was confined to moral exhortation and missionary ideas on native policy varied greatly.

Then, in discussions concerning Browne's attempts in the late 1850's to increase the subsidy for native affairs and the resulting opposition from the Assembly, Dalton states
that this arose because the majority of it\textsuperscript{147} went to missionary enterprises. The Assembly, he writes, were not only "jealous" of any expenditure on Maori, they were also hostile towards the missionaries "who were always regarded as antagonistic to the colonist's interests".\textsuperscript{148}

Such statements are more in the manner of digressions than of a focus in Dalton's text, in that the missionaries are brought into the narrative to elucidate a point, but are never a factor of his detailed investigation. There is also a certain wariness towards the missionaries in Dalton's text, so that in discussing the Waitara conflict, he states that Europeans made claims on Kingi's behalf "which he never made for himself", and includes Hadfield, Kissling, and Martin (though not a missionary, he was part of the 'Church Party') among his list.\textsuperscript{149} He then follows this by referring to "the first wave of protest from Anglican clergy, more remarkable as it was for rhetoric than for reasoning".\textsuperscript{150} Yet he is prepared to accept that Hadfield was an influential player, especially when discussing the July 1860 Assembly, and the opposition that developed in it to the Government’s pursuit of the Waitara issue. Hadfield is portrayed as the lobbyist uniting the Anglican clergy and then seeking "champions" in the Assembly.\textsuperscript{151} But in the end such formulation of political opposition was to prove "ineffectual" because a case against the Government could not be proved, nor was any alternative policy to the current course of action proposed.\textsuperscript{152} Such opposition was however part

\textsuperscript{147} Dalton states that almost 6000 pounds out of a 7000 pound subsidy were allocated (by Grey in his first term as Governor) to the three denominations who ran mission schools for Maori: the Anglican, the Wesleyan and the Catholic. (p.59).
\textsuperscript{148} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{149} Ibid., pp.106-107.
\textsuperscript{150} Ibid., p.112. Dalton, in a footnote (no. 96) to this claim, then states that Hadfield's first pamphlet is "marred by rhetorical overstatement". (p.112).
\textsuperscript{151} Ibid., p.115.
\textsuperscript{152} Ibid., p.116.
of the “irrevocably alienated influential sections of European opinion”, and yet Dalton can then state that this “irrevocably alienated” opinion could then be “used to exhort the King party to give way” little over a year later. The actual alienation was not so much that of missionary towards Government/settler as actually that of a continuing suspicion of Government/settler towards missionary. For while Dalton correctly states the important point that the Waikato invasion marks the end of “the first period in race relations in New Zealand”, stressing the withdrawal of the missionaries and Selwyn’s decision to act as an Army chaplain as strong contributors to a strengthened Maori “alienation”, this did not mean an automatic acceptance for Selwyn or missionaries in the Pakeha, settler, fold.

This underscores the main criticism of Dalton’s work from a religious history viewpoint; he is inclined to include religion to support his argument, but as soon as that occurs and its purpose is served, it is then dropped until it is needed again. This results in not only a very uneven view as to the importance and impact of the ‘Church Party’, but also in statements that lack the depth of analysis required to provide a complete picture. In the end this is too much of a history of officialdom. Therefore it is weak not only on the important issues of public sentiment but also in its discussions of a major player in issues of politics - the ‘Church Party’.

The approach that Dalton makes could be termed a concern with top-tier events, that is, those of the dominant historical dualism of Maori and Pakeha, or rather, Maori and Pakeha Government. This is an approach also followed by another expatriate historian,
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153 Ibid., p.125.
154 Ibid., p.130.
Alan Ward, in *A Show of Justice. Racial 'amalgamation' in nineteenth century New Zealand*. Ward's concern is again directed at that level above the representations and debates of popular sentiment. It is also yet another secular history in the sense that the "general reader" would most probably gain the impression that there was little if any missionary opposition to the Government's policies - and such as there was being of little importance. His major references to the missionaries are of their opposition to Kingitanga, for example:

The clergy and 'humanitarians' in New Zealand, who might have been expected to have more detachment, showed little flexibility in their attitude to the King movement. Martin was exceptional. Although many of the Anglican clergy supported Kingi's claims in Taranaki they generally joined in the litany about the necessity for the Maori to abandon the King movement, sell land and merge with the settlers for their well-being.

There is, however, no mention or discussion of the existence of 'Church Party' opposition, and there is only a single reference to Bishop Selwyn in the entire book, and that a passing mention to his proposed membership of a Native Council that never eventuated. Hadfield fares little better, with his only real mention that he supported "the basic missionary proposition that the primary task of government was to make the whole Maori populace amenable to English law..." This simplification
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157 Ibid., p.121.

158 Ibid., p.108. This is in Ward's discussion of Gore-Browne's attempt to adopt Henry Sewell's proposal to administer native affairs through a Native Council.

159 There are three references to Hadfield in the index, of which the third, (p.185) is false - there is no actual reference to Hadfield on that page!

160 Ibid., p.102.
of the issues is a major problem in Ward’s attempts to make (even passing) reference to the missionaries. It appears that, to him, missionaries were a united body (at least in any discussion of racial amalgamation) who at least were on the more acceptable side of ethnocentrism as compared to the racialism of popular sentiment. However, the “clear-cut alignment” of missionaries in support of the Government alienated Kingitanga “almost irrevocably from the missionary churches.” This is another oversimplification of the missionaries’ position. For while there were those missionaries who threw their whole-hearted support behind the Waikato invasion, there were other clerics, notably Selwyn, whose position and views were not so clear-cut - as the continued abuse of them in the nation’s newspapers would make clear. But Ward is not concerned with such subtleties in regard to the missionaries, even though the focus of his book is concerned with such subtleties for the general Maori - Pakeha issues. So he can raise important points such as that the disillusionment of Maori with the churches in the 1870s arose not only from their involvement on the Government side in the Waikato campaign, but also because of their “apparent inability to help Maori with issues of ‘culture contact’”, and yet fail to properly investigate or discuss just what this involved and why.

Ward’s text is again another example of the secularization of the New Zealand Wars that the major texts appear to have followed since Miller’s *Race Conflict*. They tend to propose a simplified argument of Pakeha versus Maori that ignores the daily debates of the settler press - and to an extent, the numerous references (usually
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161 Ibid., p.164. See also pp.160-161 for his discussion of how missionaries and humanitarians supported the invasion of the Waikato out of a desire for amalgamation and integration of Maori into European social patterns, in opposition to Maori moves towards selectivity and separation.

162 Ibid., p.168.
accusatory) to the missionaries in not only Parliamentary records, but also in the despatches of Gore-Browne. This has resulted in a generation of readers having been presented with histories of the Wars that, while representing and expressing the secular views and concerns of mid-to-late twentieth century life and historiography fail, in the process, to represent adequately the religious concerns and influences that were a subject of much debate in the nineteenth.

This is a problem that continues in our next text, Tony Simpson’s *Te Riri Pakeha. The White Man’s Anger*. Simpson dedicates his book to Sir William Martin because:

...in 1860, when the other leaders of the colony were indignantly inventing reasons for stealing the land of the Taranaki Maoris (sic), sat down and coolly wrote a book which showed that theft was the only word to describe what was happening.

Yet, while dedicating his text to a prominent member of the ‘Church Party’, Simpson makes no mention of this body which provided both support and an identity for Martin’s dissent. While Hadfield gathers a few scattered mentions (one, somewhat perversely as a “settler friend” of Maori), Selwyn is (yet again) relegated to two references, and these only concern Grey’s first term as Governor. So again the impression is given that there was little religious opposition during the Wars. Instead there are references to the “venality” of missionaries, to the CMS as a “worthy but
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163 Ibid., p.268.
165 Ibid., p.6.
166 Ibid., p.118. William Martin is the other “settler friend.” Simpson does mention the division between Hadfield and Martin’s view that Waitara was “a land quarrel”, and the settler view that it a question of “sovereignty” and deduces “Both were right”.
167 Ibid., p.11. In reference to the Government dispossession of Maori land from 1863 onwards, the missionaries are compared to the objections of “common lawyers”- of whom are given as
dreary" body, and then a curious reference that, while stating that CMS missionaries tended to remain at their missions on the outbreak of war in 1860, states CMS "priests" almost to a man, abandoned their people and actively took the settler's side. Yet Simpson fails to provide a differentiation between these two roles, rather giving as his examples a Wesleyan (John Whiteley), a North German Missionary Society missionary (Johann Riemenschneider), Richard Taylor (who was CMS) and Carl Volkner (who Simpson has just previously referred to as a "missionary").

This confusion as to the role of the churches is underscored when, in discussing the Waitara conflict, opposition is reduced to the very general description: "Voices were now being heard demanding an inquiry."

In his introduction, Simpson states that it is not a book for either historians or Maori, but rather "for myself and the rest of us." From this we can conclude that Simpson has both little interest in, and little time for, religion, especially from the 1850s onwards. Again this is simplified, dualistic history that is so secular in its focus as to severely misrepresent the actions and narratives of religion in the Wars. Even so, it is not so secular as our last history text, the new Grand Narrative of these times and examples, Sir William Martin and Henry Sewell!

168 Ibid., p.69. This is actually in a chapter discussing Wakefield's New Zealand Association.
170 Ibid., p.179.
171 Ibid., p.180. Simpson's delineation here is a curious one, and I can only conclude he has confused the CMS with the Church of England, but that still fails to account for the inclusion of Whiteley and Riemenschneider.
172 Ibid., p.135. Again there was only a prior, minimal passing mention to Hadfield and Martin "asking for arbitration". (p.133).
173 Ibid., p.12.
174 Especially now that the television series has been shown (1998) and the video of the series is now on sale.
events, Belich’s *The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict*. ¹⁷⁵

Belich’s text has become somewhat of a historical benchmark, not least due to the revisionist critique he put forward of the ‘history of the Wars’. This is one of the most purely secular of any of the texts discussed in this historiography, and even its references to a ‘philo-Maori’ opposition fail to develop the nature of their critique - or how the settlers responded. So while he mentions that historians have tended to follow the ‘philo-Maori tradition’, as exemplified by Hadfield and Martin ¹⁷⁶ (which argued the question was one of land rights, not sovereignty in Waitara), he does not discuss the forms of protest that the ‘philo-Maori’ party used - nor the settler response to it.

Similar brevity occurs when he mentions the support of Selwyn and William Williams for the Waikato war, ¹⁷⁷ and while he is correct to suggest that issues of sovereignty were a major part of the support of such figures (along with others who did not stand to gain materially, in the form of land, from such action), he fails to discuss the religious side and implications of such a decision.

Such brevity is even more noticeable in the second section of his book; *The Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict*. Here the issues of religion are reduced to a single paragraph that charts the change of heart of the missionaries from being the ones who “fearlessly argued the justice of the Maori cause in the Taranaki War of 1860”, to (owing to disillusionment over the rise of “overtly syncretic religions”) supporting the Waikato War as a “sharp lesson” that Maori needed and deserved. ¹⁷⁸

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., p.79.
¹⁷⁷ Ibid., p.77 and p.328.
¹⁷⁸ Ibid., p.328.
Such a minimalist approach is somewhat surprising in a chapter that is concerned with the problems of one-sided evidence and the histories that eventuated from it. For Belich’s work, in its overtly secular approach, interests, conclusions and narratives effectively writes out the churches and especially the ‘Church Party’ from the ‘history of the Wars’ for the vast majority of not only “general readers” but also students (and viewers) of history. Again, therefore, this is another example of the simplistic dualism that has afflicted the majority of New Zealand’s secular historiography, and especially that concerned with the conflicts and issues of the 1860s.

So this narrative of ‘histories’ has also been a narrative of the increasing secularisation of ‘New Zealand history’ in the past thirty years, the perpetuation of what, at times appears to be a simplistic liberal dualism of ‘Maori good, Settler bad’ that excludes the ‘Church Party’ from both impact and existence because it would complicate such a thesis. Yet as any investigation of the popular record and opinions of those times (the newspapers) show, the ‘Church Party’ was a major player in the disputes. What this shows is the danger that lies in an over-reliance on official primary sources - and in a concentration on official history, that which is primarily concerned with leaders and governments. However, even the sources for such official history are full of references to the impact of the ‘Church Party’ in this period, and yet historians have chosen to read them in a focus that denies their impact - and often, their presence.

There are important questions that need to be raised, outside the bounds of this thesis, about the origins and reasons for such a secular reading of the past in New Zealand historiography. Likewise, there is a need to progress past the simple dualisms in both religious and secular’ histories, to include the voices and opinions of those settler
ancestors especially when they challenge the presuppositions and assumptions of our present-day narratives.

4: Sources on ‘sources’: newspaper history

It is disturbing to realise that in a nation with such a concentration of newspapers in our past, there are only two texts readily available for the “general reader” to use to gain some understanding of their history and impact.

Guy Scholefield (1877-1963) was a prolific author, compiler and editor of New Zealand history and its sources. Probably best known for his editing of the Richmond-Atkinson Papers\(^\text{179}\) and A Dictionary of New Zealand Biography.\(^\text{180}\) Scholefield also wrote the first (and sadly, still the only) “comprehensive history of every paper published since 1839”,\(^\text{181}\) a work which methodically covers each province of New Zealand and the history of the newspapers within each one. It is a useful text for plotting the passage of personalities in each paper, for working out who was most likely the author of editorials and for the political intrigue that is always a factor of the newspaper world. It is a work that has to be consulted in any discussion of the history of New Zealand opinion, for only then can one discover who were the opinion-makers and shapers, and then proceed to research them in greater detail. That said, it needs to

\(^{180}\) G. H. Scholefield, ed., A Dictionary of New Zealand Biography, 2 vol. (Wellington: Department of Internal Affairs, Wellington, 1940). For information on the personalities discussed in this thesis, I found Scholefield’s Dictionary a far superior work to the recent DNZB. There were many people included by Scholefield who were absent from the latter works, especially missionaries, journalists, quite a few politicians, and ordinary settlers. While the latter DNZB often provided good essays, as a general reference work it was too often incomplete.
\(^{181}\) G. H. Scholefield, Newspapers In New Zealand (Wellington: A.H. & A.W. Reed, 1958), dust-jacket blurb.
be read in tandem with an invaluable, though eclectic text on the colonial press, Patrick Day’s *The Making of the New Zealand Press 1840-1880.*

This is a fascinating, though in the end, limited book, concerned with the politics and links of the newspaper proprietors. As Day is a sociologist and social anthropologist, often the history is diverted into discussions of a wider nature, but it does provide a very necessary introduction into the politics of the ‘who, what, why, when and where’ of the colonial newspaper world. It is also an important text for attempting to place the impact of the newspaper in colonial society within a sociological analysis of the period, while of special interest and importance to this thesis is Day’s contention of the newspapers as class papers which I discuss in Chapter Five. However, somewhat incredibly for a work published by an Academic Press, it is completely lacking an index and is therefore often a very frustrating work to consult.

These then are the texts that would most probably be consulted by our hypothetical “general reader”; yet having done so, what understanding would have been gained? The answer is, somewhat disturbingly, one of confusion. Our reader would end up wondering just what was the role and importance of the ‘Church Party’ in the Wars, and indeed, in a wider sphere, what was the role and impact of religion in colonial New Zealand society? For, out of these texts, the dominant impression is either that the churches had an insignificant role, if any, in the New Zealand Wars; or, that if they did have a role, then it was that of the clergy and impacted only on an official - and perhaps Maori level. Of the opinions of the laity, of the settlers to any ‘Church Party’ there is barely a mention. It is only when one ventures into the primary sources of

---

newspapers, letters and documents that one discovers a narrative that I believe rewrites and challenges most histories of the Wars, and the colonial society of that time that are currently available.

It is also important to acknowledge that my “general reader” is a hypothetically most devout and interested reader. Most with an interest in this question would not read even half the texts I have discussed, and if they stuck to general histories would gain a most uneven and secular reading of the times. Even if they strayed, somehow, into the unfashionable world of religious history they would still fail to gain a balanced perspective as to the impact that ‘priests in politics’ had upon and in, the popular debates of the period. Historians have effectively secularized the history of New Zealand, while at the same time too often written and discussed the history of the elites. This is especially true for mainstream religious history, but also, for more general, colonial history. Perhaps it would be fairer to say that there has been little work on the intellectual history of that mythical creature, the ‘common man or woman’, and as for their opinions on such a question as that of ‘religion and politics’, then the bookshelf is embarrassingly bare. Yet as an investigation of the primary sources shows, such questions were of interest and importance, for they were part of a discussion as to the self-definition of both the colonists and the colony: what type of society was desired, and who was to have an input into those discussions.

The historiography of the New Zealand Wars appears therefore to be both strongly secular, and strongly dualistic in focus. For historians, the history has, not surprisingly, tended to be concerned with a Maori - Pakeha split and concentration, yet it is also strongly focused on events. Even the ‘why’ questions tend to be concerned with the
narrative of events, or sometimes, the interpretation of the narrative of events. But as for the popular contemporary discourse that contributed to, that narrated, that challenged, that created the narrative, little work has been done. Of that most likely to be read, Sinclair’s *The Origins of the Maori Wars* possesses the advantage over Belich’s *The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict* of at least considering in some detail and taking seriously the impact of religion. Both however still shy away from the most public, and most widely and readily available repository of public opinion, the newspapers. They therefore fall into the same self-limiting trap that religious histories have tended to follow, that of ignoring, or sidelining what could be collected under the general umbrellas of lay and / or popular opinion. This is where the dualistic critique also applies, for the historical narratives of both secular and religious histories of this period are still strongly delineated along a Maori and / versus Pakeha continuum. Even those texts that mention a ‘Church Party’ critique, favour and emphasize the official / Governor / Parliament / Colonial Office reaction, and ignore the impact upon, and responses of, the settlers.

The chapters that follow are both an investigation of that settler response and an analysis of what this involved and why. For the past is always far more complex, challenging, and uncomfortable to our present-day opinions and sensibilities than we often desire. Perhaps that is why the ‘Church Party’, its opinions and impact, and the responses of the settlers has been, to a great extent, written out of New Zealand historiography? Have secular historians been afraid to note the extent to which religious questions could dominate colonial discourse at this time; and have religious historians been afraid to note the popular response to the questions raised by issues of ‘religion and politics’? For as this thesis will show, the issues and questions of ‘religion
and politics' occupied a major proportion of colonial discourse at this time - and expressed and exposed perceptions about the new country that have contributed to our ongoing narratives of nation. These issues and questions also remind Pakeha of the discomforting knowledge that they have used notions and expressions of otherness not only against Maori, but also against sectors of their own community that disagreed with their interpretation of events - whether from a settler, Government, or 'Church Party' side. The history of the New Zealand Wars is actually the histories of competing narratives, narratives that can no longer be contained within the constrictions of the prevalent simplistic dualisms. It is to a discussion of some of these narratives that we now turn.
When investigating a settler community it is important to avoid concentrating just upon the colonial situation, for, by virtue of being a transplanted society, the attitudes and opinions of and from ‘Home’ continue to play a major role in the actions and psyche of the new country. There is thus a need to provide a grounding in the contexts and intellectual ferment which formed a background to colonial actions, a necessity to position the New Zealand settlers and clergy within the wider British context. In other words, who were they, and why were they who they were?

In considering such a question, note has to be made of the Industrial Revolution, that paradigm shift in the economic, social and intellectual framework of the nation. This revolution, in tandem with the shock waves of the French events of 1789 and the years following, provided the environment, stimulus and opportunities that enabled the amorphous concept of ‘Victorian Britain’ to be later articulated and developed. The Industrial Revolution, from its rise in the late eighteenth century, provided a new system of consensus and unity, and an overarching system for a society that could be considered to have steadily fragmented into various units of interest and power since the passing of the hegemony of the Middle Ages. A new society was being created, driven partly by economics, but also by religious ideology and political change. Intellectually, an attendant notion of the centrality of progress and change arose, bringing in its wake the ferment and polarization that such elements engender. These all stimulated, as both catalyst and response, major social change in British society. The combination of such change impacted dramatically upon the religious state, the conception, and most importantly, the self-conception, of the nation and its inhabitants.

It was against such a background that there occurred the breakdown of the dominant rural nexus of “Squire, parson, tradition and community”,\(^2\) the imposed system of control, regulated duty and hierarchy. The industrially induced migration from rural to urban environments also resulted in the loss of familiar points of communal reference and the cultural as well as the physical dislocation of a sizable portion of the population. In addition, there was an attendant rapid rise in the population of England and Wales which more than doubled in half a century, and almost tripled within a period of seventy years.\(^3\)

In the minds of many Anglican clergy, the rural nexus had represented a religious rural idyll, yet there was a large body of lay discontent that regularly castigated rural clergy as being out-of-touch with both the world and their fellow citizens. Obelkevich, in his study of the rural society of South Linsey in Lincolnshire, refers to the “streak of anti-clericalism running through gentry culture.”\(^4\) This attitude was more than merely Whiggish\(^5\) in tone; it was part of the assumptions of a gentry who believed that as the Church of England was under State control at a national level, so the local representatives of cleric and church should be dominated by the squire at local level.\(^6\)

The Church of England had traditionally based itself within this parochial structure between the nexus of squire and parson.\(^7\) It relied upon a pattern of church-going that proved to be as often as

---


\(^4\) Census figures for England and Wales:
  - 1801: 8,872,980
  - 1851: 17,927,609
  - 1871: 22,712,266

\(^5\) Those who had traditionally supported Protestant succession as against the Catholic James II, and by this time had taken over the mantles of ‘enlightenment’, social reforms and curbing the powers of the monarchy.


much the result of social pressure as it was of deep faith – or indeed, of any faith at all. The emergence of an urban and industrial society presented new challenges that left the church floundering. Yet, as Obelkevich mentions, rural anti-clericalism was not just the preserve of the gentry.\(^8\) The growth of small towns created a new form of socio-religious pressure that often replaced the prior social and economic consequences of standing against the nexus of squire and parson. In these small settlements, the pressure was often to attend chapel.\(^9\)

This points to a predominant characteristic of Victorian Christianity, which was the tendency towards religious divergence. As change occurred within British society, fueled by both the French Revolution and the sweeping fires of those many revolutions of 1848, so did attendant change occur within the slumbering edifice of British Christianity. The diversity of political opinion, social makeup and status was increasingly reflected in religious divergence. There was a prevalent sense of rapid change within society and a plurality of viewpoints\(^10\) within the socio-religious climate was evident. One contemporary commentator, describing “The Age We Live In” to the YMCA gathered in the evangelical ‘powerhouse’ of Exeter Hall in the late 1840s noted:

The Churchman takes his view of the age from the top of a steeple, the dissenter from the roof of the chapel. A Tory takes his view from the steps of the throne or the townhouse of a rotten borough; a Whig stands on the shoulders of the multitude, and looks through the parchment of the Reform Bill. A Radical looks at the age and examines it from the window of the Great Western Carriage, proceeding at the rate of seventy miles an hour. A Chartist takes a peep at the age from a seat upon the orifice of a volcano.\(^11\)

---

8 Here the anti-clericalism was directed at chapel-goers, challenging their claims to piety and “the magical efficacy of organized religion.” J. Obelkevich, Religion and Rural Society, p.327.
10 It is against such divergence that the imposition of meta-narratives must be critiqued.
Such divergence of opinion was not merely confined to the political spheres, Christianity was undergoing a series of changes and challenges, some within belief systems and others affecting its very makeup and influence. For those for whom Christianity mattered, for whatever reason - faith, social expectation, morality, stability - the type of Christianity practised assumed increasing importance. The situation took on the character of a religious marketplace, which was a buyer's market in which one had to be confident in one's own choice over and against the rest of the competition.

Occupying the centre stage by virtue of self-perceived historical 'right' was the Church of England. More than just a denomination, following Henry VIII's break with Rome, it had developed into a culture, and had become for many a key part of what it meant to be English. Central to this self-belief was its history of battles with 'the others' - those sects, churches and denominations which attempted (or were seen) to challenge and / or threaten the Anglican hegemony. As a result of such 'conflict', by the early nineteenth century, "Anglicanism had become almost entirely associated with Protestantism and loyalty to the political status quo",12 opposed to both Roman Catholicism and Protestant non-conformity and their perceived political allegiances. The Church of England was thus the wall against which all other denominations and groups rebounded. Yet the wall outwardly appeared to be more unified and stable than it really was. The spread of increased political and social toleration encouraged an acceptance of the diversity of belief - or at least a tacit recognition that it could no longer be ignored.

Underlying this was the appearance of what can be described as a social dogmatism and sense of social hierarchy that enabled British society not just to cope with change and dissent, but also to accommodate it. For 'Victorian Christianity' also possessed a very strong societal component which not only involved traditional notions about eternity, morals and daily spiritual aid, but also

involved political beliefs and the establishment of limits for the social interactions with those of other denominations and classes.\textsuperscript{13}

Such thinking was heavily influenced by the mid-century quest for stability that was a reaction to the political and intellectual upheavals that had occurred between 1798 and 1815. The resulting European Treaties and the attendant rise in the promotion of free trade also created a desire for peace. This in turn left the energies of the nation free to be invested in commercial and industrial development. In such a fashion, the benefits of peace and stability created in many a desire for the continuation of the status quo and an attendant Establishment outlook which viewed any upheavals at home and abroad with suspicion and distaste. In a sense, the new dogmatism and morality was the reaction of a society in transition. The emerging middle and lower-middle classes utilized a dogmatic view of life and Christianity to provide a sense of certainty in a newly urbanized society, in which they were shunned by nearly all of the aristocracy and in which the masses appeared (to them) as barely civilized. Such thinking was, therefore, a refuge which took on a quasi-religious appeal of its own.

Anthony Trollope, the Victorian novelist and chronicler, summarized this mid-century dogmatism:

\begin{quote}
The self-confidence of an Englishman is invincible. It is in this that his great strength lies. He is able, because he makes others think that he is able. Out of this no sermon will shake him. No latterday pamphlets will drive him to despair. No essays, were they as forcible as language can make them, would cause him to believe that the end of his dominion is nigh at hand.\textsuperscript{14}
\end{quote}

Such self-determination was influenced by three broad trends within ‘Victorian Christianity’. Firstly, there was the religious polarization between the “Church” and secularist ideas. Matthew

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., p.35.
Arnold’s poignant image of a retreating ‘Sea of Faith’ in his poem “Dover Beach” (published in his New Poems of 1867) was not only rooted in the Enlightenment but also expressed current political and religious motives. The link of ‘Church and State’ as the twin pillars of The Establishment resulted in a critique of the State often, by necessity, involving a critique of the form, function, beliefs (and God) of the Church of England. Often this was rebellion undertaken from within the governing class. As well as this philosophical critique there was the social critique of the labouring (and unemployed) poor. While they were no strangers to an everyday practical agnosticism and atheism, the basis of their social critique it was not so much a crisis of faith in God, as a crisis of faith in the ‘representatives of God’; that is, the clergy and churches, which by word and (in)action had done little to endear themselves to the newly urbanized context.

In the 1840s, Edward Miall of the journal The Nonconformist invited the response of “working men” on the topic “The Working Classes and Religious Institutions”. What he received was an attack upon the social distinctions within the Church of England, and its apparent worship of respectability and its associated contempt for the poor. His correspondents attacked the “...almost total want of sympathy manifested by ministers of every denomination with the privations, wants and wastes of the working classes...[and the]...aristocratic character of the religious institutions.”

Such feelings were representative of the second trend, which is that of growing religious alienation resulting from industrialization, class division, education and the growth of urban areas.

While in the small towns the social pressures were often directed towards attendance at chapel, in

---

15 That is the term used from the eighteenth century for those who professed a belief in God but acted as though god did not exist. D. Berman, A History of Atheism in Britain (London: Routledge, 1988), p.2.
16 Edward Miall (1809-1881), independent minister, editor, radical and M.P. The motto of The Nonconformist was “The Dissidence of Dissent and the Protestantism of the Protestant Religion”. He was opposed to the State Church, supported the Anti-Corn Law League and advocated complete suffrage. His paper therefore fed into and articulated voices of Protestant dissent.
the large towns they were against any church attendance. Friedrich Engels, in discussing 'the
English working class in 1844' emphatically states that "All the writers of the bourgeoisie are
unanimous on this point, that the workers are not religious and do not attend Church."19

Was such indifference due to the horrors of industrialized society, or does this merely
overestimate the depth of allegiance and loyalty previously discerned in the rural population?
Certainly for Anglican clergy, looking back fondly to their religious rural idyll of the ancien
regime, the towns, and by inference their inhabitants, were seen as a challenge to established and
ordered religion. Yet perhaps the shift to urban centres provided the opportunity and not
necessarily the motive (or reasons) to become detached from the expected allegiance to the
Anglican Church which was to be propounded in the rural areas?

The third trend was the response many made in the new environment - the embracing of
religious pluralism as evidenced in the growth of denominations and sects. Of these, Methodism in
particular proved extremely attractive to those moving to the new towns and attempting to
comprehend the ethos of small-town life. In a new society, this new form of Christianity provided
an arena for social self-fulfillment, enabling a shift from the old constrictions and legacies of the
Church of England without a headlong descent into perceived theological or political radicalism.20
Methodism had an ethos stressing self-improvement and self-control, which, allied with a
legitimization of economic endeavor, proved very appealing to those attempting to improve their
social standing in the new societies.

---

19 F. Engels, The condition of the Working Class in England in 1844 (1892), quoted in K. S. Inglis,
In the 1890s, a clergyman could write: "It is not that the Church of God has lost the Great Towns, it
has never had them." A.F. Winnington-Ingram, Work in Great Cities, quoted in K. S. Inglis,
The Methodists were one part of a far larger and crucial shift in religious sensibility within ‘Victorian Christianity’. For if Victorian society is to be discussed, then evangelical Christianity has to be investigated. Evangelical belief, and the associated world-view deriving from this, could be described as a major component of the super-structure of the Victorian world. For the evangelicals were not merely those of an evangelical persuasion within the Church of England, but a far broader grouping that both crossed and encompassed denominational lines.

Houghton has talked of the ‘Victorian frame of mind’ as being grounded in the notion of the freedom and responsibility of the individual.\(^{21}\) The same framework can be applied to the basic theological features of evangelicalism. Here was a form of Christianity and a world-view for those of the expanding working and middle-classes who felt themselves at both the forefront of the new society, yet also somewhat adrift and alienated by the changes. It was a form of religion especially helpful for those searching for a new self-definition and psychological location, a way of making sense of the changes in society, personal situation and culture that the industrial revolution had engendered, yet still locating oneself within the broader sweep of the familiar reference points of Christian belief.

The emphasis upon conversion as against infant baptism as the point of entry into the Christian community, and the emphasis upon scripture instead of tradition and ecclesiastical authority, strengthened the position of the individual over and against the monolithic body of ‘the Church’. The evangelical approach was based upon four central themes: conversion (that individual lives needed to be changed); activism (that those lives must then be spent in expressing the message and truth of the gospel); biblicism (that the Bible contained the true and uncontested Word of God); and crucicentrism (a stress upon the meaning of ‘Christ’s self-sacrifice’ upon the cross).\(^{22}\)


\(^{22}\) D. W. Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain. A History from the 1730s to the 1980s*
A major attraction of evangelical theology was that its world-view tended to mirror the situation in which many of its converts found themselves. Just as many now felt a rupture, a separation, a dislocation from the old status quo, finding themselves in a new society where the past certainties seemed to have disappeared, so too did evangelical theology present the individual in relation to the Christian God. What evangelicalism provided was certainty in the midst of change, a claim that the most important focus was that of the (state of the) relationship between an individual and God. If that could be restored through an open acceptance of the offer of salvation provided by the ‘atoning death of Christ’, then no longer would they be “positively bad, estranged from God and under his condemnation”.  

This meant that the necessity for intermediaries was downplayed; the role of sacraments was secondary to the primacy of ‘The Word’, which was best and most readily encountered by the individual through prayer and preaching. Salvation was thus potentially open to all who desired it, obtained through an act of faith and expressed through an imitation of the work and life of Christ. Such action was necessitated by an overwhelming stress on and awareness of the reality of original sin and the subsequent fall and depravity of humanity. It was humanity that had separated itself from God, yet God had provided the means of restoration - a ‘new life’ - and an accompanying certainty that could be obtained by an act of faith.  

This faith was centred in salvation through the on-going work of the Holy Spirit, centred in the soteriology of the Cross.

24 The CMS missionary, Benjamin Ashwell, active in New Zealand from 1835, provides a good indication of evangelical theology in outlining his missionary activities amongst Maori. He talked of the Gospel “endeavouring to convince them of sin and to lead them to the Saviour”. He then turned to “the one great theme, the love of Christ…reminding them of their disease and the remedy, viz. man a sinner, and Christ the saviour”. B. Y. Ashwell, Recollections of A Waikato Missionary (Auckland: William Atkin, 1878), p.3.
and under the providence of God ‘The Father’, “just and judicial”, who would display both
“wrathful judgment” and “loving mercy” on both nations and individuals. 25

Thus it was a form of Christianity both born out of, and engendering, personal confidence and
identity. For the relationship was with a caring God who had provided the means to restore the
personal relationship which had been lost. Christianity could therefore become reduced to a
system of personal boundaries and self control that also allowed personal faith to become
statements of divine intent. 26 Central to this was a stress upon the doctrine of providence, a
continuation of the doctrine of creation. This could take two forms: the first that of general
providence, which is that the God who created the world continues to look after it and care for it;
the second is that of particular providence, that God continues to intervene directly into the
world, governing what occurs by acts of both divine judgment and mercy, that is, a belief that
God acts in human history, and that events therefore occur as part of a divine plan. 27

For a nation such as Great Britain, seemingly thrust to economic leadership of the world, the
notion of providence held a great deal of attraction. Faced with a Catholic Europe, and imbued
with missionary zeal, evangelical thought was only too ready to assert that this was ‘the will’ of
their God, whose aim involved the spread of both British Christianity and British institutions and
government. Not only that, but because ‘Britain was Protestant’, it naturally followed that God
also willed Protestantism. 28 There thus developed a popular notion that the closest human
approximation to the will and aim of God was that embodied in the existence of the Protestant
Englishman. As Eugene Black has pithily remarked, “Never in History has a national culture

25 D. W. Bebbington, Evangelicalism in Modern Britain, pp.135-36.
26 D. Rosman, Evangelicals and Culture, p13, talks of evangelical self-belief which engendered a sense
that the Holy Spirit had directed them to truth, and so all others must therefore be setting themselves
deliberately against God.
27 D. W. Bebbington, Evangelicalism in Modern Britain, p.61.
28 D. Paz, Popular Anti-Catholicism in Mid-Victorian England, (Stanford: Stanford University Press,
1992), p.3.
succeeded more completely in convincing itself that the highest morality and self-interest were identical.”

Underlying such conceptions was the influence of what could be described as an evangelical self-confidence, which was often combined with and expressed in an overwhelming belief in the need for missions. For providence swung both ways; Britain might see herself as ‘especially favoured by God’, but in order to continue in this special relationship she had to extend the truth of God to the rest of the world.

In March 1860 a Conference on Missions was held in Liverpool, attended by 126 officers of more than twenty-five British missionary societies and committees. This debated and discussed such issues as the ‘role of the missionary’, the ‘aims of missionary societies’, the ‘objects of missionary endeavor’ and ‘evangelical aims’. The mid-Victorian missionary and evangelical ethos was underlined by the choice of the eight biblical texts selected for the opening of the conference: none was from the Old Testament, two were from Mark’s Gospel, one from Luke, one from Acts, two from Romans and one each from first and second Corinthians. Read in sequence, they firstly stress the preaching of the gospel of the kingdom to all the world as a witness that will enable the End to occur (Matthew 24:14). This is followed by two post-resurrection teachings stressing the need to preach to the world (Matthew 28:18-20), especially the preaching of the repentance and remission of sins (Luke 24: 46, 47). The next reading is of the scattering of the early church to preach the word (Acts 8: 4), which is crucial because preaching results in believing which enables salvation (Romans 10: 14,15). This is again stressed (Romans 16: 26), followed by a call to support each other in this work (2 Corinthians 10:15-16). The texts end with a thanking of God for “victory through Christ” and a call to be steadfast and unmovable in their labours for God.

which are not in vain (1 Corinthians 15: 57,58).\textsuperscript{30} As one CMS representative explained, “The object of our missionary enterprise is the ultimate ruin of the empire of Satan by the establishment in every heart of the throne of Lord Jesus.”\textsuperscript{31}

Yet claims of providence were raised as support and reason for the missionary endeavor. At a public meeting held at the Conference, chaired by the Earl of Shaftesbury (an evangelical patron), Major-General Alexander, Chairman of the conference and an officer in the Indian Army neatly summarized the twin aims of peace and salvation that providence had entrusted to Britain:

Protestant Britain would be in the midst of the world as a fountain sending forth the pure streams of the water of life to every kingdom and people under heaven. The purpose for which God had exalted us above all nations, and given us a dominion to the very ends of the earth, would be fulfilled.\textsuperscript{32}

Under such thinking the aims of Empire was inextricably entwined with the aims of missionary endeavor. For evangelicals, Empire was to further and provide the support for the extension of Protestant Christianity - an aim often completely different to that of colonial rulers.\textsuperscript{33} It was such a focus and belief that would cause problems in the New Zealand situation.

While evangelicals could be found across the denominational spectrum, in the popular mind they tended to be associated with a particular place: Exeter Hall. ‘Exeter Hall’ became a byword throughout the early and mid-Victorian age for representing a certain type of evangelical zeal and attitude. In the eyes of the popular press, in both Britain and its settler colonies abroad, ‘Exeter

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{30} Conference on Missions (Liverpool 1860), (London, James Nisbet & Co.), pp.iii-iv.
\item \textsuperscript{31} Ibid., p.59. Rev. T.B. Whiting, CMS Central Association Secretary. This was to be achieved by proclamation of the gospel.
\item \textsuperscript{32} Ibid., p.320. Public meeting, 23 May 1860.
\item \textsuperscript{33} G. A. Oddie, “‘Orientalism’ and British Protestant Missionary Constructions of India in the Nineteenth Century”, \textit{South Asia}. v.77., no.2 (1994):27-42. Oddie (p.40) mentions this in his discussion of the missionary agenda which in turn resulted in a programme composed of images and ideas they believed would engender sympathy and support for their objectives back in Britain. It was to such a constituency as this conference and its attendees that they aimed their epistles.
\end{itemize}
Hall' was used as a blanket title to attack all those evangelical ideas and groups that were in opposition to a perceived status quo and the envisaged colonial future.

Exeter Hall itself, "a kind of Headquarters for dissenting Protestants," was built in London near the Strand and Waterloo Bridge in 1831. Large, able to accommodate up to 4000 people, it was the location for many meetings by the various evangelical societies, a place for central planning and discussion, a central lobby group using the influence of the Bishops, Peers, MPs and leaders from the church and business worlds who were on the committees of these various groups. By nature of its composition and influence Exeter Hall tended to polarize opinion.

Anthony Trollope was most dismissive in his satire Clergymen of the Church of England, originally published in the Pall Mall Gazette 1865-6. His essay "The Zulu in London", whereby one of the 'disciples' of the then notorious Bishop Colenso of Natal visits the Hall, is scathing in its description of the attitudes he believes were held by its members:

He [the Zulu] then told me that no discussion was allowed in the Hall of Exeter, and that the audience there would listen to no arguments opposed to their own established modes of believing. If this be so, of what use is the hall of Exeter?

Various concerns exemplified by evangelical Christianity and Exeter Hall can be discerned in the lectures given under its auspices to the YMCA of London. Collected, bound and published in 1865, these provide a fascinating insight into the evangelical mind 1845-65.

34 For example, the Melbourne Argus attacked it in an article reprinted in the Canterbury Standard in New Zealand (8 July 1864, p.3) as representing "the new doctrinaire sect" in association with the Aborigine's Protection Society, together "perhaps the worst possible referee on any question connected with British Imperial management of the colonies." They were accused of being too fond of "natives" and "dark men", too ready to believe in "any tale of the white man's cruelty or the white man's greed"; unable to believe that "secular" Europeans could encounter "an aboriginal without enslaving him, ill-treating him, or exterminating him."
36 John William Colenso (1814 - 83), appointed Bishop of Natal 1853, became a clerical cause celebre with his advocacy that a large amount of the Pentateuch was non-historical (1862-3).
37 A. Trollope, Clergymen of the Church of England (originally in Pall Mall Gazette 1865-6)
Several broad themes are constantly repeated: the providential aspect of England, the importance of personal conversion, the divine intent of Commerce and Progress as a benefit to Christian mission; the importance of Christian Character in influencing secular society and secular pursuits, and the challenge of Popery and the “infant Popery” of Puseyism or the Tractarian movement. Catholicism was repeatedly presented as intellectually and morally lacking:

...a conspiracy...the fetter of the intellect, the bar of progress, the leprosy of nations. It is the curse of Ireland, the mildew of Spain, the cause of France’s infidelity, the clog of Austria, the chain of Italy and the plague of every land that has it.

The Tractarians were attacked because of their supposed desire to return the Church of England to the Roman Catholic fold, their stress upon the clerical and ecclesiastical nature of the church and especially their belief in bishops as constituting the centre of church unity and life. Their embracing and restoration of ritual and vestments offended evangelical sensibilities, as did their stress on sacraments and tradition. While both evangelical and Tractarian Christianity were concerned with a reform of the contemporary church, the Tractarian (or Anglo-Catholic) appeal to the High Church ideals of the seventeenth century was viewed by evangelicals as ‘out-of-step’ with their notions of the providential progress of Protestant Britain.

A major part and process of this providential progress was articulated in the rise of and concern for Mission Societies. While missionary work (apart from the obviously religious convictions)
proved attractive as a method of self-improvement, providing access to education and a life-style previously not available to the lower classes in Britain, there were those who looked with distaste upon the 'missionary explosion'. Much of this was social snobbery, for the missionaries, to contemporary observers, appeared to be increasingly drawn from what could be called the 'middling class': the artisans, the petit bourgeois and the "newly professionally conscious"  

those groupings who, as Bebbington has noted, tended to be attracted to evangelicalism towards the end of the eighteenth century. Such a change in religious functionaries and their associated ‘enthusiasm’ elicited critical comment from ‘The Establishment’, for example the wit and parson, Sydney Smith, complained in 1808:

Why are we to send out little detachments of maniacs to spread over the fine regions of the world the most injust and contemptible opinion of the gospel? The wise and rational part of the Christian ministry find they have enough to do at home... But if a tinker is a devout man, he infallibly sets out for the East.  

This critique occurring at a time when religion was under attack from the effects of Enlightenment thought, resulting in many Christian apologists defending 'rational religion' over and against the 'peculiar doctrines' and overt enthusiasm of the faith.  

The missionary societies actively sought to attract representatives from the lower classes, feeling that they would be more deferential to the societies' wishes and also easier to control. It did not escape notice that there were also financial inducements to becoming a missionary, with a

---

(1857-8), p.308.
42 D. W. Bebbington, Evangelicalism in Modern Britain, p.25.
resulting salary (if married and ordained) that was above what could be expected for many in either incumbencies, charges or positions back in Britain. What is more, the chance to acquire property for themselves and dependents was often available, and many, not surprisingly, took advantage of the situation.

Many of the problems encountered by the mission societies were part of an interesting paradox constantly replayed upon the mission field. As we have seen, mission work, in the Victorian sense, was a product of an evangelical upsurge and influence, itself also a product of the Industrial Revolution. Yet, once on the mission field, it repeatedly ran into confrontation (often directly) with those other, secular products of the same parent - the trader and the colonist. In a sense, the missionary was the religious alter-ego of the colonist and the trader. There were similar sentiments at work, a desire for gain (either land, money or souls), a will to succeed, a quest for self-improvement and, to be generous, a desire for the advancement of British society and its attendant (and God-given) blessings. All were attempting to create a new society, yet the secular trader and colonist often feared that the missionary sought a return to the old rural-idyll so beloved by the urban-fearing churchman, almost in some cases, if not quite a theocracy, at least an Old Testament notion of religious patriarchy. Yet the colonist was also in a sense seeking to create a rural idyll, but one in which they (the often previously dispossessed in Britain) became the possessor, and “progress”, not “gospel” was the keyword. In a way, both sides were in competition, with the missionaries themselves a colonist, and often a trader, in both a material and spiritual sense.

45 C. P. Williams mentions a wage of between 200 - 400 pounds per annum in “Not Quite Gentlemen”, p.56.
46 This caused many problems in the New Zealand context, especially with Governor Grey’s infamous “Blood and Treasure” despatch of 25 June 1846. This attacked the missionaries in the north of New Zealand for claiming large tracts of land which, he believed, were unable to be enforced without a large expenditure of British “blood and money”. (See A.K. Davidson & P.J. Lineham, Transplanted Christianity. Documents Illustrating Aspects of New Zealand Church History, pp.60-61 for readily available selections from Grey’s despatch).
Often underlying such a critique of missionaries was an anti-clericalism evident in Victorian society. This was often articulated in the criticism that ‘the church’, especially the Church of England, had failed to adjust to the new society that was in the process of being created. Whilst many within the Establishment were criticizing the upsurge of clerics from outside the traditional upper-middle class catchment pool, those with an eye to missionary endeavour often stated those (especially of other denominations) of a more common background and undergoing a more practical training would find it easier to prosper in the colonies.

Compounding the issue was a widespread perception that the preaching of the churches was of a poor standard, which provided a common cause of complaint in the newspapers of the day. It even spread to the Victorian novel, such as the complaint outlined in Trollope’s, *Barchester Towers*:

> ...no-one can rid himself of the preaching clergyman. He is the bore of the age, the old man who we Sindbads cannot shake off, the nightmare that disturbs our Sunday’s rest, the incubus that over-loads our religion and makes God’s service distasteful. We are not forced into Church! No: but we desire more than that. We desire not to be forced to stay away.

The clergy could not fail to be aware of the critique. The Religious Census of 1851 had caused such shock waves in the Church of England by not only revealing the unexpected size of the non-

---

47 This was described as a problem of having to call on numbers of “non-university ‘literates’” to fill the “void” left by “men of education and social position” entering the clergy. The Church of England might be part of the Establishment, but its clergy increasingly were not. *Press*, 22 April 1863, pp.1-2. Reprint from the *Times* (London), no date, “Prospects of the Church of England”.

48 In an article reproduced in New Zealand, the *Saturday Review* in 1860 attacked the abilities of country clergy under the broad heading of “Fools”. It sought to create a link between the inability of the simple, ill-educated country clergyman who “takes to his mind faint germs of truth and knowledge, and in a faint way, with many errors and much feebleness and uncertainty...” and the situation of the missionary where “zeal and folly go together... he is a kind of buffer between the thoughtful Christian and the untaught heathen.” *Nelson Examiner*, 20 June 1860, p.4. A reprint of *Saturday Review* article “Fools”, 3 March 1860.

Such articles were sporadically reprinted in the New Zealand press. The implication being that the limitations of such clergy were replicated in those attempting to involve themselves in politics in this country.

conformist body, but also the extent of non-attendance (less than one-in-ten attending in the largest towns \(^{50}\) that it was never repeated. Some sought refuge in the old status quo. Harry Jones, author in 1866 of *Priest and Parish*, wrote that a clergyman must also be a liberally-educated gentleman on the same social and educational level as other professionals. To abandon this standard would result in a decline of influence in "modern society". If clergy were to slip into being a mere "religious functionary", then people would "use him as the servant of the public and as representative of respectability, but look elsewhere for the leaders of their thought."\(^{51}\) In addition to such class-derived 'self-criticism', other issues were raised as contributing to the apparent difficulties facing the Church of England in the mid-Victorian era. The missionary-oriented Bishop of London, Archibald Tait (later Archbishop of Canterbury 1868-1882) outlined three problems confronting the clergy in December 1862:

...the spirit of free enquiry and criticism which was gradually alienating many educated people from the Church; secondly, the difficulties of an established church in an age of freedom of worship, and thirdly, the ever-growing population of England, in which a generation of the working class was now growing up without any knowledge of the Church or of Christianity itself.\(^{52}\)

The second of Tait's concerns played a major part in the Victorian religious world view. Dissent, or non-conformity, is a blanket-term used to cover such religious groupings as English Presbyterianism, Methodism, Congregationalism, the Quakers and the Baptists, and a host of minor sects. Though all distinctly separate in structure, theological emphasis and church government, they were lumped together by the 'Establishment' because of their refusal to conform to its discipline, doctrines and polity. Such a separation is traditionally traced back to the

\(^{51}\) B. Heeney, "On being a Mid Victorian Clergyman", *Journal of Religious History*. vol.7, no.3.(1973) pp.210-211.
\(^{52}\) M. A. Crowther, *Church Embattled, Religious Controversy in Mid-Victorian England*, (David &
battles of the seventeenth century. However, by the nineteenth, such groupings were often attractive to a newly rising middle-class as they provided outlets for self-determination and influence against the prevailing hegemony of the Establishment status quo.53

Religious dissent often thus both implied and contained political dissent, and so the Establishment traditionally viewed the groupings with high suspicion. In response, political obstacles had been put in place which were only gradually being overturned, such as the repeal of the Test and Corporations Act in 1828 which had effectively limited high executive and judicial positions to members of the Church of England. Other obstacles had meant that until 1838, dissenters could only be married in a parish church, while until 1877 they were still required to pay Church Rates and were unable to be buried with their own rites in a parish churchyard. They were also legislated against academically, denied the chance to take degrees at Oxford and Cambridge until the mid-nineteenth century, while prizes and university posts were not totally open to them until 1871.54

However, reflecting the concern for stability inherent in the Establishment psyche, divisions were made between “political non-conformists”, seen as “bad, religiously insecure and unwilling to accept civic disabilities”, and “conscientious non-conformists” who, in opposition to their brethren, were viewed as “good, religiously sincere and prepared to accept a position of second-class citizenship as a result of their beliefs.”55 An ambivalence, at least, thus lay in the non-conformist-Establishment relationship, with a wariness as to methods and motives evident on both sides. However, both Establishment and non-conformists were united in their hostility to Roman

---

53 H. Perkin, The Origins of Modern English Society 1780-1880, p.34, notes that Dissenters were the filling in a social sandwich between Church of England at the top and bottom of society (or Roman Catholics in rural Lancashire). Dissent was an option if one was financially viable and not dependent upon the whims of a landlord, or, conversely, if one did not wish to be part of country society.
55 F. M. Turner, Contesting Cultural Authority, p.31.
Catholics, especially once the tide of poor, Irish Catholic immigrants began to seep into England in the early mid-century. For, not only was this another church, it was viewed as another culture, one that had been overthrown in England, providing the source for Protestant self-definition, with the added critique of being the religion of many of Britain’s enemies.

For the evangelicals, the fight against the spread of Roman Catholicism took on militant tendencies, with a belief in the effectiveness of evangelical proclamation of the ‘true Gospel’ in being able to defeat the enemies of the ‘Protestant God’. This theme was to be transplanted to New Zealand because missionary endeavor was not only a matter of competing Protestant mission societies, it also involved a battle between Protestant and Roman Catholic agencies and associated notions and claims regarding Truth and Heresy. The fact that the earliest Roman Catholic missionaries to New Zealand were also French only served to double suspicion in the minds of many Protestants as to their ultimate aims. For a common theme in a nation with an

---

56 N. Vance, *The Sinews of the Spirit. The ideal of Christian Manliness in Victorian Literature and Religious Thought* (Cambridge University Press, 1985), p.23, writes that “When the old Roman Catholic hierarchy of Bishops was restored in England in 1850 it gave the House of Commons an opportunity to fight the Civil War all over again.”

57 For example, in *The Christian Observer* (no.48 April 1850) there appeared “The Mode of dealing with Popish tendencies”, outlining a policy of resistance based upon the evangelical clergy, because “…as popery has never been able to hold its ground against the faithful proclamation of the Gospel, we may confidently believe that, though the struggle may be sharp, in the end the Captain of our salvation will tread this, with all other “enemies under his feet”.


58 The CMS missionary B.Y. Ashwell wrote to his parent body of his suspicion that there were, to his eyes, too many similarities between “Popery” and Hau-hau for it to be a coincidence. His concerns included Maori use of “Popish translation” of scriptural names and terms and that “their chants are like the monotonous drawl of the Popish worship”. That there were “now in the country many French priests” only served to confirm his suspicion that Roman Catholicism was working against the interests of the colony. B.Y. Ashwell, Letters and Journals 1834-1869, Volume 4: 1863-1869 (qMS-0090) 26 November 1864, p.511, Letter to CMS. Archives & Manuscripts, A.T.L.

59 The missionary William Williams stated in 1867 that “Romish priests…[were] saying that they have no connection with the English or with the English Government; and hence the notion which has been impressed upon the natives, that the Protestant Missionaries were sent by the Queen to prepare the way for the colonists.” W. Williams, *Christianity among the New Zealanders* (London: Seeley, Jackson & Halliday, 1867), pp.v-vi.
Establishment is to what degree is a religious divergence or challenge symptomatic of a political one?  

The situation in which 'religious' Britain found itself was one which had developed the practice and acceptance of denominationalism. This meant that the prior structures of societal dominance characteristic of 'Church religion' and the attendant, converse subcultural marginality acceptance of 'sect' religion were becoming peripheral to the Victorian situation. Rather, a choice now had to be made, a choice not only of attendance, but also of practice and belief. On the one hand, the rise of 'personal religion' due to both denominational rivalry and evangelicalism resulted in increasing numbers of people having, in the face of change and new ideas, to work out their own religious position. On the other hand, the old certainties - such as they were - had undergone a series of challenges. The questions raised by biblical and historical scholarship, not to mention geological and biological scholarship, were challenging literal interpretations of Scripture, while increased leisure activities provided a counter to Sunday service.

All this promoted the development of non-belief, and the practice of non-adherence to any church. The High Churchman and journalist, Thomas Mozley, writing in the Anglican periodical, the British Critic, noted this alienation in 1840:

It may be truly said that the whole of our manufacturing people, the whole of our poorer classes in our towns, are alienated from the church. Yet this does not by any means express the sum of their misery. An enormous proportion, three-fourths or nine-tenths, are neither church people, nor of any other religion.

---

60 It was paradoxically the inverse of this question that was raised in New Zealand, where representatives of the 'home' Establishment were the ones criticizing the Status quo, while dissenters tended to support the Government and the settlers.


It was these people who tended to migrate: the dispossessed and dissenting farm workers, the small-town artisans and the alienated urban workers. They had attempted to shake off the yoke of the orthodox Establishment, so it is of little wonder that when, in a new country, the representatives of the old order appeared to be attempting to control their lives and aspirations yet again, that dissent reappeared.63

The rapid growth of Industrial society, and with it the attendant explosion of urban areas,64 combined to create a large degree of ‘culture shock’ in Victorian Britain. In fact it has been argued that pre-industrial society was not replaced by another, industrial society, but rather a floating experience of societies based on liberal theories of political and economic freedom, composed of individuals motivated by self-interest and only kept in check by the need to fulfill legal contracts.65 Such an analysis is rather too atomistic and reductionist, but there was a new socio-religious ethos developing in Britain. Equally as important as the economic ideals was the rise of the notion of respectability - especially as a means to rise in the new social strata - if only self-conceptually. Subsequently this cult took hold of and relied upon a Christianity based on notions of “God-fearing”, strict morality, “clean living” and “a law-abiding life”.66 As Bebbington describes the Evangelical view of politics, it involved a commitment “…to a negative policy of reform. The proposals were regularly for the elimination of what was wrong, not for the achievement of some alternative goal.”67

The old certainties - such as they were - had undergone a series of challenges. The concepts of Society and the Establishment had experienced the process of fragmentation. One response, one

63 The nature of this dissent is covered in depth in chapter seven.
64 F. M. L. Thompson, The Rise of Respectable Society (Fontana Press, 1988), p.23. In 1801 there was no British city outside London with a population of 100,000. By 1831, London was joined by Manchester, Glasgow, Edinburgh, Liverpool, Leeds, Birmingham and Bristol - which together accounted for a sixth of the total population of Britain.
67 D. W. Bebbington, Evangelicalism in Modern Britain, pp.133-137.
attempt to chart a new course was to leave the old society and create a new one - not in Britain - but overseas, for the story of Victorian Britain is also one of colonization.

On his return to Britain in 1866, the prominent New Zealand settler, Charles Carter, made a telling observation:

The two extremes of great luxury and great poverty, co-existent throughout the British Isles, appear to me to indicate, in some measure, a declining rather than a rising Empire, and as such they should be viewed with apprehension rather than satisfaction.68

Carter's observations, though from a mid-century viewpoint, echo those of many thinkers on the state of British society earlier in the century. Part of the response to the massive changes engendered by industrialization was a critique of the ills of the new society - and the attendant search for solutions.

In tandem with the awareness that British society was undergoing great physical change was a simultaneous growth in philosophical speculation on ways to solve the attendant ills. Carter's criticisms of the divide between rich and poor had been noted by many previous observers, Edward Gibbon Wakefield not the least amongst them. Erik Olssen has recently traced the influence of Adam Smith and the late Scottish Enlightenment in Wakefield's thought, especially the elements of "systematic thought and procedure" and Smith's definition of civilization as encompassing a mix of "human nature, civil society and historical anthropology".69 This aimed at

---

Charles Rooking Carter (1822-1896) was involved with the Chartists and the Anti-Corn League, writing on economic matters and labour conditions before emigrating to New Zealand in 1850. Establishing himself as a builder, he was later involved in the Small Farm Association and was MHR for Wairarapa 1859-1865. The town of Carterton, and the Carter Observatory in Wellington are named after him.

69 E. Olssen, "Wakefield and the Scottish Enlightenment", in The Friends of the Turnbull Library, Edward Gibbon Wakefield and the Colonial Dream: A Reconsideration (Wellington: GP
escaping the limitations of prior history in exchange for the new plateau of enlightenment and refinement, and involved building on the Enlightenment’s general claims of and for universal truths, mixed in with Romanticism’s calls of national destiny and regeneration. The end aim was that of saving Britain from a Malthusian explosion by exporting both surplus capital and people.

It has been said that Wakefield’s success “lay in appealing to greed and nostalgia in equal measure”, and while such a position needs to be considered, there is also the danger of taking a position high-up the mountain of late-twentieth century morality that betrays a modernist notion of progress very similar in many ways to the despised Victorian ‘Great Chain of Being’. For, too often Wakefield, his schemes and later emigrants have been dismissed out-of-hand as little short of an ‘unnatural disaster’ for New Zealand, yet there is the other side of those who came, who emigrated in search of a positive new start. There was of course a sense of nostalgia involved by those emigrating, yet a nostalgia tempered by dreams of a new society, not just a replication of traditional rural England. As John Martin has recently stated, Wakefield’s plans were directed primarily at the labouring class and the uneasy middle class and aimed at all settlers (eventually) having opportunities for land; in the process abolishing the large inequalities of wealth prevalent in Britain, and also seeking the extension of democracy and suffrage. So while there was a certain degree of arcadian nostalgia involved, there was also a pragmatic decision of opting for the chance to start again and anew.

The accusation of greed is, of course, somewhat harder to define. For often in historical writing it has been an accusation leveled from the comfort and security of the academy. We must therefore attempt to view emigrant motives through the lens of their own society. Is the

---

70 Ibid.
71 Ibid., p.48.
73 J. Martin, “A ‘small nation on the move’”, p.35 in Edward Gibbon Wakefield and the Colonial
acquisition and farming of what their culture defined as waste lands mere greed, or is it more to
do with Victorian notions of progress, self-help, Christianity, providence and civilization? It must
also be remembered that it was those who had suffered most: handloom weavers, the small tenant
farmers, the farm labourers, those bypassed by the benefits of, or reduced in circumstance because
of, industrialization who composed the bulk of British emigration.74

In Wakefield’s fictionalized consideration of the issues, A View of the Art of Colonisation
(1847), there is a series of letters between “A Statesman” and Wakefield. In these, Wakefield
attempts to answer “Statesman’s” queries as to the hows and whys of colonization. This provides
a fascinating insight into how Wakefield, at least, viewed his ventures - and their benefits. At one
point, “Statesman” makes a declaration which expresses the propaganda of recruitment that
Wakefield aimed for:

If I were a common labourer, and knew what I knew about colonies, I am sure that I would not
stay in this country (Britain) if I could anyhow find the means of emigration to high wages, to
the prospect of comfortable independence, and the immediate enjoyment of that importance
which belongs to the labouring class in the colonies.75

Such aims were to be linked into what can be best described as ‘Imperial humanitarianism’ which
has links back to Enlightenment aims and notions, as Wakefield had outlined a decade earlier.
This included: “…a deliberate and methodological scheme for leading a savage people to embrace
the religion, language, laws and social habits of an advanced country.”76

Dream: A Reconsideration.

74 O. McDonagh, ed., Emigration in the Victorian Age (Westmead: Gregg International Publishers
76 E. G. Wakefield & J. Ward, The British Colonisation of New Zealand (London: J. W. Parker for
the New Zealand Association, 1837), p.42. Ged Martin has recently critiqued Wakefield’s colonization
plans, stating that they never worked in practice because they were never intended to apply to real
colonies. Rather, they were part and parcel of a Wakefieldian fantasy world to which he was
especially prone. G. Martin, “Wakefield’s past and futures”, p.35 in Edward Gibbon Wakefield and
Often such aims conflicted with pragmatic experience, yet in the Britain of the time many felt that a certain degree of compatibility was attainable.

Charles Reynolds, in his study of Imperialism, is careful to distinguish between Imperialism and Colonialism. Imperialism is, he states:

an idea that denotes a relationship of dominion... Imperial relations are essentially those of the imposition of rule by one locus of authority upon alien people... [while Colonialism ]... denotes the settlement of territory by the peoples of a metropolitan power.  

The question that needs to be asked, the question that lies at the centre of the New Zealand situation is: can Colonialism actually occur without Imperialism? J. A. Hobson, in a sense the ‘grandfather’ of Imperialist studies, in his definition of Colonialism appears to state that it cannot:

Colonialism, in its best sense, is a natural overflow of nationality; its test is the power of colonists to transplant the civilisation they represent to the new natural and social environment in which they find themselves.

These (broad) definitions stress the need to remember that while Imperialism can occur without the need to expand into Colonialism, Colonialism necessarily requires Imperialism, firstly in order to have a location, and secondly, in order to survive. After all, Colonialism occurs in lands that  

---

*the Colonial Dream. A Reconsideration.*

This is, I feel, too harsh. Wakefield was primarily a theorist, as Olssen has demonstrated. His aims had sound links in the Scottish Enlightenment. His theories were not out of step with other ‘colonial propagandists’ who sought, if not Utopia, at least a semi-ruralized Arcadia in New Zealand, and believed that it was possible.

already have occupants, with the result that so much of the history of colonization has resulted in inter-cultural conflict.

Yet underlying much of Britain’s expansion into the world was a notion of destiny which had its roots in Christian theology. Emigration was popularly thought of, and often exhorted as, the will of God; as in the injunction of Genesis 1:28 to “be fruitful and multiply” throughout the earth, especially when Britain was overpeopled while her colonies (or potential colonies) were viewed as almost empty. J. M. Blaunt, in criticizing “The Colonizer’s Model of the World” talks of this as part of a diffusionist “myth of emptiness”, based on a notion that non-Europeans lacked the intellectual and spiritual factors that had resulted in European progress. This in turn led to a series of claims that because the new location is wasteland, European settlement does not involve the displacement of natives, or if it does, they in any case made no claim to territory as understood by European notions of political sovereignty. This was because the original inhabitants were viewed as culturally inferior and lacked notions of private property. Therefore settlers could take lands because no one owned them; and in any case, the inhabitants were lower down on the Chain of Being which meant they needed Europeans to elevate both them and their lands.

The notion of a “New Exodus” was frequently cited, with New Zealand in particular a new “Promised Land”, especially in colonial rhetoric:

> God gave the earth to man to use - not to particular races, to prevent other men from using;

> and I know of no principle of reason, no precept of revelation, that gives the inhabitants of

---

one valley in New Zealand a right to appropriate a neighbouring valley, in preference to the
Englishman who cannot find the means of subsistence at home.\(^8\)

It is important to remember this common religious undercurrent to the act of settlement. Biblical
injunctions and phrases were commonly invoked, especially those of “The Land of Goshen” and
“a land of milk and honey” to describe New Zealand.\(^8\) These terms, which link the act of
colonization with the ancient Israelites being favoured by their God, gave a theological
justification to the act of settlement. A similar theme is evident in the settlement of North
America, which often stressed the concept of creating the “new Zion” in the wilderness, of travel
to a new “promised land”.\(^8\)

So underneath the act of colonization, evident in the many texts and treatises written on the
subject, was the sense that something ‘new, great and good’ was being embarked upon. Charles
Hursthouse, in his influential 1857 text (reprinted 1861) on New Zealand, could still, in the mid-
century, refer to all those who would be “saved” by emigration.\(^8\) Thomas Cholmondeley, another

---

\(^8\) Wanganui Chronicle, 3 March 1864, p.2. This was most probably written by James Taylor, who was
to resign as editor the following year to become a Presbyterian minister.

\(^8\) The Land of Goshen (Genesis 46:28-34; 47:1-10) was the area in the eastern Egyptian delta where
Jacob and his family settled, because of the existence of fine pastures for their sheep. The link is
thus made with New Zealand’s potential for sheep farming. A land of milk and honey (Deuteronomy
6:3; 8: 7-9) is the land promised to the Israelites if they keep the commandments. The use of such phrases
stressed the common self-perception that the British were the new Israelites, the new chosen people.


\(^8\) C. Hursthouse, New Zealand, the “Britain of the South”. 2d. ed. (London: Edward Stanford,1861), p.4.
Those to be “saved” included “struggling professional men, petty capitalists, farmers, traders...half paid
labourers and mechanics.” Dr. John Shaw (“Fellow of the Geological and Linnaean Societies of London
and the Botanical of Edinburgh”), in A Gallop to the Antipodes (London: J. F. Hope, 1858) wrote
“Mr Hursthouse has written an able, interesting and amusing book on New Zealand, which has had,
I believe, a pretty good circulation in New Zealand,” (p.222). Charles Hursthouse (1812-1876) had
been a settler in New Plymouth in the 1840s, returning briefly from England in 1854, and then again
in 1870 until his death. He wrote and lectured widely on Antipodean matters, beginning in 1849
with An Account of the Settlement of New Plymouth (London: Smith, Elder and Co, ), dedicated, by permission, to
Sir George Grey, and which lists 127 subscribers in Britain, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa,
who took a total of 495 copies. Of these, the New Zealand Company took 100, Grey 20, and E. G. Wakefield 6.
early chronicler of New Zealand, wrote in 1854 of the “unfolding vision” of a “new national life” in which “duties and expectations go hand in hand.”

All this was combined with a developing notion of Anglo-Saxonism which colonial encounters tended only to engender. In this the British were self-perceived as possessing not only the grace and will of the Christian God for governing other races, but also, through divine providence, possessing a unique constitutional system combining liberty, justice and efficiency.

Underlying such conceptions was a strong influence arising out of evangelical self-confidence and an attendant overwhelming belief in the need for mission. Mission took on socio-political tones, a notion of a general conversion taken ‘on the road’, and was expressed as a three-fold package of economics (free trade), politics (representative government) and religion (Protestant Christianity). This became the purpose of Empire, which, entwined with evangelical notions of a world of unregenerate but potentially redeemable humanity was commended as what Kabbani calls mission civilisatrice. What this meant was that the ideology of Empire encompassed more than the commonly presented brute jingoism, rather it sought to involve contemporary notions of reason, science and history to perpetuate and further its ambitions. There was thus a quest to maintain an honourable image of the colonizer, hence the stress on enlightenment over exploitation, of duty (to God and Sovereign) over mere profit, of aiding and benefiting the indigenous population by European Christianity and civilization. The result of this was, that in an age so enamored of the notion and belief in ‘progress’, those attempting to limit colonial endeavor were, in the colonies, marginalized. For colonies were nothing less than ‘progress’ in a

85 T. Cholmondeley, Ultima Thule or, Thoughts suggested by a Residence in New Zealand (London: John Chapman, 1854), pp.3-4.
87 I. Bradley, The Call to Seriousness. The Evangelical Impact upon the Victorians, pp.89-90.
physical geo-political laboratory. A retrospective view was provided by H.W. Tucker in his 1877 memoir of Bishop Selwyn. He placed the whole attempt in a religio-social framework:

It was determined to try for the first time the great experiment, whether the representatives of the superior race, when they found themselves in that borderland where they confront the vices of both barbarism and civilization and the virtues of neither, should be true to their higher destinies; and whether a fragment of the family of the first Adam, long sunk in degredation, could be engrafted into the family of the second Adam and maintained in social and political vigour.\(^9\)

Such philosophical perceptions (allied to those of the ‘God-given right’ of settlement and the ‘God-given gift’ of land in which to start afresh), would inevitably result in conflict with the indigenous inhabitants. For, as in Canaan, there were already people living there, people who had not heard about this right or gift from another’s tribal God to their land. As Dalton has noted, there was a common settler inability to admit that Maori land was the property of Maori. If this land was granted a crown title then this was perceived of as “granting away the colonial territory to natives”, which resulted in the common settler lament of the “alienation of waste lands”.\(^9\)

Once the settlers arrived, the concept of settlement could become a reality.

To understand the colonial situation of the 1860s, there is also a need to consider the actions and perceptions of the early missionaries, for in a sense, they were the first colonists. The sealers and whalers who predated them, being exploiters, not settlers, transitory, not ‘permanent’, ‘entry points’, not promoters of a new culture, were not a ‘colonial event’ in the same way that missionaries were. The missionaries were also by far the most articulate, able to create opinion both in New Zealand and back in Britain.

\(^9\) B. J. Dalton, *War and Politics in New Zealand, 1855-1870*, p.82.
Officially active in New Zealand since the arrival in the far north of William Hall and Thomas Kendall in June 1814, by as early as the 1830s settler resentment against the missionaries’ seemingly partisan approach to Maori was being stated, with settlers feeling that (in Morrell’s phrasing) they were regarded as “homo homini lupus.” Some early commentators had viewed the missionary as an essential part of the process of colonization. Writing in 1840, John Ward, Secretary of the New Zealand Company, was strongly supportive of the missionaries and their work amongst Maori: “The Missionaries have, in fact, accomplished a revolution in New Zealand, and have prepared the way for an enlightened colony, that would not only protect, but co-operate with their labours.”

Wakefield had been very keen that his prototype settlements should exhibit a Christian character. He attacked the existing provision for religion in the colonies as “nearly all make-believe and moonshine...[on a] scale of inadequacy that looks like mockery.” He conceded that while in colonies such as Canada, Michigan, South Australia and New Zealand there might be overt religious observance, there was a distinct lack of religious influence “upon the morals, the intelligence, and the manners” of those considered “the best-informed and best-behaved” classes. This was partly the result of what became a common lament, the lack of clergy in some

---

91 William Hall (7-1832), CMS missionary from 1809, was a ‘mechanic’ missionary with expertise in carpentry and shipbuilding. He undertook these duties, along with farming, resigning from the CMS in 1825 and moving to farm in Australia.

92 Thomas Kendall (1778-1832), CMS missionary from 1809 following an evangelical conversion, established New Zealand’s first school in 1816, having published in 1815 the first book in Maori. A layman, he was soon involved in musket trading with local Maori, and while friendly with the local leader Hongi Hika, soon fell out with his fellow missionaries and other settlers. Dismissed by the CMS in 1823 for adultery with a Maori, he remained in New Zealand until 1825 when he left for Chile, and later, New South Wales. He was an important early link between European and Maori.


94 John Ward (1805-1890), variously a lawyer, prison inspector and secretary to the first Earl of Durham, resulting in his becoming Secretary of the New Zealand Company. He soon became a diplomat in Germany.


97 Ibid., p.152.
areas; but Wakefield was also keen to echo the sentiment of Samuel Hinds,\textsuperscript{98} then Dean of Carlisle, who wrote an essay on “Colonization” in 1832. This, Wakefield included in his \textit{A View of the Art Of Colonization}. Hinds was keen to stress that, for the colonial situation, a clergyman required more than “mere learning or eloquence or even piety”, but rather needed to be able to be respected by the “better sort” of colonist, while his “character and talents” would suit the particular colonial situation.\textsuperscript{99}

Others were not so sure that Wakefield’s plans, (or other European settlement) could be so easily reconciled with missionary aims and endeavour. Some, such as John Beecham,\textsuperscript{100} Secretary of the Wesleyan Methodist Mission (Society), wrote in 1838 that the New Zealand Company’s plans would “prove a most serious obstruction to the Missionary Societies”.\textsuperscript{101}

Many settlers felt that a clash with the missionaries would occur, not because missionary and settler aims were different, but rather because of the similarities of their final objectives. Both, it could be (and was) argued, were after land and influence; material gain being a common aim, yet only one side, the settler, being up-front and honest about this.\textsuperscript{102}

\textsuperscript{98} Samuel Hinds (1793-1872), D.D., later Bishop of Norwich. Born in Barbados, a ‘moderate liberal’ in politics, his essay was originally an appendix to Richard Whately’s (Archbishop of Dublin 1831-63) \textit{Thoughts on Secondary Punishment} (1832). Whately wrote widely on many subjects, both religious and secular, including Political Economy, and in opposition to the transportation of criminals to Australia.

\textsuperscript{99} S. Hinds in E.G. Wakefield, \textit{A View of the Art of Colonization}, p.115.

\textsuperscript{100} John Beecham (1787-1856), D.D., wrote and spoke on the work of missions. He was Secretary of the Wesleyan Mission Society in Britain 1831-1850, when he was elected President of the Wesleyan Conference.


\textsuperscript{102} The British Army Officer W. Tyrone Power, stationed in New Zealand 1846-48, was critical of missionary activities, in firstly attempting to separate Maori from settlers and therefore “making an invidious distinction between the races” and secondly, because “…they have not always been so immaculate in their dealings as to render the goodness of their motives entirely unsuspected by their fellow countrymen, and it has been generally considered that a struggle for temporal rights and influence has induced many of them to set themselves against the interests of the settlers and the peace of the country.” W. T. Power, \textit{Sketches in New Zealand} (London: Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans, 1848), p.147.
To newly arriving settlers, it was obvious that many missionaries had profited materially out of their association with Maori; they had farms, land, well-built homes, orchards and labour to work upon them. When the missionaries attempted to limit wholesale land-buying by settlers who had endured at least a four-month sea journey to do just that, resentment naturally occurred. The missionary view was that emigration, if it had to and was to occur, should be conducted in accordance with Christian principles, especially regarding the treatment of any aboriginal populations. They must be seen as people not animals and their humanity respected. They were ‘Children of God’ and so had rights - rights to subsistence and ‘Christian justice’ - which had to lie at the basis of any land appropriation. Therefore their interests must be respected. Overall...

the simple view should be that colonists, with better knowledge and loftier civilization, should in all their transactions conduct themselves as in the sight of Him who has given them this better knowledge and loftier civilization. 103

The question was, how were these conflicting aims and expectations to be played out in the New Zealand context? To begin to answer this we must first turn to look briefly at the settlers’ perceptions of their new environment - and society.

Wakefield’s schemes had established a pattern of those who ventured to New Zealand. In his plans, married couples were to be preferred, and one had to at least be a mechanic, a craftsman, an agricultural labourer or a domestic servant. Those in the workhouse, or existing on parish relief found no place in the schemes. These would, by the provision of a “sufficient price” for land, provide both a population and an economy willing and able to work for, and support, a nation of immigrants who over time would become themselves land owners supporting in turn further influxes of willing workers. 104 A sort of self-striving egalitarianism, tempered with those from the

104 See J. E. Martin, “A ‘small nation on the move’” in Edward Gibbon Wakefield and the Colonial
higher classes of society would thus form the Wakefieldian colonies - at least in embryonic perception. While his colonies might not have been as successful as he would have liked, there is no doubting his influence upon the newly-emergent New Zealand. In fact, of the 22000 Pakeha in the colony by 1852, 12000 had emigrated under Wakefield-inspired schemes. 

For them, the location appears to have been of less importance than the final result. The lure of cheap passage and good prospects usually meant a shorter voyage to the United States or Canada. Settlement further afield, such as South Africa, Australia or especially New Zealand was primarily for those with more money (and hence more choice) or those who actually “wanted to found new societies for the sake of doing so.” 

The lure of New Zealand was the promoted notion of a fertile Eden, of a readily available arcadia that was uniquely suited to English sensibilities. It was a land of potential opportunity to which the best elements of British life could be transplanted to create a ‘better Britain’ in the South Seas. The lure was not only the land but also a life free of the old societal constraints tended to limit the potential advancement of those from the lower sectors in British society.

New Zealand was thus a settlement born out of a quest for an improvement in life and in social advancement, rather than a sense of complete desperation. While agricultural and other labourers were a predominant feature of emigration to New Zealand, a primary reason for this was their possession of the background, skills, and aptitude necessary for breaking in a new country. The Wakefield schemes had aimed to replicate a better England in the South Pacific, the reality is that

---

Dream. A Reconsideration, for further discussion on Wakefield’s labour plans.

107 W. D. Borrie, Immigration to New Zealand 1854-1938 (Australian National University, Demographic Program 1991), p.39. For example, in the returns for the New Zealand Emigration Board for 1865, (admittedly after the Wakefieldian schemes - but continuing the trend) of 942 emigrants (those with professions, excluding wives and children), 585 (62%) were either agricultural or
New Zealand\textsuperscript{108} better represented small pockets of industrializing villages who dreamed of re-attaining a pastoral idyll past.

\textsuperscript{108} By 'New Zealand' is meant Pakeha settlements in contrast to what could be described as 'Maori' Aotearoa.
3: THE CREATION OF OTHERNESS: SUBCULTURES AND NARRATIVES IN COLONIAL NEW ZEALAND.

The complex web of English culture and its competing narratives and claims had been arriving in New Zealand since before 1840. By 1860 the varied narratives had taken on their own local colour. It is from this understanding that my expression and interpretation of the Pakeha debates of the 1860s can proceed.

My thesis of competing narratives has its basis in a broadly painted (and admittedly simplistic and reductionist) two narrative hypothesis of ‘Settler’ and ‘Church Party.’ Yet it is important to articulate the general outline for the dualist expression is a potent one in the historical imagination and needs to be expressed if it is to be later critiqued. Otherwise there is the risk of confusing a hypothesis with the reality - another form of the events-facts misreading.

The narrative of the settlers involved the history of an under-utilized land, of missionary obstruction of settlement (and allied missionary self-interest and greed) and of Maori being misled by ‘missionary inter-meddling’. It involved a present where the legacy of history created a battle between civilization and barbarism; and a future of settler triumph, peace, access to land, prosperity and identity as the ‘Britain of the South Seas’. The ‘Church Party’ narrative included the existence of a fallen but redeemable portion of humanity (Maori); and the efforts and success of conversion continually being hampered by the incursions, distractions and oppositions of the ‘ravenous and blood-thirsty’ settler. There was conflict between ‘the aims of God’ (as
evidenced by mission work amongst Maori) and ‘the aims of Man’ (sic) (as evidenced by settlers and large-scale colonization). The present was the intensification of this conflict - and by the Waikato war, an acceptance (though still critical) of the settler civilization versus barbarism narrative. As for the future, it was neither the theocracy nor ‘jesuitical republic’ as claimed by their opponents, but nor was it that of the ‘settler triumph’. It was for a land lived and ruled by ‘Christian principles’ - a ‘Christian nation’ in which Maori were treated with honour and respect - and so were missionaries.

The context (very broadly speaking) was that settlers wanted land, Maori often desired to keep it, and missionaries desired an impact that settlers did not wish to grant or give them. In response, all created their own narratives - just as the above has been a created narrative in order to explain a thesis. It is the situation in which certain claims are made about the world and the relation of differing perspectives to it, which are taken as provisional guides in the making sense of experience.¹

Before we venture off into the evaluation of the competing narratives, we must first understand the situation which allows (or forces) us to acknowledge the presence and legitimacy of competing narratives.

The 'narratives' of postmodernity
- or the promotion of provisionality.

1. sub-culture and Imperialism

It is one of the major contentions of this thesis that the Pakeha debates of the period under review can be (re)read under categories and notions of otherness. This is both the defining otherness created / imposed by the dominant settler discourse, and a critiquing otherness that has resulted in the many narratives approach - the embracing of plurality. It is also the story of a sub-culture - that of colonial New Zealand, which was involved in relationships of otherness as it attempted to establish itself in the new land. The others that were created and encountered involved not only the racial otherness of Maori culture, but also the developing new otherness of British society and policy - and the competing Imperialism of the missionaries and Churches. Otherness can also thus be evidenced within cultures as between them. It is such an understanding that lies at the heart of the critique of the seminal works by Edward Said. In Orientalism (1978) and Culture and Imperialism (1993) Said not only

2 The other was/is used as a method of definition – a presence which the defining group could reference themselves against; something or someone to which they were self-perceived to be at an advantage. A. Pagden, European Encounters with the New World, pp.183-84.
A useful term is that used by Richard Slotkin in discussing the mythology of the American frontier. He uses the term “definition by repudiation” to describe how, in a clash of cultures, in opposing ‘the other’, each side symbolically affirms their own. R. Slotkin, Regeneration Through Violence. The Mythology of the American Frontier 1600–1860. (Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1973), p.22.

3 In the Master narrative, the voice(s) of the other(s) were subsumed under the dominant discourse, plurality was not acknowledged – except as that against which Truth could be defined. In the postmodern framework, otherness returns – as a competing voice, as the embracing of plurality and dissenting (and exiled) views and experiences. There is thus the writing of narratives and not a single Narrative; the recognition of the complexity of issues and viewpoints, the articulation of experiences
brought to the fore the Western construction and promotion of the notion of other, but also the inter-linkings and inter-reliance of Western Culture and the Imperialist venture and world-view. Especially important is his continued stressing of the link of narratives with the outworkings of Imperialist ventures. Therefore the newspaper reports that I have used in discussing the New Zealand conflicts can be read as writing a nation - both creating and informing (and under-girding) a viewpoint.\(^4\)

However, if theoretically a Nation is a Narrative, it is also composed of many other sub-narratives that tell the stories of the sub-cultures that both complete and critique the Master Narrative.

\(1.a: \text{The creation of Maori as 'other'.}\)

Maori are the most obvious candidates to be relegated to the status of other by the settlers in New Zealand. For settlers arriving in the new land, the relegation of Maori to other was tied up not only with European notions and beliefs in the hierarchy of culture but also with questions as to the use and ownership of land. Thomas Cholmondeley provides a fine example of this issue in writing on the question of "Maori land" in 1854:

\(^4\) The importance of what is called ‘colonial discourse analysis’ is that it emphasizes the shared use of language which is used to both describe and analyze and “which is not transparent, innocent or merely instrumental”. R. Young, “Colonialism and the Desiring Machine” in Liminal Postmodernisms, The Postmodern, the (Post-) Colonial, and the (Post-) Feminist, Postmodern Studies 8, ed. T. D’Haen & H. Bertens (Amsterdam & Atlanta, Ga: Rodopi,1994), p.10.
Since the prosperity of every country depends, first or last, upon its land; since the cardinal point in the character of a nation is, the way in which they regard a deal with their soil; the fact that the native New Zealanders had no notion of an individual possession of land, such as immemorial custom sanctions among us and civilized nations generally, is a very important clue to their character.5

Maori became other not only because of skin-colour and culture, but also because \textit{they were here} where Pakeha wished to establish themselves. By reducing Maori to other it becomes easier to dehumanize; what Said calls “structures of attitude and reference”6 come into play. These involve the notions of racial and cultural hierarchies, of subject races, of an English Mission to colonize. However, to reduce another to the status of other is, as Peter Gay has noted, an alibi for aggression.7 For otherness constructed out of a Grand Narrative viewpoint is, most commonly, a combination of pseudo-science and habitual prejudice.8 There is also, as Rana Kabbani states, often a

\begin{footnotesize}
5 T. Cholmondeley, \textit{Ultima Thule}, p.187. Cholmondeley follows this with a discussion as to whether the ancestors of “civilized” races were ever at the same level as these “savages” - and concludes that they were not. For such a view “is to cast a slight on the scheme of God, whereby his beneficence becomes tarnished and to put a very mistaken construction upon our own nature, and position in the world”. (p.202).


7 P. Gay, \textit{The Cultivation of Hatred} (London: Fontana Press, London, 1995), p.35. The other “Victorian alibis for aggression” were, he states, “the case for competition” and “the cult of manliness”: “The animus was always the same; whether nation, province or city, whether religion, class or culture - the more one loved one’s own, the more one was entitled to hate the Other”. (p.68).

8 Robert Young, in “Colonialism and the Desiring Machine” (pp30-31), discusses, as an example, a nineteenth century, four volume survey on Race (R. Brown: \textit{The Races of Mankind},[London 1873 - 79]) in which the possibilities of ‘inter-race mixing’ and ‘naming’ in South America result in twenty three “crosses” which have received names. Robert Brown’s survey was obviously popular and successful for, in 1882 he brought out a six-volume revision, entitled \textit{The Peoples Of The World} (London, Paris & New York: Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co.). Brown was a well-known geographer and explorer and wrote copiously on such topics. His views on Maori arc of those who believed Maori were almost approaching the levels of Europeans, as he states of the generic family of Polynesians: [they] “are in most respects superior to other savage races. They have a decidedly good opinion of themselves, are religious, but not moral, and have proved to be more easily influenced by Christianity than almost any other people with whom the missionaries have come in contact, so that few of them, nominally at least, retain the primitive pagan faith.”(1882, vol.2, p.4). Of Polynesians, he says “the New Zealanders are perhaps the noblest and most intellectual of them all.” (1882, vol.2, p.15).

Brown’s volumes express a mania for comparison and classification, in which strong notions and expressions of otherness are hidden behind a supposedly scientific observation and description.
\end{footnotesize}
sense of sado-masochism intermixed - the world of the other being characterized in Victorian minds with both “lascivious sensuality” and “inherent violence”.  

It is in such a climate that the newspaper reports of the death of Volkner would revel in the details of death and dismemberment whereby Maori were portrayed as complete others, having, in this physical act, rejected both Christianity and Civilization. As such, these notions and articulations of otherness fed into residual beliefs whereby, as Thomas Cholmondeley wrote:

The imagination of my own boyhood surrounded the tattooed natives with a halo of delightful mystery. Their warlike power was tremendous; their aspect ferocious; their cruelty unutterable; unfortunate white men seldom escaped, and then only half-roasted, from their horrid orgies; their priests were wizards, and they loved the flesh of the missionaries more than any other food.  

Yet otherness towards Maori was not always couched in what could be termed such negative forms, there was also what could be termed neutral otherness. This was more the preserve of the missionaries, viewing Maori as potentially redeemable - as long as they accepted Civilization and Christianity. Underlying this was what Said  

The number of engravings of ‘half-naked savages’ is reminiscent of the purient interest in such images that the National Geographic was infamous for. (See following footnote) .  
Robert Young’s essay “Colonialism and the Desiring Machine” is a post-colonial / postmodern investigation into such notions that concludes: “For the Victorians, race and sex became history, and history spoke of race and sex”. (p.32).  
Such notions helped supply an alibi for aggression in the sense that the West could believe that the Non-West needed the Imperialist presence of the West in order to fulfill the mission of civilization.  
10 T. Cholmondeley, Ultima Thule, p.7.  
11 It is a moot point as to whether the classification of another as other can ever be neutral -and in many ways it is an oxymoron. However I use this term in contrast to the aggressively negative otherness I have been discussing. So neutral otherness still involves a large degree of negativity, but was (supposedly) more (potentially) open and accepting.
terms “imperialist polemic”, whereby the “native race” is by nature a “delinquent” and the “white man a stern but moral parent and judge”. Such perceptions can be read into the actions of both Selwyn and John Morgan in New Zealand; into how they could find themselves on the same side, opposed to Kingitanga in the Waikato campaign. For such rebellion (as they viewed it) encompassed both a refusal and a falling away from Civilization, that necessary adjunct to the successful implementation an application of Christianity.

Hadfield falls more under Geoffrey Oddie’s critique of Said’s *Orientalism*. For Hadfield was evangelical in orientation, and evangelicals, Oddie argues, perceived the world differently. They still undertook a division of the world in terms of otherness, but their understanding tended to be spiritually, not culturally or racially based. All humanity were, for them, sinners in need of Christian hope and redemption. Their belief in the equality of all in the body of Christian (Protestant) faith meant that alliances were primarily based upon the existence and profession of Christian conversion. So evangelicals placed Christianity first and foremost. For them it was belief that led to right action; not the semi-Pelegian outlook that some humanitarians and many Imperialists seemed to tacitly support.

But the evangelical viewpoint was always a minority viewpoint as regards Maori in this period. Maori tended to occupy a sliding scale of acceptance that depended upon the contemporary situation and experience of the colonist. Bravery in battle was

---

recognized and applauded, but the rejection of Christianity was condemned. There was often a comparison made between Maori and ‘other races’, part of the Victorian mania for classification and ordering - thereby imposing their Narrative and control. Thus to some writing in the 1860s, Maori, though “not equal” to “North American Indians” were “a fine race”\(^{15}\); but “not possessed of the same critical powers as the Zulu Kaffirs”.\(^{16}\) Yet conversely, such beliefs were not considered out-of-line with a self-critique such as John Gorst’s that stated:

> to view men whose skin differs in colour from our own as “damned niggers”, is a weakness of our Anglo-Saxon character, which proves our civilization and Christianity less than perfect.\(^{17}\)

Gorst tended to lay the blame on “the general mass of townspeople” who speak of Maori “with disgust and dislike”.\(^{18}\) Amongst them there was common sentiment that

---

\(^{14}\) This refers to the belief, midway between St. Augustine and Pelagius which holds that humans take the first steps towards salvation, following which Grace will then supervene. The Victorian expression of this was the Civilize then Christianize doctrine.

\(^{15}\) W. I. Grayling, *The War in Taranaki during the years 1860-1861*, p.10. Grayling is a supporter of the then prevalent notion of a racial hierarchy whereby “Australian Aboriginals” are “amongst the lowest grades of the human species” (p.10). Maori, to him, appear to fit in the middle of a hierarchy of “savage tribes”. They do not possess the “individual traits of nobleness” of “North American Indians”, and “they had no definite Gods of their own to worship”. Otherness comes through in such comments as “No one can doubt the Maori’s power of comprehension”, but they do not (apparently) possess “ a love of the sublime and beautiful”. In comparison to Maori, Grayling contends that the “Anglo-Saxon” possesses “a higher enlightenment, connected with national energy of character” (p.11).

\(^{16}\) J. Gorst, *The Maori King* (London & Cambridge: Macmillan & Co, 1864) p.158. This is in a discussion of the conversion of Maori to Christianity and refers to their fondness for reading the Old Testament. Gorst is here comparing Maori to ‘Bishop Colenso’s Zulu’ whose critical readings of the Old Testament forced him to undertake the research on the Pentateuch that made Colenso a current theological cause celebre.

\(^{17}\) Ibid., p.74.

\(^{18}\) Ibid., p.75. These, Gorst contends, compare very unfavourably with Grey, Selwyn, “superior officers of the Government, the clergy, the more highly-educated colonists and the older settlers”, who treat Maori as “gentlemen”.

a musket-ball for every New Zealander [Maori] was the best mode of civilizing the
country...[or] a ship-load of infected pestilential blankets would ease the settlers of a host of
troublesome niggers, and make them more inclined to part with their land.\(^{19}\)

In such a situation, especially in times of conflict, the concentration is directed to
what makes the other, “other”. A settler could therefore write in 1862 that Maori
“were but acting up to their instincts as savages”…:

I do not care who states to the contrary, no race of beings who live amidst dirt and filth, and on
meagre diet, when the means of plenty exist around, can be considered in any shape as
connected with true civilization.\(^{20}\)

Otherness was also used to link those who were other at home with the other in New
Zealand - thus underlining the otherness of both groups. Writing for an audience of
Victorian boyhood, an “Army Chaplain” informed his readers in *Beeton’s Boy’s Own
Magazine* that

In appearance they [Maori] bear a striking resemblance to those gypsies who may still
occasionally be seen in the neighbourhood of Norwood and the Crystal Palace. They are a fine,
powerful, muscular race, naturally fond of war and possessed of great energy of character.\(^{21}\)

19 T. Gilbert, *New Zealand Settlers And Soldiers: or, The War in Taranaki* (London: A.W. Bennett,
1861), p.261. Gilbert, a former Baptist pastor, then a settler near Omata in Taranaki is critical of
such attitudes. But he is also critical of missionary (in)action in failing to teach Maori “certain
truths and principles” of ‘civilization’ which, he believes, would have eased dealings with the
settlers. Both Gilbert and his son George, refused to serve in the local militia - viewing all war to be
“unchristian and impolitic”. (p.27).
21 *Beeton’s Boy’s Own Magazine*, “Sergeant Major Lucas of the 40th Regiment and the Victoria
[1865?] P ). John Ward in his *Information Relative To New Zealand* (2nd ed. 1850) quotes a
“Mr Savage” who states that “The Colour of the natives, taken as a mean, resembles that of an
European gipsy”.[sic](p.65). Other descriptions linked Maori as similar in colour to Italians
the Spanish [ J. Pollack , *New Zealand, being a Narrative of Travels and Adventures*, vol.1.
The otherness of Maori was a result, or rather a creation of European encounters and perceptions of location, culture, skin colour - and above all, their opposition to European claims to their land. Sir Thomas Gore Browne acquired his own copy of Gorst’s *The Maori King*, and amidst the myriad marginalia he scribbled are two comments that neatly summarize the creation of Maori as other. The first is in reference to Gorst’s statement of Maori disappointment with their slow attainment of the “social advancement” they believed to be associated with European colonization. To this Gore Browne replies:

> civilization is a plant of slow growth and equality between savages and a highly cultivated race is not possible in either one or two generations.\(^2\)

The hierarchy of Civilization thus made Maori other. In many guides, memoirs and introductions to New Zealand published in the first half of the nineteenth century, there was repetitive description of Maori - their ‘origin’, ‘racial character’ and appearance, their beliefs, customs, dress and ‘potential future’ were all discussed. These were generally positive (especially in comparison to descriptions of “Australian Aborigines” and “negroes”) because Maori were seen as potentially culturally, societally and religiously redeemable To the writers this meant that within a few generations of assimilation “they” would become “like us” (‘Europeans’).\(^2\) In periods of inter-
cultural conflict however, Maori were too often and easily believed to revert to ‘savage’ otherness. To Pakeha this involved Maori becoming the (barely controllable) impediments to Civilization and Government. These were sentiments shared at the highest level, for Gore-Browne could annotate next to Gorst’s statement “But to really govern the Maories would have been costly…” his belief of “Very costly and has proved impossible”.24

To place Maori in the position of other was also a method whereby colonial New Zealand could delineate and define itself. In traveling from a European centre to a colonial periphery is in a sense a reversal of what can be called the ancestral journey. That is, a physical journey that also encompasses a mental one. Symbolically, it involves a traveling backwards in time; their context has changed from one of ‘civility’ to one of ‘savagery’.25 Therefore a strong stress had to be made between Civilization and Barbarism, for “progress” was the catch-word of the age. The settler had to reaffirm their difference to Maori, especially when they (settlers) were commonly being described, in both missionary publications and reports as “greedy and bloodthirsty” - two elements or descriptive tags that were usually connected with analysis of ‘savages’. This is also linked to the nature of the situation, for New Zealand was a colony, not a possession. The advantage of a possession was that its primary function

1. Gorst, The Maori King, p.2. (Gore Browne’s copy).
24 J. Gorst, The Maori King, p.41. (Gore Browne’s copy).
25 A. Pagden, *European Encounters with the New World*, p.160. Hence the repetitive stress in early-mid- nineteenth century books on New Zealand of the ‘cannibal past’ of Maori. While Gorst could (in a humanitarian vein) write of “cannibals” as “nearly extinct” in 1864 (thereby referring to them as if some aberrant, ill-fated creature or species), Gore Browne could make the annotative generalization that “30 years ago every man in New Zealand was a cannibal”. J. Gorst, *The Maori King*, p.2. (Gore Browne’s copy).
was exploitative, there was no emotional attachment - both place and people were there to be used. Settlement would be minimal, and often transitory, therefore conveying little sense of alienation; it was part of an exploitative journey where ‘home’ was also ‘Home’. A colony, however, implies settlement, and settlement involves self-definition. To the colonist, alienation was part of establishing an ‘alien - nation’; for however much a replication of ‘Home’ was attempted, there was continued contact with the perceived ‘primitive’, the ‘untamed’ and the ‘wild’, in both landscape and humanity. In response to such difference, in the face of critique from ‘Home’ as to their ‘fallen standards and behaviour’, the colonists felt themselves forced to assert and reassert themselves with increased vigour. To fail to do so would be to lose control, to doubt their own culture and society, which, they had been taught, was the ‘pinnacle of Civilization’. Yet with this went a cultural evangelism.

Frantz Fanon, in writing on the psychology of colonization, provided a way of understanding the situation:

On the unconscious plane, colonialism did not seek to be considered by the native as a gently loving mother who protects her child from a hostile environment, but rather as a mother who unceasingly restrains her fundamentally perverse offspring from managing to commit suicide and from giving free reign to its evil instincts.26

Now while this was a subtext for Imperial colonialism, whereby, at Government level at least, there was an underlying perception that an attempt had to be made to ‘save’ Maori from ‘barbarism’, this is more in line with the ‘Christian Imperialism’ and colonialism of the missionary churches - especially the ‘Church Party’. Their ‘restraint’
was focused in two directions; firstly to restrain the ‘perversity’ and ‘barbarism’ of the settlers and Government in the Taranaki campaign, and then, while continuing such an effort, also attempting to do the same for Maori in the Waikato campaign. In both instances it was not so much an effort and aim of protection, but rather that of restraint and chastisement.

The position in which the ‘Church Party’ placed itself was the result of a combined belief in both divine providence (the right and need for British Protestant Christianity to be here) and an evangelical undercurrent of a strong belief in both moral and spiritual responsibility. Both religious and secular groups could refer to the spectre of a returning, encroaching ‘barbarism’, but the difference was that the settler saw barbarism as only the preserve of the Maori other. Thus, ‘barbarism’ was something Maori had to be rescued from, something they had reverted to. It was thus believed that it was only in the power of ‘the White Man’(sic) to institute such a salvation;- for Maori were deemed incapable of achieving this on their own.

The ‘Church Party’ saw things rather differently - for if all humanity were fallen, then Europeans could revert to a state of barbarism as easily as Maori - especially in the freedom of a colonial society. In fact the greatest danger was that of ‘uncivilized’ or ‘barbaric’ behaviour by settlers, for that would only serve to undermine the work of missionaries with Maori. For, if Christian settlers chose to act in such a manner, then

---

28 ‘Barbarism’ was / is always seen as a state into which a group either reverts - or needs to be elevated’ from. It is thus part of a Western Teleological, Salvific Narrative of History and Culture in which The Christian West is, if not the coming of the Kingdom, at least as close as has yet been achieved.
what were the benefits, indeed, even the use of Maori listening to the missionaries and converting to Christianity?

The situation was that anyone (settler or Maori) who transgressed the ‘Church Party’ code of ‘right’ moral, social and spiritual behaviour became an other - a still potentially redeemable other, but an other all the same. But the settlers believed themselves in possession and creation of the dominant discourse, The Narrative of the Colony. For the ‘Church Party’ to challenge this put them in a situation analogous to rebel Maori - they too became an other. What made the situation complicated was that the other could be your neighbour, your cleric or your parishioner and, in times of Maori - Pakeha conflict, subsumed into the larger narrative of other that characterized Maori - Pakeha relations.29

1.b: The religious other.

On 7 September 1860, Governor Gore Browne sent a despatch to the Duke of Newcastle complaining

...that many (but by no means all) of the clergy belonging to the Church of England Mission have recently placed themselves in antagonism to the Government, and have added greatly to

---

29 This is of course both late Twentieth-century theory read back into and onto the mid-nineteenth century and (as theory is prone to be) a simplification of a complex situation. Yet to avoid the use of theory is to seek to do reportage, not history, and description and not critique and analysis. The delineations of otherness are conceptual frames within which to discuss and critique; permeable conceptual enclosures and not hard and fast realities.
the embarrassments with which it is surrounded. I do not doubt the purity of their intentions, but I regret the fact and its consequences.\textsuperscript{30}

His wife, in her narration of the war, was less circumspect, stating:

\ldots that Christian charity and sincere love of truth were to give way, in the clerical mind to blind and passionate feeling\textsuperscript{31} [and] \ldots that the basis on which the clergy build their opposition... is totally rotten and false and that it has been proved to be so by those most competent to judge.\textsuperscript{32}

Both the Governor and his wife were members of the Church of England, yet, like many of its laity (and indeed those of other denominations) they found themselves in a situation whereby the members of the ‘Church Party’ (predominantly Church of England clergy and missionaries) rapidly assumed the position of other in public and private colonial discourse.

The seeds for such alienation were, as we have seen, sown in both the conditions and experiences of British society, and in the history of missionary - settler mutual suspicion over the ownership and appropriation of Maori land. Yet during the years 1860-65, especially 1860-63, the strength of settler feeling \textit{against} what were termed “missionaries”\textsuperscript{33} intensified to a point where the ‘Church Party’ could be posited as occupying a position of otherness in settler society. The “missionary” qualified for otherness on two levels. Firstly, it was underlined by a common feature of their life-
style - their undertaking what amounted to a voluntary exile in the hinterland, distancing themselves from the concentrated coastal settlements of the settlers.\(^3\) This resulted in a common suspicion that such immersion in and with Maori culture and society had made them other by sympathy. There was a common charge that members of the ‘Church Party’ had become too closely identified with Maori, to the extent that they no longer understood (or identified ) with settler society. The warning was clear - otherness was catching.

Opinion was divided as to whether this appropriation of otherness was accidental or voluntary; the result of naïve or willful action. The ‘accidental and naïve’ argument attempted to provide an alibi for the ‘Church Party’ as being duped by Maori (seen as a cunning, untrustworthy other) into supporting Maori claims and action; and into believing that their influence over and amongst Maori was greater than it really was. Of course, providing such an alibi for the ‘Church Party’ other merely served to reinforce notions of Maori otherness. At least those accusing the ‘Church Party’ of acting as a ‘treasonous’ other restored some degree of autonomy and integrity to both ‘Church Party’ and Maori other; “missionaries” might be other, but at least they chose to be so.

The other level of “missionary” otherness arose from firstly the history of missionary opposition to large-scale European settlement, and then from the contrast experienced

\(^3\) Timothy Brennan, in discussing the notion of the ‘exile’ posits it as a conflicting pole of feeling to ‘nationalism’, involving similarities to the conflicts between “artistic vision and communal assent, the unique vision and the collective truth”. The division, he states, is often presented as not only that between individual and group, “but between loser and winner, between a mood of rejection and a mood of celebration”. T. Brennan, “The national longing for form” in Nation and Narration, ed. H.K. Bhaba, pp.60-61.
by many settlers between their own attempts to prosper materially and the evident material prosperity of many missionaries. Many of those who had voyaged to New Zealand had been made to feel other by the ‘Squire-Parson’ nexus in Britain. Now, in the new colony, it seemed that many clergy were again ‘imitating the Squire’ - and limiting opportunities for the ‘common man’ (sic). The ‘Church Party’ also made itself other with its ability, through ‘Exeter Hall’, to influence (so it appeared) both “Home” and Colonial Government, lobbying against settler concerns. Their involvement in politics was commonly regarded as betraying a fundamental trust. The popular, settler view of Selwyn in 1860 was that

> He and his clergy are in sore and dire disgrace at present. The duty of the Clergy is to speak quiet and never speak on quasi-political questions, even though the deepest moral interests are therein involved.\(^{35}\)

To the colonist, the ‘Church’\(^{36}\) was duty bound to support settler civilization and society - yet it seemed to have turned against this. It had done this not only in opposition to the Nation as ‘Church’ (resulting in such nomenclatures as the ‘Church Party’ or the ‘Bishop’s Party’), but also in alliance with the “brown savages” - Maori. Settler questions were raised (and remembered):

> After so many years of toil and the expenditure of such vast sums of money upon sacred literature, educational reserves, etc., what is the result? In the ‘sixties we find them - one of the

\(^{35}\) *Extracts of Letters from New Zealand on the War Question* (Lady Martin to Miss Palmer, 28 August 1860), p.18. Lady Martin is not endorsing such sentiments, rather she is referring to the situation that she and other members of the ‘Church Party’ found themselves in.

\(^{36}\) While such a general designation is usually made to refer to all branches and denominations of the Christianity, there is also the additional reading of this context whereby ‘Church’ means the ‘Church of England’. In popular thought this body, more than anyone else (because of the legacy of ‘The Establishment’) were ‘meant’ to support the State.
most intellectual of native races - despite the thirty years of missionary teaching, more savage, vindictive, and treacherous than when first observed.\textsuperscript{37}

“Missionaries” were other by both action and association - indeed they too were often regarded as a treacherous and vindictive other by settlers. A situation arose which approached what Peter Gay terms “the fiction of evil advisers”.\textsuperscript{38} His (albeit Freudian) interpretation succinctly summarizes the position that the ‘Church Party’, accused of being “treasonous Jesuits”, found themselves in. It is also, Gay argues, linked into a form of political control whereby if you cannot prove that your critic had committed treason, you at least charge them with fomenting faction.\textsuperscript{39}

The ‘Church Party’ were thus presented in the secular pulpit of the press as ‘fomenting a faction’ (and indeed undertaking a ‘treason’) that sought to undermine the Narrative and Nation of the settlers. This is a crucial point for the settler-missionary conflict in New Zealand. Both sides wished for the dominance of their own ‘narrative’\textsuperscript{40} - their conflict was a question as to which one would dominate - and, how?

These ‘narratives’ were also part and parcel of an Imperial Overlay.

\textsuperscript{38} P. Gay, \textit{The Cultivation of Hatred}, p.213: “...the fiction of evil advisers - a classic instance of a defensive stratagem which makes unacceptable feelings acceptable by displacing them onto less awe-inspiring targets.”

A prime example of this are the sentiments expressed by Helen Wilson, wife of the Colonial Surgeon at New Plymouth, in writing to Donald McLean in 1860: “...but I will not allow myself to believe that our good Governor will allow himself to be led away by a set of Exeter Hall Boobies.” F. Porter & C. McDonald, ed., \textit{‘My Hand Will Write What My Heart Dictates’} (Auckland: Auckland University Press, Bridget Williams Books, 1995), p.120. Helen Wilson to Donald McLean, Wellington, 25 April 1860.
\textsuperscript{39} P. Gay, \textit{The Cultivation of Hatred}, p.220.
\textsuperscript{40} As John Logan Campbell, the patriarch of Auckland, wrote in 1881: “How supremely grotesque was ever the Exeter Hall romance tale of conversions when compared with the Antipodean reality as known to the pioneer settlers!” J. L. Campbell, \textit{Poenamo} (London: Williams & Norgate, 1881; facsimile, Auckland: Wilson & Horton, 1970), p.200.

Of course to reduce the context encountered by the Pakeha to two competing narratives is, in many ways an admittedly gross generalization. Yet to ignore that the articulation of competing views and actions does tend to generally fall into two broad groupings is to ironically perpetuate the monism of
Imperialism is a concept that resembles an intellectual mine-field. It is not only an ‘emotional’ word, but also a term that creates a myriad of definitions, that have been especially criticized by academics and intellectuals since Hobson’s monumental study first appeared in 1902. At heart, Imperialism is an act of extension and aggression, of imposing ‘oneself’, as a Nation, as a People, and an Ideology out onto the World, and onto ‘other people in other lands’. It is thus the conquest and subjectification of the other. Such acts can be physical (as in invasion, annexation, subjection); economic (traders establishing and controlling a new market or economy); intellectual (the creation and imposition of new modes of thought, often involving new narratives and discourses), and religious (missionaries seeking to impose a new religious ethos in place of the old). All of these have, at their heart, an aim and a desire to impose,

much historiography. For without such a dualistic reduction (admittedly imperfect and flawed) the predominant perception of a singular Pakeha narrative against Maori would continue.

41 I use the term “emotional” in that the out-workings of what has generally been termed Imperialism have undergone a strongly critical analysis. ‘Imperialism’ has tended to become a catchword for all that ‘was wrong’ with Western European expansion out into and onto the World. Imperialism has undergone a necessary revision from the late-Victorian ‘white man’s burden’, bringing Civilization and Christianity to the World; to a competing notion of ‘white man’s imposition and repression’ onto the World. (The use of “man” is intentional).
Yet Imperialism takes and took many forms (both European and non-European, Cultural, Sexual, Physical and Intellectual) which cannot be dismissed in blanket-form as ‘wrong’. This is because cultures are continually in forms of contact and change (I hesitate to use the ‘Western Historicist / Social Darwinist’ terms of ‘growth’ or ‘evolution’), and Imperialism itself took and takes many different forms, and arises out of attitudes ranging from the benign to the willful.
Yet too often it (quite understandably) evokes a ‘gut reaction’, is responded to in terms of dogma and ‘knee-jerkism’ whereby a concept becomes basically an anthropomorphized other.
change and control. They involve a belief that what is occurring is "right" and "justified"; that this was done not only for the Imperialist, but also (but not always) for the benefit of the imposed-upon. It is thus an exercise of power, arising out of a self-belief that not only can an audacious act be attempted, but that it will succeed.

In effect, this often involved an element referring to an act of (what can be termed) salvation and redemption. Missionaries would undertake their work on others not only for the benefit of their souls, but also to raise "them" out of their present situation into one where "they" might eventually aspire to "be" 'Brown Englishmen'. Charles Kingsley clearly stated such a vision when, in 1856, he reviewed a book on Paraguay and Brazil:

> Each people should either develop the capabilities of their own country, or make room for those who will develop them. If they accept that duty, they have their reward in the renovation of blood, which commerce, and its companion, colonization, are certain to bring.\(^4\)

It is this attitude that Hobson criticized, whereby domination, adventure and a lust for power are given a noble and / or self-sacrificial overlay; a suggestion that it is undertaken "for the best", and will be to the benefit of those imposed-upon.\(^4\)

In the New Zealand context, both economic and religious Imperialism expanded in Colonization, and then became and undertook what I term, 'located imperialism'. That is, European settlements and missions were firstly primarily located around the coastline, and then sought their own imperialist ventures into the hinterland; a second-


tier imperialism occurring under an overarching “Pink Umbrella”. In the case of New Zealand, it was a ‘dual-imperialist’ enterprise. On the one hand, the settlers sought more and more land; on the other, the missionary sought more and more souls. Each feared the success of the other, aware that though both talked a base rhetoric of “Civilization and Christianity”, the end aims were somewhat contrasting. At times these conflicting aims, the struggles of ‘inter-state’ rivalries, were reduced to the local context. What occurred in New Zealand was a clash of cultures (European and Maori), and a clash of sub-cultures (Settler and ‘Church Party’). The latter involving the clash of imperialist visions.

It so happened that this occurred at the time of the rise of the ‘paper-pulpit’ of the press. Previously, directional rhetoric (in a public sense) had mostly tended to be the preserve of the clerical sermon. Now the situation was changing. The rise of the press and its rapid use and acceptance by those in power both created and resulted in a variety of public opinions. The power of the clergy to both control information and to direct and expound ‘right views’ and ‘narratives’ was under attack. In part, Christianity itself was a major part of this process. Its continual dissolution into the competing voices and views of ‘churches’, ‘denominations’ and ‘sects’ called into question the notion of an overarching Church Grand Narrative. In a sense, religious modernity was under attack from a state of ‘proto-postmodernism’ even before it had really begun.45

45 While early settlers often paid tribute to the missionary success in converting Maori, and thereby enabling settlement to proceed, there was a continual distaste for missionary piety and to their opposition to colonizing ventures.

46 Such an audacious statement is actually supported by J. F. Lyotard, who states: “In an amazing acceleration, the generations precipitate themselves. A work can become modern only if it is first postmodern. Postmodernism thus understood is not modernism at its end but in the nascent stage and this state is constant.” J. F. Lyotard, The Postmodern condition, p.79.
With the development of a choice of which religious grouping to belong to, comes also the choice of non-allegiance to any grouping. This is made easier (in the British city or the colonial context) with the lack of provision of religious 'machinery' and the breakdown in (or liberation from) public perception and control that enforced religious practice. Allied to the growth of choice is the discovery and promulgation of competing views - a state added to with the spread of literacy. In a society such as New Zealand, composed at this time of condensed settlements, isolated, existing in a time of crisis and fearful of the 'other', not all need to be literate for opinions to spread rapidly. All that is needed are representatives of groupings within that society to be literate for the opinion and argument of and from the press to spread throughout that society. Yet even this is a circular process, for newspapers and opinion feed off, and create, each other.

While the physical battle of settler and Maori occurred in the fields and forests of the North Island, the psychological battle of settler and 'Church Party' was primarily fought on the printed page throughout both the colony, and back in Britain. Both reduced their imperialist opposition to a state of otherness, employing the reductionism of stereotypes: the "greedy, blood-thirsty settler" or the "treacherous, self-serving missionary". It was a conflict of interests, aspirations and dreams. Led by the newspapers, settlers read 'Church Party' action in a way that supported residual anti-clericalism, in a manner that underlined and supported the sense of betrayal that many felt in response to both 'Church' and "missionary" support for Maori. In creating the

---

47 Anthony Trollope, writing in 1854-55 commented: "It is true that no newspaper could live for a day which commenced its operations without supporting a code of thought endeared to some section of
"missionary" as other (as those perceived of as in opposition to what it was believed being 'British', 'civilized' and a 'colonist' entailed) there was a further marginalization of 'the Church', a wariness as to the motives and methods of clergy, and predominantly, a sense that perhaps 'the Church', and especially the majority of "missionary" clergy were ill-suited to the demands and expectations of the new colony (that is, those held by the colonists!).

Yet there was always a third party involved, that other “other” of Maori. In such a situation they became either the impediments (for settlers) or hope (for missionaries) for the creation of a new land and society. However, when some Maori decided to undertake an act of autonomy by not only establishing, but successfully continuing Kingitanga, the missionary and the settler combined in opposition. As Kabbani states of the Imperialist’s encounter with indigenous people: “The Calibans of the New World, they were tolerable only when subdued”. In such a situation, the base-level narrative of British Imperialism took precedence. Thus arose a second Imperialist Grand Narrative: of civilization versus savagery and barbarism; of superior race against inferior race; of parent against rebellious child. In the first Taranaki conflict, Maori had, to a large degree, been used (or at least had their grievance appropriated) as an issue by the competing sub-cultures, those competing imperialisms. In the Waikato campaign however, the forces of 'Church and State' combined, united against a

---

48 Again this was the common and popular method of referring to the Church of England; but it could also be used as a blanket-term to describe any Christian church or denomination (or representative thereof) which was out-of-favour with the colonial opinion-makers.
50 The terms 'Church' and 'State' refer to conceptual unities and monoliths that have little relation to 'real', day-to-day experiences. They are employed here as a form of reductionist, theoretical shorthand.
common foe, yet still critical and wary of each other. Yet the ‘Church’ needed the State more than the State needed the ‘Church’. Of course the State was happy to use the ‘Church’ to provide either a ‘sacred canopy’ for its actions, or as a source of information and support as to conditions and areas it had little information on. The State however, was always the dominant partner. That is, the ‘Church’ narrative would occupy the level of a second-tier truth to that articulated by the State.

In New Zealand the ‘Church-State’ relationship underwent a series of changes from one involving disruption and mutual suspicion, to one of qualified renewal in support of an overarching British/Civilization/Imperialist Grand Narrative. After the Waitara conflict, the ability and opportunity for the ‘Church’ to intrude, comment or attempt to influence State action and opinion was open to heavy critique in the popular press and in public sentiment. Both the colonists and their Government had expressed a desire for a secular existence (either by non-attendance / allegiance, or the 1854 Government decision as to “a perfect political equality in all religious matters”). By the time of the Waikato campaign and beyond, the ‘Church’ needed the State to quell the unrest so that its missionary operations could continue. Without military protection (and imposed peace), it was increasingly difficult, indeed dangerous, for missionaries to continue to live in some areas. Therefore the State (in part) became the arm of justified action that would allow the ‘Church’s’ missionary calling to continue.

But the situation was also one in which the ‘Church’ found itself as an auxiliary, and not a pillar of Society. Of course many still viewed it and its religious functions as

---

51 Again this is referring to a conceptual relationship rather than a physical reality. This
important, but any lingering sense of privilege was gone. It might perhaps be heard, but this did not automatically, or even necessarily mean that it would be listened to.

a preliminary conclusion

The 'Saidian' stress on the pervasiveness of otherness is an important issue within this thesis. I have wanted to widen the boundaries and investigate how it can operate in a sub-cultural interface in contrast to the predominant stress in the prevailing orthodoxy on inter-Cultural action. For to be other can be expressed and experienced in many forms. So when I suggest that the 'Church' became other, I raise such a point in the abstract, not generalist sense. This means that the opinions expressed throughout the New Zealand colonial press at this period suggest that settler society (and especially those who could be termed the 'opinion makers') were determined to only allow the 'Church' a public voice in assent, not dissent of the State.52 This meant that laity could, on the one hand, be vociferous in their condemnation of the 'public Church'53 and, on the other, still be members, supporters, attendees of a church, or identify themselves, in a general sense, as Christian. In other words, 'Church' became other when it attempted to move from the location of 'religion' (the world of piety, Sunday services, 'good works' and the like) into the world of politics.

relationship is a creation, a tool used for, and created out of the interactions of 'Church' and 'State' discourses and narratives. It does not refer to any legislated relationship, but rather that underlying frame of reference that seems to illuminate the articulations and opinions of both sides in this debate.52 I include under this term both the 'political' State and the formulating conception of 'settler New Zealand'.

52 'Church' in this case covering both the 'Church Party' and those individual clergy castigated in the settler discourse.
This boundary was one that was drawn by the settlers - and supported by many of the clergy not contained within the ‘Church Party’. They created and desired a Narrative of Nation that existed on clearly delineated lines. This narrative involved a belief that ‘religion’ was a matter for the individual, occupying a separate sphere and concern from the ‘secular’ world of every-day and political life. What makes the New Zealand Wars both interesting and important for the issues of ‘Church and State’ is not that the situation changed during this period, but rather that the ‘Church Party’ attempted to change and challenge it - and were rebuffed. That is, they were denied the influence that they desired within the public, political sphere of ‘the Nation’. It is not that the ‘Church Party’ views and opinions were denied expression, but rather that they were denied validity within colonial society. Their concerns were dismissed, their arguments rigorously and vehemently discounted and their claim to a special insight and status denied. It is this that made them, for that period, and for those issues under debate, other.

It is out of this understanding that I have created my competing chapters of ‘Church’ and ‘settler’ narratives, for to reduce the Pakeha disputes of this period to a single narrative is to fail to engage with the differences apparent between (and indeed within) these two groupings. Yet at the same time an overview must be attempted to provide a background against which to evaluate and critique the conflicting claims and interpretations presented by the various sides in this dispute. However, before these discussions can occur the situation encountered by the church and the press in the colonial environment needs to be evaluated. For, the ‘Church-State’ conflict of the 1860s is not only the consolidation of an ongoing issue of colonial secularization, it is also a conflict driven by and largely fought within the colonial press. Therefore four
differing narratives follow: a discussion of the colonial situation of church and press, a
general overview, a 'Church' narrative and a settler narrative. None are complete in
and of themselves, rather being four competing broad visions of what occurred in this
period. What they seek to do is to present the variety of alternative narratives that
become available when issues of public opinion and debate are examined using
neglected and ignored sources.
From an estimated Pakeha population hovering around 11000 in 1842, colonization had resulted in this soaring to over 28000 in 1852 and to 59000 in 1858, overtaking estimated Maori population of 56000. Underlying such expansion was a sense of optimism such as that outlined by the future settler Charles Rooking Carter in one of his frequent outpourings to the *Weekly Times* in Britain on the subject and opportunities of New Zealand:

> if there be one spot here on earth more adapted than England to suit English constitutions, English institutions, English industry, perseverance and national character, that spot is New Zealand.

Given the current misery and discomfort experienced by many in England, it is not surprising that many felt that their best chance to improve their lives lay in venturing to this ‘new England’, this ‘Better Britain’ in the South Seas. Yet such hyperbolic propaganda failed to address the reality of the situation. Already in residence were two groups, each in their own way wary of increased British settlement. The first were Maori, whose position ranged from physical opposition to European encroachment to a qualified ‘welcome’ - or at least acquiescence. The second were the missionaries,

---

3 Ibid., p.118
who worried about the effect that a tide of colonists would have upon their efforts to Christianize Maori.

Octavius Hadfield, (later to play a major part in the ‘Church Party’) was already in 1840 bemoaning, in a letter to his father, the influence of “the immoral English”, writing of the objections of non-Christian’ Maori to “the lives and conduct of my own countrymen”.\(^6\) Another missionary, William Williams\(^7\) complained to his missionary society in 1846 that when he compared the principles of the CMS and the New Zealand Company, he found them “diametrically opposed”.\(^8\)

The situation in New Zealand was a familiar one, a collision between missionaries and their supporters who viewed the new lands as mission grounds and sought the conversion and equality of the native races; and the aims of settlers, who sought to create a new country and were increasingly impatient with those natives and their supporters (especially missionaries) who attempted to halt, or limit, such ‘progress’. Therein lay the problem, both conceptual and practical for the emergent colony: How was colonization going to proceed? The colonists had effectively dispossessed themselves at home by undertaking the voyage to New Zealand. Naturally their aim was now to possess land and establish themselves in the new colony. Yet to do so would mean dispossessing those already inhabiting the land.

\(^6\) B. Macmorran, *Octavius Hadfield*, p.166.

\(^7\) William Williams (1800-1878), Oxford educated, ordained 1824, CMS missionary in New Zealand from 1826. In 1837 he completed a Maori translation of the New Testament, and in 1839 relocated from Northland to Turanga in Poverty Bay. Bishop of Waipu from 1859, he was very closely involved in Maori education and church work.

In order to understand the later context of the ‘Church-State’ debate in the 1860s it is important to outline an overview of the religious situation of settler New Zealand in the years leading up to 1860. This is crucial, for the issues under consideration in this thesis are directly influenced, and a result of, this religious terrain. It is here that mention must again be made of E.G. Wakefield, for his vision of settlement often addressed questions of a religious nature. A crucial point, often overlooked, was the ecumenical nature of the Wakefieldian vision, a "...determination to assist all denominations of settlers alike, with respect to religious provisions". Religion was considered of importance in a new colony because of its ability to influence morals, manners and intelligence, as well as preventing a lapse into "a state of barbarism". What Wakefield’s ecumenical aim engendered was a colony of religious divergence. He was not of course totally responsible for the diversity of denominations in colonial New Zealand for not all emigration occurred under his schemes. As part of an attempt to start anew, Church settlements were attempted, notably in Dunedin (Presbyterian) and Christchurch (Anglican) - and later a nonconformist one in Albertville, north of Auckland. So New Zealand never was a single-denomination colony - even the mission societies represented a variety of competing Christian affiliations, with Anglicans, Methodists and Catholics being the most predominant. Such a variety from the early days of settlement meant that no one Christian tradition or denomination could lay sole claim to the colony - or successfully claim a right of special privilege in attempting to especially replicate the Establishment model of ‘Church –State’ relations as existed in England and Scotland.

10 Ibid., pp.152-53.
Another crucial point was the voluntary nature of the church experience in New Zealand. The term ‘voluntary’ can be discussed in two ways; firstly that of a socio-religious manner, and secondly, within the Anglican system. The first refers to the religious situation transplanted to New Zealand. As we have seen, the growth of Protestant dissent and the collapse of the *ancien régime* in Britain had resulted in a situation whereby attendance and choice of denomination was now a voluntary act. One could choose to belong and believe - or not to. If one did, then there were a variety of Christian churches one could attach oneself to. Though there was the established Church of the Church of England, there was no monopoly of affiliation.

There is also the ‘voluntary’ nature of the Church of England in New Zealand. George Augustus Selwyn was in 1841 consecrated Bishop of New Zealand. This was the result of the work of C. J. Blomfield, Bishop of London, who had been calling for the establishment of episcopal church government in the British colonies. The CMS and the New Zealand Company had also been exerting pressure for the appointment of a bishop to New Zealand, and the result of this was that half of Selwyn’s stipend was to be paid by the CMS, and the other by the colonial Government. Those outside the Church of England tended to view such ventures with suspicion, fearing an attempt to impose the Church of England as the ‘Established Church’ upon the new colony. Selwyn himself wished to keep his church independent of the controls of the colonial Government, refusing the offer in 1842 of the New Zealand Church Ordinance which provided for the provision of government assistance for churches, chapels and stipends. A similar refusal occurred in 1844 to the offer of government assistance to his stipend. Although offered similar support, Presbyterians and Roman Catholics also refused. The reasons for such a decision were hostility to an imposed contribution
(through taxation) to those denominations other than one’s own - coupled with a suspicion of what any government might seek to demand or impose in return. Selwyn’s decision would thus shift the onus of financial support for his church from the government to the Anglican laity.

The Colonial Legislature was also suspicious of any move to prefer one denomination over another. On 26 May 1854, the first day of the first parliament, disputes over opening the sessions with prayer, and which denomination was to conduct them, resulted in the carrying of the motion that “The House distinctly asserts the privilege of a perfect political equality in all religious denominations”. In this way it ensured that there was no pre-eminence granted to any church or religious body. New Zealand therefore became a colony of many religious denominations, yet not officially linked into any single one; rather New Zealand was officially established as a pluralistic nation.

So how did such a situation work itself out in practice?

Issac Cooper (soldier, settler and provincial politician) was most enthusiastic in 1857, claiming that the lack of a State Church and the common necessity of sending children to schools presided over by a teacher of a denomination different from one’s own, meant that there were “no church bickerings”: 
Religious animosity is not felt; man is content to let his fellow-man alone in religious matters. Christian and Jew, Churchman and Dissenter, English and Irish meet one another with mutual goodwill and Christian forbearance.\textsuperscript{11}

Cooper’s ecumenical enthusiasm can be explained, as he was writing a guide for settlers to New Zealand - but other contemporaries were somewhat more guarded. It is important to consider briefly the issues arising out of non-establishment as they underlie the debates of the 1860s. On the one hand those who accepted and promoted the separation of Church and State, and on the other the ‘Church Party’ who appeared determined to claim a special right of influence and in doing so attempt to resurrect a colonial version of the Establishment.

Thomas Cholmondeley, in his erudite and wide-ranging book \textit{Ultima Thule; or, Thoughts Suggested by a Residence in New Zealand} (1854), devotes over forty pages to the issues of the ‘Church in New Zealand’. He neatly sums up the difficulties as one in which “the Church” (Anglican) has no legal existence and so no laws or jurisdiction which can be enforced by the State. Rather, it is in the same situation as the Roman Catholics and the Wesleyans, except their systems “are built expressly to meet such a difficulty” while the Church of England “is nicely calculated as a dependency of the State”. What this means is that “the church gets hit on both sides”.\textsuperscript{12}

In light of this he then considers the general religious context of the colony. He himself was based in Canterbury, but he is careful to note that he has also questioned inhabitants of other settlements as to their situations. The most important factor is, he

argues, that “English, Irish, Welsh and Scotch (sic) are flung together” resulting in “an atmosphere of vigourous speculation and improvement, but also of recklessness and wild audacity”. This is compounded when we remember that the majority of the migratory classes are without education, and indifferent to religious forms when they arrive in a new country. They have little to lose, save a certain traditional phraseology. Their great attachment was to the soil of the old land, and their observances and beliefs were generally the outgrowth of that natural sympathy...

Cholmondeley also mentions how, in the new colony, many considered themselves “weaned” of the church, where pig-hunting was considered a better way to spend a Sunday, and where the practice of private prayer could be described as “no good”. Cholomondeley, it must be stressed, is a “Churchman” (Anglican). His critique is undertaken because he is concerned with the form and functions of the survival of the church in the new colony. His worry and view was a representative one. The concerns he raises are also mentioned continuously in both the newspapers and the books printed at this time. On the one hand there was a general hope that a new flowering of Christianity could occur in the new colony - and on the other, a fear that colonial conditions would stunt its growth before it had time to re-root itself.

12 T. Cholmondeley, Ultima Thule , p.253.
13 Ibid., pp.270-271.
14 Ibid., p.271. A century later, M.H. Holcroft, writing on the difficulties for religion in the New Zealand environment, made a sage point when he stated: “Religious moods are emotional; it is not easy to sustain them, except as an act of faith, against seasonal incongruity.” M. H. Holcroft, Encircling Seas, An Essay (Christchurch: The Caxton Press, 1956), p.78.
15 T. Cholmondeley, Ultima Thule , p.272. On p.281 he refers to “the indifference of the present generation of colonists in New Zealand".
William Marjouram (1828-1862), Royal Artillery Sergeant and evangelical Methodist convert, was somewhat dismissive of the state of Christianity in the colony when he arrived in the mid-1850s. For him, "the Church of Christ can scarcely be distinguished from the worshipper of mammon", all of which he saw as evidence of "the lukewarm state of the Church of Christ." Likewise, when Elizabeth Muter, wife of the Lieutenant Colonel of the 13th Light Infantry, arrived in New Zealand in the early 1860s, she noted that

There is a materialism apparent about these places, a frantic rush after the means of existence, an air tainted with tallow and hides and dry goods, a want of repose, and little inclination for calm thought and quiet conversation.17

Others, such as John Godley18 of the Canterbury Association, mentioned at a meeting on Church Government held in 1852: "the apathy and helplessness which are such melancholy characteristics of our colonial churches."19

D.G. Herron has claimed that the New Zealand situation was similar to that discovered by the 1851 Religious Census of England and Wales. That is, around 75%

---

16 W. Marjouram, Memorials...including six year's service in New Zealand during the late Maori war (London: J. Nisbet, 1861), p.56. This work ran to four editions, 1861-63.
17 Mrs Muter, Travels and adventures of an Officer's wife in India, China and New Zealand, 2 vol. (London: Hurst & Blackett, 1864), vol. 2, p.209.
18 John Godley (1814-1861), a founder of the Canterbury Association, was lay leader of the Canterbury Settlement while they were looking for a Bishop. A vehement supporter for the fullest type of colonial self-government, he had, when in the United States, seen and supported their self-reliant, un-established, Episcopal church.
19 J. W. Fitzgerald, ed., A Selection from the Writings And Speeches of John Robert Godley (Christchurch: Press Office, 1863), p.93. Others, such as Dr. John Shaw who 'galloped' through New Zealand in 1857, mentions in passing a Nelson schoolteacher who states 'infidelity' was "rather prominent in the colony."(p.167). Shaw also mentions his belief that missionaries need to be sent to the distant sheep stations to both the "educated" and "uneducated" on them, who "have not seen the inside of a church for many years in succession". J. Shaw, A Gallop to the Antipodes...p.203.
of the population did not regularly attend church. John Bradshaw, writing on *New Zealand as it is* in 1883 states that New Zealanders are neither religious nor non-religious. On the one hand, like Britain he says, there are labourers who never attend, farmers who do so never or rarely, and “a portion” who spend their Sabbath “in holiday making and sensual indulgence”. Yet there are many churches and chapels, large Sunday schools, and “the larger part of the population” practise “decorous behaviour”.21

On the one hand, colonial coolness towards organized church Christianity was a product of home upheaval consolidated by the religious inter-mixing and lack of services on the voyage out, compounded by the nature of the new settlements and society. For many, starting again also involved a chance to start again without the constraints and expectations of organized Christianity. The voluntary nature of all denominations required a commitment of time and effort from the laity that had to compete with the siren calls of rest and recreation. Denominational rivalry was also often viewed as counter to the necessary ethos needed to build new communities composed of a variety of beliefs and backgrounds.22

On the other hand, the effort of colonization also often overtook the available resources, with a mobile, shifting population, poor communication links, isolated

20 D. G. Heron, “The Structure and Course of New Zealand Politics 1853-1858 ” (Ph.D. diss., University of New Zealand (Otago), 1959), pp.50-51.
21 J. Bradshaw, *New Zealand as it is* (London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington, 1883), pp. 315-16.

Richard Taylor (1805-73), a CMS missionary in New Zealand since 1839, bemoaned in 1868 the inability of the various christian denominations to undertake an ecumenical merger as a “Catholic Church for the whole” in the new colony. R. Taylor, *The Past and Present of New Zealand with its
settlements and an inadequate number of clergy helping to consolidate nominalism, if not often, complete indifference. The wars only increased this situation, for while the numbers of officiating ministers had actually increased by 45 clergy in the period 1860-1863 to a total of 202, the unsettled nature of the country and the conflicts tended to concentrate them in the towns. In the expanses of the South Island, this problem was especially apparent. In 1863 the Lyttleton Times tackled the issue of “Spiritual Destitution”; inadequate pastoral care for those in outlying areas arising out of the change from an Establishment to a voluntary system for the Church of England. A letter from “Up Country” had sparked the debate, stating:

"Already, numbers have got the idea that they can do well without religion; that if they do nobody any harm it is no-one’s business how they spend the Sabbath. Epithets towards the clergy I will not repeat."

In response, the newspaper stated (in what is a good summary of the situation):

"whether the cause be apathy to the concerns of the church, or whether the root of the evil lies deeper and takes its rise in dull indifference to religion - the result of a widely spread indifference to religion - the result of a widely spread material prosperity - it is certain that the evil of spiritual destitution exists."


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church of England</th>
<th>95 (79)</th>
<th>Church of Scotland</th>
<th>1 (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>39 (22)</td>
<td>Free Church of Scotland</td>
<td>30 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan Methodist</td>
<td>22 (22)</td>
<td>Congregational Independent</td>
<td>6 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>4 (3)</td>
<td>Primitive Methodists</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>1 (-)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 Ibid., p.4. This editorial was most probably written by Crosbie Ward (1832-67), who while editing the paper was also a Provincial and General Assembly politician. He held the posts of postmaster general and secretary for crown lands in the Fox ministry; and held the former position in Domett’s
Such sentiment is representative of what can be called the elegy of loss. Aware of the issues and problems confronting Christianity back in Britain many, especially in Church settlements, felt that the new colony ought to be able to provide an alternative and the example of a new way forward for Christianity in the life of the (emerging) nation. So when the reality of widespread indifference became known a certain sense of frustrated disillusionment occurred. It is out of this background and context that the issue of clerical involvement in colonial politics lies. In 1852 New Zealand had been granted responsible government and the new General Assembly was given control of what were termed waste lands. This in turn provided a means and impetus to abandon the Wakefieldian model of systematic colonization. Missionaries, (especially the CMS) had always been wary of the creeping pockets of European settlement, but at least the Settlement companies had provided a model for colonization approaching a system and a plan. Now however, settlers were controlling settler policy and aims. The issue for the missionary was firstly whether to become involved, in an attempt to advocate Maori interests as they saw them; and secondly, would they be allowed to do so?

The issues of Church and State are essentially those of power relations. In the New Zealand context, the question came to be: who has the right to criticize, and why were they undertaking such a critique? Coupled with this was the question of role and identity; how were those clergy opposing Government policy speaking - as clergy or as private citizens? Could indeed clergy ever actually speak out as private citizens or was their role such a public one that they would always be associated in the public’s mind

ministry. He was well known for his satirical ability, and conducted a long-running battle with Fitzgerald of the rival Press newspaper.

as representatives of their institutions? The situation was further complicated because the Bible seemed to take a somewhat contradictory line. On the one hand there was the State’s commonly-quoted scriptural reference: “Let every person be subject to the governing authorities; for there is no authority except from God, and those authorities that exist have been instituted by God.” (Romans 13:1).

On the other, that favoured by a critiquing clergy: “But Peter and the apostles answered “We must obey God rather than any human authority”’’(Acts 5:29).

The compromise traditionally offered was to view both ‘Church and State’ as divinely-ordered entities, but with the Church staking the final claim when the actions of the State came into conflict with the will of God, as understood by the Church. One contemporary theologian talked of the situation in terms of a religious “mind” guiding a secular “arm”.

Yet in New Zealand, there was no ‘Church’, but rather a variety of churches, a point that had been underlined by the 1854 General Assembly. The variety of denominations and sects meant that there were a variety of Christians; to which group was the State to give precedence? Which ‘mind’ was to guide the ‘arm’? It was easier to view all as citizens first, and as Christians second. For in such a framework, the primary duty of the citizen is to the State, because it is only this communal identity that all hold in common.

---

27 H. Geffchen, Church and State, 2 vol. (London: Longman’s, Green & Co, 1877), vol.1., p.7.
However, a problem occurs in a time of crisis, when to question the actions of the State can be viewed as questioning the identity and legitimacy of the State, for a State is as a State acts. For clergy to speak out as a readily identifiable body of clergy, showed that the State was not as homogenous, harmonious and unified a body as it (in theory) believed itself to be. For to challenge the State, or the actions of it, was to question the legitimacy of its rulers, and in a time of crisis, a time of conflict, this was not surprisingly viewed by those rulers as intolerable.

The missionaries and their allies might have been seeking to right wrongs and correct injustice from their perspective, but the zeal of their approach, their willingness to chastise both Government and settlers triggered great unease as to the (presumed) reasons for their support of Maori. For, to support the other in preference to your own was, especially in a Victorian colonial situation, to express sympathies seen as sorely out-of-kilter with those of European society.

William Sewell, Oxford divine and Professor of Moral Philosophy, wrote on the subject of *Christian Politics* in 1854. This work provides an interesting insight into mid-Victorian thought on the issue. He states that Political Christianity is the attempt to realise the “heavenly reality” here upon earth. To do so requires measuring “good and evil, beauty and deformity, by an externally revealed standard of the Divine

---

26 William Sewell (1804-1874) was brother of the New Zealand politician and first Premier, Henry Sewell. An early Tractarian, he later withdrew because of the moves of some members towards the Church of Rome. As well as theological works, he wrote on classical topics and also published four novels.

29 Sewell was writing in England and while I have found no reference to his work in the context of this thesis, his links to New Zealand are assured through his brother. The conjecture can therefore be safely made that it seems almost certain that there was at least one copy of his work in New Zealand at this time. Reference to Sewell’s work is made because it offers an example of contemporary thought
The State is created out of the Providence of God, thus entailing it being no less a “responsible being” than an individual. Yet any opposition to the State, by the Christian must be done in a “responsible” manner, which Sewell defines as petitions, appeals, the claiming of constitutional rights and a refusal to take any active part in doing ill. The clergy are ideally “a neutral body, whose impartiality and equality may be safely trusted” - but they are also called upon to have a voice of moral influence in the State. This, Sewell states, means “[the clergyman] is bound to protest and remonstrate; otherwise he becomes involved in the guilt of suppressing truth and encouraging wrong.”

Sewell’s critique succinctly encapsulates both the position and response of the ‘Church Party’ in New Zealand. Their dissent was in line with ‘orthodox’ thought, their actions within the bounds of required behaviour. Yet Sewell was writing out of an Establishment context - that encountered in New Zealand was quite different.

The Chilean theologian and sociologist Pablo Richard describes secularization as “an affirmation of the autonomy of secular society over and against the Church as a religious and sacral power”. In a continuation of the 1854 General Assembly decision claiming the political equality of all denominations, the opposition of the Government to the wishes and claims of the ‘Church Party’ can be read, I argue, as part of the process of secularization. It was a Parliament and the vast majority of settler society upon issues of ‘Church and State’ from within the Establishment that, in the colonial context, was challenging the actions of the State.

31 Ibid., pp.2-3.
32 Ibid., p.111.
33 Ibid., p.204.
34 Ibid., p.111.
standing up to and opposing, the wishes of the church that was the Establishment in Britain. What complicates (and yet helps explain\textsuperscript{36}) the issue is the fact that the opposition to the wishes of Government and settlers was predominantly clerical (in tandem with some high-placed laity). It is important to remember this, for their opinion was often out-of-step with many Anglican laity (who were settlers and often desired a move onto Maori land) - including both Governors Gore-Browne and Grey. Dissenting denominations, especially the Methodists, were, like the Scottish Presbyterians, also predominantly opposed to ‘Church Party’ initiatives and aims due to their ties being firmly rooted in settler society.

The freedom given to the individual by both the Enlightenment, and the rise of evangelicalism, led many to view Christianity as a matter for the individual and not a corporate reality. The diffusion of opinion engendered by denominationalism, coupled with the pluralistic nature of New Zealand society (underscored by the 1854 decision), had resulted in a situation where a church, or individual Christians could speak out, but the State felt no compunction or reason to necessarily listen or agree. The history of missionary wariness and opposition to large-scale colonization had also created a residue of suspicion as to church motives; suspicions fanned into flames by the Waitara situation. This fed into popular anti-clericalism and contemporary fears of a resurgent ‘Popery’ - resulting in common accusations of “priestcraft” and “jesuitical motives”.\textsuperscript{37}


\textsuperscript{36} As will be later discussed there was quite a strong anti-clerical and anti-missionary sentiment evident in New Zealand that used the involvement of the ‘Church Party’ in the wars as an opportunity to attack the objects of their scorn.

\textsuperscript{37} As Walter James wrote in \textit{The Christian in Politics} (Oxford University Press, 1962), p.5: “The objection to the Church ‘taking part in politics’ is that it must take sides; and those who are on the side opposed to that which it takes feel a sense of injustice in being attacked, not by the ordinary arguments of political controversy, but by a body which claims divine authority.”
If the churches provide one side of the background narrative, the other is filled by the newspapers - the vehicles of, and contributors towards much popular opinion. Marc Ferro in a recent work on the history of colonization mentions that with the rise of the popular press in the nineteenth century Imperialism “becomes a popular phenomenon”.38 Those attending the 1860 Conference on Missions in Liverpool were left in no doubt as to the effectiveness of the fourth estate in presenting and articulating opinion. Rev. T. B. Whiting of the CMS saw it as a way of maintaining a “missionary spirit”, for it was “a very powerful means” of spreading information, especially to those who “would never read a missionary periodical.”39 Likewise, Rev. T. Smith, lately of the South African WMS stated:

The press is a most powerful agency in bearing upon public opinion; and Christian opinion is public opinion; and it is upon Christian opinion, feeling and sentiment, that the success of missions depends.40

In New Zealand, however, the fourth estate tended to articulate and circulate ideas in opposition to the ‘Church Party’ - the reason for this a direct result of the process of establishing the press in New Zealand.

Newspapers were first printed in the colony in 1840, appearing at opposite ends of the North Island; in the south, the New Zealand Gazette and Wellington Spectator; in the north, at Russell, the New Zealand Advertiser and Bay of Islands Gazette. New Zealand avidly embraced this form of communication and information. In the next

40 Ibid., p.70.
decade a further eighteen newspapers were begun, some not lasting more than a few years, others continuing well into the next century. By 1859 there were fifteen papers in circulation. For the period under consideration, 1860 - 1865, there were twenty-seven. Following the increased population, prosperity and immigration of the mid-1860s-1870s, there had been, by 1879, a further 181 newspapers founded. As is the nature of the enterprise, not all were successful. Indeed 87 of these had ceased circulation during this period, but it was still a phenomenal increase, reflecting the desire for news and information in a dispersed frontier society.

One contributing factor was that at this time New Zealand, as a unified entity, existed more as a conceptual dream than as a physical reality; not one community but many, with regional identification and (interests) being considerably more important than that of a national community. In the colonial situation, the newspaper had a dominant role in a new society attempting to define itself, a society set on establishing a new life in a new land. The press was an instrument that could provide direction and leadership in a dispersed community, a guide to thought and opinion, a reference point to what was occurring elsewhere. It acted not so much as a process for democratization, rather perhaps as propaganda that varied from benign to constrictive according to the issue and personal situation of the reader. The political dimension is not to be underestimated. As Patrick Day notes (in one of the few studies of the New Zealand press), in the moves towards self-government in the colony, newspaper personnel were

---

42 G. H. Scholefield makes the interesting point that in 1865, newspapers of all categories had an aggregate circulation of five and a quarter million copies, or 29 copies per head of population. G. H. Scholefield, *Newspapers in New Zealand*, p.8.
44 Ibid., p.81.
distinctly over-represented in the new political institutions. This in turn resulted in strong links between politics and the press.

Charles Hursthouse, writing in 1857, makes special mention of the almost “exclusively political” nature of the New Zealand newspapers. He states they say it is because “their subscribers are electors, keen local politicians, and that they must write to please these, the hundreds who pay”. Those who paid - and very often, who wrote and edited, had strong links into the financial, business and political worlds of the colony. In a recent study of New Zealand politicians for the period 1854-1881, of a database of 881 politicians (out of a total number of 1210 involved in the House of Representatives, the Legislative Council, and provincial councils), 119 were involved, in some capacity, in journalism - financially supporting, writing for, or editing newspapers.

For those on the make, seeking to have an impact upon New Zealand life and politics, the press provided a grand opportunity. Patrick Day discerns a Wakefieldian influence in the New Zealand press, where journalism was granted a higher purpose and status than it enjoyed in England. This was because it was perceived (at least by those undertaking it) as “a moral duty...a combination of public service and political activity”. There was also an ideological dimension to the function of the newspaper

---

45 C. Hursthouse, New Zealand the "Britain of the South", 2d ed., vol.1, p.312. However, from the 1860s, the rise in population, the advent of daily publication and a subsequent decrease in price to one penny considerably widened the readership, and resulted in a torrent of new papers.

46 S. Butterworth, “Scholars, Gentlemen and Floppy Disks,” in Edward Gibbon Wakefield and the Colonial Dream: A Reconsideration, p.177. This figure, she says, is “probably an under-estimate”. A further 149 politicians published something in their own name (this does not include journalists).

in these small, isolated settlements. The newspaper was an important and astute way of ensuring that the settlement would develop in ways compatible with the values and ambitions of those given, appropriating, or seeking the task of leading their societies.\textsuperscript{48}

A crucial point for explaining the vitriol hurled at the ‘Church Party’ during the years of conflict is directly linked to the notion of newspapers as class papers. Taking Day’s contention of the newspapers as primarily the voices and representative opinions of an emerging upper class (in both ownership and allegiance),\textsuperscript{49} it becomes easy to understand why there was such an outpouring of a sense of betrayal. Firstly, the missionaries had often tended to hinder and oppose the efforts of those seeking to claim large tracts of Maori ‘wasteland’. Secondly, for many of the elite, either in Parliament, or supporting its policies, the ‘Church Party’ were the local representatives of that church many either tended to belong to, or identify with.\textsuperscript{50} Class betrayal could thus be represented as a form of cultural betrayal. Not only were these ‘treacherous clergy’ acting against the interests of their ‘supporters’ (literally so in the New Zealand voluntary system) and laity, they could also be represented as acting against the interests of every settler; and there is nothing like rhetoric, slander and conflict to sell newspapers.\textsuperscript{51}

\textsuperscript{48} Ibid., p.81.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., p.5.
\textsuperscript{50} Apart from such ‘well-born’ clergy as Bishops Selwyn and Abraham (both Eton and Cambridge), it was more the idea of the institution rather than the individual clergy that the elite identified with (or wished to).
\textsuperscript{51} Keith Sinclair, writing on the Wars and the impact of the public debate in the press noted “The battle of words was fought parallel with the physical war which produced it.” K. Sinclair, \textit{The Origins of The Maori Wars}, p.221.
So while direct access to a newspaper was often limited by subscription costs and literacy, their influence and opinions ranged further than their immediate readers because of the self-enclosed nature of much settlement. For, one of the functions of the press is to raise issues, provoke opinion and provide topics for talk and thought. They might have been class newspapers and political mouthpieces, but their large number spread throughout the colony means that to ignore their impact upon a developing society is to severely limit our understandings of the issues of the period.

The colonial situation in New Zealand in the years leading up to the conflicts of the 1860s is, in many ways, an antipodean twist upon the “home” British situation. The rise of the Protestant denominations and the subsequent challenge to the hegemony of the Establishment had, under the influence of immigration patterns, achieved in New Zealand what the Establishment had feared at “home”. The variety of denominations with no one church achieving a clear-cut advantage had combined with the freedom of colonial society to result not only in the voluntary nature of church attendance but also in the accepted adoption of a voluntary position by the Church of England in the New Zealand context. Yet in practice a portion of the Church of England’s clerics, in tandem with some CMS missionaries, still desired the special privilege of political influence afforded by the “home” Establishment position. This the settlers were unwilling to grant, especially when this was in support of Maori against the expansionist aims of colonial society. Their dissatisfaction with ‘political parsons’ was provoked, recorded and promoted in the pages of the colonial press as part of the ongoing process of secularization that flared into life whenever clergy were perceived

52 It is estimated that, in 1857, a quarter of the colonists were unable to read. K. Sinclair, The Origins of The Maori Wars, p. 9.
to be acting against the aims and wishes of the settlers in the inter-related matters of land and Maori.

This conflict is a complex matter which cannot be satisfactorily reduced to a single narrative. In 1854, Hugh Carleton,\textsuperscript{53} M.P. and frequent contributor to the Auckland newspaper, *Southern Cross*, writing as “Metoikos” (emigrant or settler), in a sense outlined the future task for all New Zealand historians:

> The future historian of New Zealand has an arduous task before him (sic). The difficulty of compiling a faithful chronicle will consist, not in the paucity of materials, but in their abundance; in their extreme complication, in their discrepancy, in the utter untrustworthiness of despatches and other official records, on which his (sic) main reliance would otherwise be placed.\textsuperscript{54}

It is in an attempt to be able to “compile a faithful chronicle” that I have undertaken these various representations of conflicting opinions that follow. For the stories are too many, too large, and too complicated to be reduced to singular whole. Carleton was correct in stating that it is not the paucity, but the abundance of material that causes problems for the historian. This is especially true when writing on a period of conflict, for each side had their own narratives, sources and mouth-pieces. So the aim in what

---

\textsuperscript{53} Hugh Carleton (1810-1890), attended Eton and Cambridge and trained as a lawyer before emigrating to New Zealand in 1845. He quickly became involved in both politics and journalism, and never hesitated (in the manner of the time) to use his journalism to attack his opponents. A vigorous opponent of provincialism, he had a paternalistic view towards Maori, yet saw them as ‘unique’ and ‘special’. He was always a controversialist, especially when editing the *Southern Cross* for a period from 1856. He had links by marriage into the missionary establishment, being not only the son-in-law of Henry Williams but also the brother-in-law of Octavius Hadfield.

follows is to present three views on what occurred. The first is a general overview that is entitled the ‘scholarly consensus’. This discusses and critiques the accepted and received history of this period that is most readily available. Yet such a singular approach is inadequate for understanding the details of the complexities of this ‘Church-State’ conflict. So this is followed by two general accounts taken from the conflicting sides, as an acknowledgement that the reality was by no means as clear cut as it can often initially appear. These are the clerical and ‘Church party’ view of the conflict and the alternative view from the settlers and the colonial press. There is, I believe, a need to provide these alternative readings of the conflict because we are working in the arena of public opinion where much is necessarily hearsay, personal interpretation and perception of what “seems to” and “might have” occurred. Yet to ignore this fertile area and the abundance of material such as that existing in the newspapers is to privilege that deemed official over that deemed public and that deemed acceptable over that deemed unreliable. It is to forget that in the conflicting voices and emotions of public opinion and the press that we can begin to get an inkling of first-hand accounts of what the situation might have possibly been. We need to remember Carleton’s warning – especially that concerning official sources.
5: THE SCHOLARLY CONSENSUS

In order to understand the background that lies behind the conflict between ‘Church Party’ and settler in the period 1860-1865 we must first turn to Waitara in Taranaki, where land issues had been complicated by two events. The first was that Waikato Maori had invaded the area in the 1820s, resulting in the local Te Ati Awa migrating south to the Kapiti coast. This situation was complicated by the then Land Claims Commissioner, William Spain, who, investigating the New Zealand Company’s claims to the New Plymouth settlement awarded the Company 60,000 acres because of an 1840 negotiation with a small Te Ati Awa remnant. Yet at the time of the decision, Te Ati Awa were returning to their tribal land, finding much had been signed away and was now claimed by European settlers. So began a long series of claim and counter-claim, not only between settler and Maori, but also between conflicting Maori interests: those who wished to sell land to the Europeans, and those determined to retain that which they still had.

The New Plymouth settlers looked to gain the land lying north of the settlement towards the Waitara river. Here was located (on the north bank) the Te Ati Awa leader Te Rangitake (or as he became known throughout the colony - Wiremu Kingi). ¹

Wiremu Kingi (?-1882) had, from 1844, repeatedly told the Government that he would not give up Waitara. He had returned to Taranaki in 1848 and although

¹ I use this ‘Maori’ version of Te Rangitake’s baptismal name -‘William King’ - as it was the one most current in contemporary settler society. It is also the most common form of address in later historical works.
conducting friendly relations with the settlers, he was adamant that Waitara was not for sale. In 1854 he supported members of the Puketapu hapu who resisted attempts by other members to offer and sell land; this, coupled with his continued intent to hold onto Waitara led many settlers to attack him in the province’s newspapers. While Kingi had previously resisted the efforts of Ihaia Te Kirikumara to sell land, matters came to a head in 1859 when Te Teira Manuka, driven by a personal grievance against Kingi, offered land on the south bank of the Waitara for sale to Governor Gore-Browne. The Government accepted this (providing Teira’s title could be confirmed), as they saw the buying up of small pockets of land as one way to break a united Maori hold on wanted land. Taking his stand on rangatiratanga (as principal chief of Waitara), Kingi opposed this sale. The Government however was determined to push through a system of individual land-selling and denied Kingi’s claims.

On 25 January 1860 the Governor, supported by impatient settler opinion, gave the order for the survey of the disputed Waitara block to proceed. Understandably, but fatally, he allowed the military to accompany the survey party. Initially, Maori response took the form of passive resistance, but the situation grew increasingly tense and martial law was declared in New Plymouth on 22 February 1860. Five days later the surveyors were driven off the area by Kingi’s supporters. In the previous month, for both Maori and Pakeha, pride and sovereignty had been both defended and challenged; now the bluff had been called. Both sides now prepared for conflict, with many settlers

---

2 Teira believed Kingi was responsible for the failure of a woman to marry one of his relatives. Dalton notes that the average price for Maori land in Taranaki was three shillings an acre; Teira was offered one pound per acre. Obviously the Government were determined to buy the land and cause a division in Maori opinion and opposition. B. J. Dalton, War and Politics in New Zealand, 1855-1870, p.95.

3 Taranaki Herald (edited by Arthur Atkinson who was soon to join the Taranaki Rifle Volunteers), stated that “the utter abandonment of the settled country for an indefinite period is an extreme
feeling that it would be a limited skirmish which, if undertaken with a "strong hand", would be preferable to later "complications and hazards".4

Reading many accounts of these years it would be easy to conclude that the 'churches' played a marginal, if not minimal role in the ensuing conflict. This, to put it bluntly, is incorrect. For the Pakeha, notions of Civilization and Christianity were to become an underlying justification for action, particularly in the Waikato conflict. From the beginning of the Taranki conflict, questions of 'Church and State' were a second-tier issue that became, from the start, blurred with the primary issue of sovereignty. This is not surprising, for such issues were also questions concerned with notions of sovereignty: what role were the 'churches' to play in this new society, this pre-industrial refuge settled by industrialized refugees? On the one side were representatives of some of the mission societies, especially the CMS; on the other, the majority of settlers determined that the province of the 'churches' was to remain firmly that of piety. Excursions by the 'churches' (that is some of their clergy) into the realm of politics - if not in support of the State - were considered dangerous and not to be tolerated.5

The continual opposition of Kingi to the Governor's wishes was also considered intolerable, and the Government soon signaled its intentions. On 29 February 1860

---

4 Wellington Independent (edited by the Chartist, Richard Wakelin) made such points (28 February 1860, p.3), which were echoed increasingly in the following weeks and years. This paper did later claim that "while the dignity of the Crown had to be maintained, bloodshed must, if possible, be avoided." (6 March 1860,p.2).

5 While such a breakdown may appear extremely untidy and provisional, this reflects the nature of the situation. For while there was a 'Church Party' and what could be called an opposition of settler opinion, these sides are only ways of signifying the existence of conflicting opinion, statements and debates within (a quite often fluid) Pakeha society.
Governor Gore-Browne⁶ and Colonel Gold⁷ arrived in New Plymouth. They declared the Waitara a military district and preparations for conflict were increased. This began in earnest on 17 March 1860 with the attack of the European military forces on the Pa at Te Kohia.

The opposition of the ‘Church Party’ will be dealt with in depth in a subsequent chapter, yet the support for Kingi from some CMS missionaries and from various Anglican clergy and laity had already resulted in settler scorn. At this early stage such clerical support was commonly perceived as being naive and foolish; however later, as conflict increased, this turned to being regarded as treacherous and traitorous. Both sides in this Pakeha debate tended to view Maori as the pawns in their conflict.⁸ The ‘Church Party’ tended to believe Maori were being goaded into conflict so that land could be confiscated. Many of the settlers believed that the ‘Church Party’ favoured support of a Maori rebellion in the hope it would force the end of colonial expansion and halt any further erosion of ‘Church Party’ influence over both land and Maori. As is usual, both sides had their extremists and both positions were guilty of attempting to reduce Maori to the role of ‘playing pawns’ to European interests. Maori had their own reasons for instigating and responding to conflict; to deny their

---

⁶ Thomas Gore-Browne (1807-1887), Governor of New Zealand 1855-1861. Although later historians refer to him as “Browne”, at the time it was common to refer to him as “Gore Bowne” or “Gore-Browne”. I have chosen to stick with this extended version as this was how his contemporaries seem to have predominantly referred to him.

⁷ Charles Gold (1809-1871) had previously served in British Guiana, the West Indies and Canada. He arrived in New Zealand in 1846 with the 65th Regiment of Foot, and was Commander of the Military Forces in New Zealand from 1858. He commanded the troops in Taranaki until August 1860. He was also an active water-colourist, painting many somewhat quirky scenes of colonial life and scenery.

⁸ In fact the Taranaki Punch (New Plymouth), vol.1, no.7 (16 January 1861), pp.4-5; printed a rough wood-cut illustration of “The Game of War”, with Maori as black chessmen and Europeans as white. Bishop Selwyn and Archdeacon Hadfield appear, cloaked predominantly in black as a indication of their sympathies.
autonomy, as was predominant at the time, was and is to perpetuate a Victorian notion of race and hierarchy.

It was the Church of England which, in the first years of conflict, had the accusations of treachery leveled against it. The reasons behind this involved notions of both belonging and identity. For the general (European) populace, loyalty to their country was taken as encompassing loyalty to the Government and to European interests and ambitions. Support for Maori was seen as support for rebellious citizens,\(^9\) and, as a betrayal of the ‘white’ population - a double betrayal. For the betrayal of Government authority was a serious matter, but a betrayal of race (and the attendant notions of progress, civilization and Empire) was to prove unforgivable. The Methodists and other non-conformist clergy, with their constituency of predominantly white settlers, tended to support the Government. The Church of England missionaries, with their long history of supporting Maori interests, in conjunction with a clergy whose hierarchical structure and lesser reliance upon the immediate financial support of their laity, allowed them to follow a more independent line, tended to side with Kingi and his supporters. The dissenters had now become the supporters of the State, while those who had been the ‘Establishment’ were now the new leaseholders of dissent. This truly was the antipodes, nothing was as it had seemed; the colony’s self-confidence was shaken and so refuge was sought in increasingly polarized positions.

\(^9\) In a recent work, Graham Brazendale notes that the prominent Taranaki missionary John Whiteley believed that Maori had violated the Treaty of Waitangi by challenging the sovereignty they had ceded to the Queen. This meant, Whiteley believed, that Maori must be punished, even if it meant war (pp.47-48). Brazendale also stresses the important point that Whiteley, like so many of the Methodists, because of his evangelical attitudes, believed that questions over land were diverting the attention and energies of Maori from the far more important issues of their personal salvation. G. Brazendale, John Whiteley: Land Sovereignty and the land wars of the nineteenth century
When news of the heavy defeat of the British forces at Puketakauere\textsuperscript{10} (which involved for the first time a large force of Kingite Maori) on 27 July 1860 was relayed to the settler communities, accusations against the ‘Church Party’ increased. Early dreams of easy victory began to evaporate and growing bitterness undercut jingoism. In this situation, those who seemed willing to support, and even aid such a dangerous and rebellious foe were viewed as dallying on the edge of, if not already sliding rapidly down into, treachery. This combined with the undercurrents of the past history of missionary opposition to colonization and Selwyn’s\textsuperscript{11} High Church connections (seen by many as ‘almost’ Catholicism) to do little to lessen settler fears that they were also combating a vocal and traitorous self-interested set of clerical fifth-columnists. Such sentiments were aired upon the resumption of parliament, with J.C. Richmond\textsuperscript{12} echoing the feelings of many when he summed up his position:

When I came out here it was in the hope, Sir, to see a nation founded in the image of that great and glorious nation from which we sprang, and to which we belong; for I will not allow any

\textsuperscript{10}The Battle of Puketakauere was fought at a Pa specially built a mile from the British base at Camp Waitara. The building of this Pa was a deliberate provocation undertaken by Kingi because of the arrival of Kingitanga Ngati Maniapoto warriors to support his stand. It was felt, Belich has argued, that an engineered conflict against the British could now be winnable (and so it proved), which would improve their situation and result in full-scale Kingitanga support. Belich mentions that the settlers found it extremely difficult to admit that they had been defeated, often stressing (falsely) that Maori had suffered enormous casualties, and that it was ineffectual strategy and leadership by Colonel Gold that resulted in the defeat. Rather, Belich stresses, it was superior Maori tactics and engineering techniques in the construction of the Pa that won the day. J. Belich, The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict, pp.90-98.

\textsuperscript{11}G.A. Selwyn (1809-78), D.D.; Eton, Cambridge, friend of Gladstone, was ordained in 1833 and consecrated Bishop Of New Zealand in 1841. He and his wife Sarah arrived in New Zealand in 1842, settling first in the Bay of islands, and then in Auckland. Fluent in Maori, he traveled widely in New Zealand, often under trying conditions and was widely respected for his energy. Selwyn involved himself in both church expansion and reform, and was often involved in matters of politics. In 1868 he left New Zealand to become Bishop of Lichfield in Britain.

\textsuperscript{12}J. C. Richmond (1822-1898), brother of the prominent colonial politician C. W. Richmond, was at this time member for Omaia in Taranaki. From 1862 he was editor of the Nelson Examiner, and in the late 1860s returned to politics and was in charge of native affairs. Richmond’s Unitarian background probably influenced his comment.
man - even though he may wear a mitre - to filch from me my birthright, my share and interest in the honour of that nation.\textsuperscript{13}

Passions were further excited when it came to the attention of the Government (and the press) that a missionary had allegedly withheld correspondence that could have prevented the Waitara war. That the clergyman so accused was Archdeacon Hadfield\textsuperscript{14} of Otaki merely confirmed their suspicions. Hadfield’s vehement opposition to the Government’s policy at Waitara had made him very much a \textit{bete-noir} for the colonists. Now it was alleged that not only had he broken his word to keep the Governor informed as to Maori sentiment, but that he had taken it upon himself to withhold letters from Wiremu Kingi, even though Kingi had requested that Hadfield pass them on to the Governor. It appears that it was more a case of caution exercised by Bishop Abraham of Wellington who, unaware of the Governor’s intention to force the issue at Waitara, had counselled Hadfield to wait until Gore-Browne visited Hadfield at Otaki. It was the speed of events, rather than intention to deceive that caused the confusion. Many settlers, however, were prepared to believe the alternative version of clerical duplicity, being willing to believe the worst of Hadfield and his intentions. The Native Minister Frederick Weld\textsuperscript{15} wrote to his wife “Could anyone have believed such conduct possible?”\textsuperscript{16} Accusations flew in Parliament that Hadfield had been supporting and counselling Kingi in opposition to the Government, whether through deliberate

\textsuperscript{13} \textit{NZPD} 3 August 1860, p.199, House: Mr J. C. Richmond, Native Offenders Bill.
\textsuperscript{14} Octavius Hadfield (1814?-1904), Oxford educated, CMS missionary of evangelical leanings, was in 1839 the first priest ordained in New Zealand. From late 1839, he established his mission at Waikanae and Otaki, a post he continued until being appointed Bishop of Wellington in 1870. From 1890-93 he was Archbishop of New Zealand.
\textsuperscript{15} Frederick Weld (1823-1891), a West Country Catholic and educated on the continent (University of Frieburg), he arrived in New Zealand in 1844 and was involved in establishing sheep stations. Elected to Parliament in 1854, he opposed any discrimination against Catholics, and as Native Minister saw Waitara as a question of sovereignty.
\textsuperscript{16} F. A. Weld, Correspondence 1846-1891, 4 August 1860, p.2. (Microfilm of qMS-2129)(MS-Copy-}
intent or a certain injudiciousness of opinion. As Henry Sewell noted in his journal, the support of the ‘Church Party’ “by sympathy, if not counsel” was widely regarded as not “the duty of clergymen”. Instead, “it is producing a most unfortunate feeling of hostility towards them as a class on the part of the mass of the people”.  

The uproar resulted in the summoning of Hadfield to Auckland to be questioned at length by the House on 14 August 1860. He was actually questioned more on the background to the Waitara, his knowledge of Kingi and on issues of Maori land ownership, especially that relating to Waitara. In the process he answered 89 questions, often at length and provided a comprehensive coverage of the issues. Very little was directly related to the issues of the letters, while Hadfield continually denied any knowing role in formulating, influencing or guiding Maori opinion. At the same session, Donald McLean, the chief Land purchase Commissioner, gave his opinions on the Waitara purchase, in turn answering 86 questions. In the end a stalemate occurred. It was left to individual members to weigh up the evidence, in which, as Dalton notes, Hadfield’s evidence aided those in the House who sought to oppose the Government’s intentions and actions. Lethbridge states that Hadfield’s statements were the “turning point” in the formulation of opposition to the Stafford Ministry. So there is the suspicion that Hadfield’s appearance had more to do with colonial party-politics than with the actual accusation leveled against him. What this underscores is

---

19 Donald McLean (1820-1877), from a Scottish crofter background, arrived in New Zealand in 1840, and by 1853 was chief Land Purchase Commissioner. He was ultimately responsible for Governor Gore-Browne’s decision to accept Teira’s offer to sell the Waitara.
20 B. J. Dalton, War and Politics in New Zealand, 1855-1870, pp.115-16.
the complex and intertwined and important way that the issues of ‘Church and Politics’ are related to the questions of colonial government and of the New Zealand Wars.

By September 1860, the ‘Church Party’ had further involved itself in issues of State with a strategy of opposition to the Native Offender’s Bill now being debated before the House. This aimed to curb settler trade with disaffected Maori; yet it failed to be passed partly because it would inhibit further settler purchase of Maori land, and also because of fears that it would create further Maori hostility.22 The clergy based their opposition on the third article of the Treaty of Waitangi, which granted Maori royal protection and the rights and privileges of British subjects. This, they argued, would be compromised by the passing of the Bill. Members of the House of Representatives also voiced their dissent. Some, like William Fox and Henry Sewell,23 based their opposition on a defence of the Treaty. Others, such as Hugh Carleton24 voiced their dissent on the grounds that it was a “bad law” - which, if passed, might force some clergy into insisting that they be made martyrs by being refused access to “native districts”.25 The twin threats of unconstitutional law and further clergy involvement in politics appear to be the major elements contributing to the Bill’s defeat. Such victories, whilst showing politicians and clergy could find a pragmatic form of common

23 Ibid.,pp.152-53. William Fox (1812? -1893) had a long-running battle with Sir William Martin (judge and Anglican layman), the Government and missionaries. He occupied a political middle-ground, more often out of opposition to Government and Governor, than wholly supportive of Maori interests. He was Premier 1861-62.
Henry Sewell (1807-1879), first Premier of New Zealand 1856, Anglican layman and periodic M.P. until 1873. He left an insightful journal which is an invaluable record of early colonial life and opinion.
24 Hugh Carleton (1810-1890) newspaper editor, notably of the Southern Cross, and long-serving M.P. 1855-1857, 1859-75. He had previously supported Fox, but now supported Stafford, despite disapproval of the Government’s Waitara policy. In 1861 he voted against Stafford and became an independent.
25 NZPD 11 September 1860, p.485, Mr Carleton, Native Offenders Bill.
ground also helped to deepen the suspicions of clerical involvement in politics which were held by many colonists. These involved fears transplanted from a European past: "Scrutator"\textsuperscript{26} of Hawke's Bay pleading "For God's sake, let us have not Wolseys or Richelieus - or imitators of such- in a new colony."\textsuperscript{27} Others were quick to compare the missionaries with the Jesuits who, "on account of their mischievous inter-meddling in the affairs of state were banished by every court in Europe".\textsuperscript{28}

Such sentiments expressed the transplanting of both English anti-Catholic prejudice and anti-clerical stereotyping to the new colony. For when the colonial newspapers are consulted it appears a colony ever ready to view clerical involvement in politics and questioning of the status quo as part of a supposed 'twist to Rome'. So did old-world prejudice find itself repeatedly voiced in the new world.

Hadfield had meanwhile been busy writing the first of three pamphlets directed to the Colonial Secretary, the Duke of Newcastle, and which were published both in New Zealand and London. \textit{One of England's Little Wars} was an able and forcible defence of his position and actions. The basis of his position was the issue of whether chiefs were to be debarred from the right to defend their land-title in a court of law, a right which Hadfield traced to the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi.\textsuperscript{29} Other themes are the effect of Governor Gore-Browne's actions upon the Christianity of Maori, the injustice of Gore-Browne's actions and an attack on the ability of Gore-Browne himself.

\textsuperscript{26} Translation: One who searches, an investigator.
\textsuperscript{27} \textit{Hawke's Bay Herald} (Napier), 15 September 1860, p.4. Cardinal Wolsey (1475?-1550) was an influential courtier to Henry VIII; while Cardinal Richelieu (1585-1642) was basically de-facto ruler of France from 1624 under Louis XIII.
\textsuperscript{28} \textit{New Zealand Advertiser}, 15 September 1860, p.2.
Hadfield had stolen a march on his opponents by appealing directly to the Colonial Secretary - and they were not impressed. He had also astutely instructed his brother, Charles, to pass on information from his letters regarding his views of the New Zealand situation to the influential Aborigines Protection Society, the Anti-slavery Society, and to the Evangelical figure-head, the Earl of Shaftesbury. Hadfield’s direct approach was influential in creating anti-colonist opinion and rhetoric in Britain. The *Aborigines’ friend and Colonial Intelligencer* went as far as to urge its readers that:

Archdeacon Hadfield’s “Letter to the Duke of Newcastle” ought to be in the hands of every Member of Parliament, Minister of the Gospel, and English citizen, who is solicitous for the honour of his country, or desirous of performing his duty in relation to it.

In contrast, the *Taranaki Herald*, speaking as it was from the heart of the conflict, attacked Hadfield for bringing the Church Of England into disrespect, stating that “what he calls opinions, are but the passionate feelings of a man who combines womanly weakness with priestly presumption.”

This was a major problem; what some in Britain viewed as an act of honour, was seen as an act of treason in New Zealand. ‘Home’ support for Hadfield and the ‘Church Party’ only served to deepen settler resentment; that their protests were reportedly being relayed and read in the various corridors of power and influence meant the settler-‘Church Party’ divide was deeper than ever.

---

31 *Aborigines’ friend and Colonial Intelligencer* (London), Jan-Dec 1860, p.130.
Settler and Government concern was increasing with the growth of the King Movement (Kingitanga). A pan-tribal movement, arising out of Maori concern with settler encroachment and pressure to sell their lands, it had been led by the Waikato Chief, Potatau Te Wherowhero, since 1858. While some members of the ‘Church Party’ defended it as a justifiable Maori response to European inability to enforce law and order, in the main, Pakeha opinion viewed it as a threat and a challenge to British sovereignty. Kingitanga support for Wiremu Kingi, including the sending of warriors to fight alongside his forces, only served to harden British resolve not to tolerate its existence. That the movement did not die with the death of Te Wherowhero in June 1860, but rather that a second King, Matutaera Tawhia succeeded him, confirmed in settler eyes all their worst suspicions that Waitara was not, and would not be an isolated rebellious outbreak concerned with purely local land claims.

The journeying of Waikato Kingite warriors to assist Kingi had disturbed some missionaries, such as John Morgan of Otawhao, near Te Awamutu. They felt, and communicated their fear, that the issue was not just one of an isolated pocket of land and disputed ownership, but rather a concerted attempt to oppose British sovereignty, in fact to expel British colonization from New Zealand. This, the missionaries felt, would be a tragedy, not only for the settlers, but also for Maori. As Morgan wrote to the CMS:

33 John Morgan (1806/07 -1865) was active as CMS missionary in New Zealand from 1833, in Otawhao from 1841-63. His plan for Maori involved the establishment of ‘christian’ farming villages, which while creating some success with mills, orchards and wheat-fields, was considered too worldly and mercantile in operation by the CMS hierarchy. Situated as he was in the heart of Kingitanga territory, Morgan had first-hand, long-term experience of the movement and its aims. His concerns with it also placed him in conflict with his parent organization, especially when he agreed to supply the Governor with information.
Hence I consider that entire submission to British authority, the introduction of law and order, the promotion of industry and the progress of civilization, together with the blessing of Christianity, are the only means by which the Maories as a people can be saved.  

The Governor, Thomas Gore-Browne, increasingly concerned with the growth of the King Movement, made use of missionaries such as Morgan to keep him informed of Maori opinion in their districts; in the case of Morgan requesting that he write to him every week, with information on Maori in his area. This was information Morgan was only too happy to provide. For he believed that only in their “submission to the Queen” would Maori find their “salvation”, for they needed “law and order” to stop them “constantly” carrying out war, with each other which would only result in them perishing.

Yet despite, or perhaps because of such information, Gore-Browne was finding his position increasingly difficult. Attempting to hammer out peace terms acceptable to the Government, the settlers, the ‘Church Party’, Maori, and the Colonial authorities in Britain could have been the requirement of a latter-day Sisyphus, such was the seemingly never-ending travails of the task. In the end, he decided that he had to go-it-

---


35 Sir Thomas Gore-Browne Papers, Archives Holdings 1855-1872, Accession 146, 190, Series 1, Letters Received By The Governor, 1/2d Letters from missionaries, 1 Jan 1861-12 June 1864, Rev. J. Morgan, National Archives, Wellington. Letter 16 January 1861, p6. Morgan says that it his “duty” to do so. He also relays and refers to news he hears from other missionaries, in his letters.

36 J. Morgan, Letters and Journals, 1 January 1861, p682. “To CMS, London”. (A.T. L.) In the same letter, Morgan outlines his position which is a support of the “just rights” of Maori, leavened with his faithfulness to ‘Queen and Country’. It also includes a belief that Maori need to be reminded of their duty as British subjects, and a stress on the benefits of the introduction of law and order - which they are “impotent” to exercise without the “assistance of the Queen”. (p.684).
alone and trust his own judgment - otherwise conflict would only continue. He decided that neither settlers nor "Episcopal Party" would be satisfied with his terms for peace, for the settlers desired more and the "Episcopalian" less than he would demand. Yet the "Episcopalian" wishes could never be effected, even with English parliamentary support, for they would only "exasperate" the settlers, forcing greater conflict with Maori, "which will sooner or later end in the ruin of the latter". The result of such an attempt was his removal to become Governor of Tasmania and his replacement by the recalled "hero", George Grey, from South Africa.

The major concern for the government was to stop the conflict spreading from Taranaki. This however, as John Morgan noted, resulted in the ironic situation whereby Auckland actually funded the Maori war effort. He wrote of this to the London CMS, stating that the local Waikato Maori fight in Taranaki, then return to harvest their crops, which they sell to the Europeans at Waiuku and Auckland, then purchase supplies, return home and then go off to fight again. The reason for such a situation was that Gore-Browne felt at this stage it was preferable to limit the spread of the conflict, for a localized conflict was far easier to deal with than a widespread war conducted in the heart-land of Kingitanga. However, the situation would change with the return of George Grey, who would choose to institute such a policy.

37 The colonial businessman and colonist, Charles Rooking Carter (1822-1896) wrote of Gore-Browne in 1866 that he was "not above mediocrity" intellectually, who "meant what he said, and did what he promised; but he liked to take things easy. He was, in the main, a true English gentleman; but he merited the appellation of a drawing-room Governor". C. R. Carter, Life and Recollections of a New Zealand Colonist, vol.1, 1866, p.152.
38 T. Gore-Browne, Letterbook 1855-1861, 4 March 1861, "To Fortesque." (qMS-0284), Archives & Manuscripts, A.T. L.
39 A Post that incidentally paid a higher salary than his New Zealand position. A fact that upset many who felt that his punishment was, in fact, a reward.
40 J. Morgan, Letters and Journals, 21 March 1861, pp.701-02.
Meanwhile, the situation in Taranaki was failing to resolve itself, the British forces failing to defeat Maori and a war of attrition prevailing. The effect of a drawn-out, inconclusive campaign had affected both settler opinion and emigration, so financial pressures were added to a feeling that it would be better to relocate military pressure and activities elsewhere. Hostilities stopped on 18 March 1861, and while the terms of peace included Maori handing over plunder and those of their number who had killed unarmed civilians, paying compensation, and formally submitting to the Queen's authority, none of this actually occurred. Instead, Maori banned travelers and mail from passing through their territory and also seized a further 4000 acres of 'settler' land at Tataraimaka.\footnote{J. Belich, The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict, pp.113-115.}

It is little wonder that such a situation merely hardened settler opinion against those who were seen to have promoted peace. Questions were continually being raised as to what was the role of the 'Church' in a new colony; with whom did its loyalty lie, and what was to be done with clergy who attempted to involve themselves in questions of national politics?

In this context, insinuations were made that such a clash of views was due to conflicting notions of 'independence' to be found in the new colony. The New Zealand London Examiner made such points in an article entitled "Priestly Interference in New Zealand"; an article seized upon and reprinted in the colonial press.\footnote{The article originally appeared in the New Zealand London Examiner on 14 January 1861; on 30 March 1861 it was reprinted in the Otago Witness (Dunedin) p.10, and again on 20 April 1861 in the Taranaki Herald, p.3. Such reprinting of articles, both from overseas and from other papers in the colony was a common occurrence in the press of the period.} This supported settler belief that while they were now less willing to submit to authority than when
they left Europe, the clergy were actually more inclined to assert authority than at 'home'. Anti-clerical in tone, it asserted that clergy, though "the most venerable of men...when sincere" were too often and easily prey to "worldly ambition." Clergy had their place - that concerned with 'religion'; however they were unsuited to a world contained outside the "dogma" of their books. The combination of "worldly ambition" and naiveté had resulted in their support of Maori and their opposition to settler "independence" - "hence our anomalous, intolerable and perilous condition of things." \(^{43}\)

The following months revealed a strong and determined streak of anti-clerical feeling in the colony. Now that the war was over, it was seen as a chance to deal with those clergy who, it appeared, had betrayed both settler trust and notions of the role of the clergy - as both British Gentlemen and as representatives of 'The Church'. (The attacks were primarily directed against Bishop Selwyn and Archdeacon Hadfield). Coupled with this was a common feeling that missionaries had spoilt Maori, that their influence and "fatal gift" of the Bible\(^{44}\) had been instrumental in hampering Maori development towards being civilized British subjects and peaceful co-inhabiters of the land.

Meanwhile, two important events were occurring, both of which were to affect the future of the colony. In the south, in the rugged environment of inland Otago, Gabriel Read discovered gold. This triggered a gold rush that would transform the South

\(^{43}\) Ibid.  
\(^{44}\) As the above article on "Priestly Interference" claimed, Maori took the notions of "Blood for blood" from the Old Testament and "equality" from the New Testament and "out of ignorance" created "a principle of antagonism". It also prophetically stated that as Maori now have a King, soon would arise "fanatical prophets" who would use the Bible as an example of "holy" combat.
Island, and especially Otago, with an influx of prospectors from (especially) Australia and further afield, and the attendant businessmen and women of varying shades of repute. The prosperity engendered by this increase in population made the southern citizens even less inclined to share the financial responsibility for a northern war - a feeling shared 12,000 miles away by the citizens of Great Britain.45

The day following Read’s pivotal discovery, Downing Street dispatched notice to Gore-Browne that he was to be replaced by Sir George Grey.46 This appointment put on hold Gore-Browne’s plans to invade the Waikato and confront the Kingitanga, thus the colony enjoyed a year and a half of uneasy peace. The return of Grey was regarded as a victory for the ‘Church Party’. Their criticism of Gore-Browne had been loud and long, and, through pamphlets and letters, made quite an impact back in Britain. Selwyn and his supporters believed Grey to be more sympathetic to both Maori and themselves than his predecessor. Grey however, despite both liberal and broad-minded inclinations was also an intensely proud, pragmatic and somewhat autocratic man.47 He was not at all inclined to be treated as an ‘errand boy’ by either Maori or missionary interests.

45 Elizabeth Muter, who resided in New Zealand in the 1860s wrote that the South Island settlers felt aggrieved at having to pay for the war in the North Island, and also at being lumped in with the northern settlers by English opinion and so being charged with “robbing” Maori land and “profiting” from British taxation. She says they have no interest in the war except for the finance sent to the north, and felt they were not allowed any voice or control in the matter. (pp.280-281). She also discerns three views of the New Zealand ‘situation’: 1; The Imperial or British taxpayer’s view. 2; The colonial - or that of the settlers of the North Island “in proximity to, or actual contact with, the natives.” 3; The southern aspect - those settlers “…of the provinces who were in no way influenced by danger to life or property”. (p.276). As she somewhat overstates: “The North Island is nothing to the inhabitants of the South...They are mere rival communities, competing for the stream of living beings drafted from Great Britain”. Mrs Muter, Travels and Adventures of an Officer’s wife in India, China and New Zealand, vol.2. p.121.

46 Read discovered gold at Gabriel’s Gully on 20 May 1861. The despatch was sent on 21 May 1861. Grey had already served a term as Governor 1845-1853.

47 Charles Rooking Carter described Grey as possessing “peculiar and appropriate qualifications to have made him a good Governor of a Province of India, where, if appointed to it, he would have administered a mild, firm and beneficent system of Government bordering on despotism”. C. R. Carter, Life and Recollections of New Zealand Colonist, vol. 1. (1866), pp.50-51.
It is not at all surprising now that peace was in effect that further consideration was given to philosophical questions raised by the involvement of clergy in issues of war. The Nelson Examiner, (under the editorship of J.C. Richmond, whose wife Mary was heavily influenced by F. D. Maurice, the theologian\(^48\)) noted that questions of justification, precepts and conduct were "far from being satisfactorily determined", but that until they were, the best hope was a "broad line of demarcation" between the "proclamation and inculcation of the truths" of religion and "the task of applying the rules as best they may to the practical business of life".\(^{49}\) Any alternative, it implied, would be too similar to a return to the rule and influence of the Jesuits. The Press, while recognizing the "odious (sic) and criminal" nature of much warfare, still stated a belief in war as a possible instrument of divine good:

Put in its best light, war is the ultimate appeal to force, when all other means have failed to preserve the right and the truth entrusted to a nation's keeping. Like the trial by combat of old, it is a solemn appeal to God to protect the right; and that, in an issue in which no human tribunal has authority extensive enough to give, or power great enough to enforce, a final judgment.\(^{50}\)

The period of peace also signaled a change in government. William Fox, in the past a sparring partner of Bishop and clergy, had gradually moved into an informal alliance with them and had come to be seen as the leader of the 'peace party' in opposition to

---

\(^48\) F. D. Maurice (1805-1872) was one of the leaders of the early 'Christian Socialist' movement, who attempted to fit a Christian response into the gaps and questions left by the failure of Chartism. He promoted an inclusive and universalist theology of the Kingdom of Christ.

\(^49\) Nelson Examiner, 15 June 1861, p.2.

\(^50\) Press (Christchurch), 15 June 1861, p.1. This was most probably written by James Fitzgerald (1818-1896), past Secretary of the Canterbury Association, founder of both the Lyttelton Times and the Press, and Superintendent of Canterbury 1853-57. At this stage a Provincial politician, he returned to national politics (1862-67), having previously sat in 1854-57.
the ruling ‘war party’ of Stafford. His opponents attacked his new position, with C.W. Richmond stating Fox’s involvement in the ‘peace party’ had been rather minor - “He has only been a jackal to the Bishop of New Zealand’s Lion.” Others stated that the real issue was, as Josiah Firth remarked, a deeper question “of law, order, and civilization itself” and not merely “a question of missionaries, settlers or Maoris.”

The Parliament carried the resulting no confidence vote by 24 votes to 23, Stafford resigned and Fox became Premier on 12 July 1861. Hadfield was elated, writing to his brother, Charles:

What will people in England now think? They imagined that I and few of the clergy were having a say about nothing and now they will know that a House newly elected with all the influence (and it was not small) brought to bear on the election, supports my view of the Governor’s proceedings and the war.

Hadfield’s reading of events was rather premature, victory had been narrow and Fox was as wily as his name. The situation was one in which political pragmatism and ambition had as much to do with the changes and re-alliances within Parliament as with any sudden ‘Damascus road’ experience as to the validity of the opinions of Hadfield.

51 E.W. Stafford (1819-1901), arrived in Nelson in 1843, and became MHR 1855-78. He was Premier 1856-61, and twice also after this. Opposed to forced Maori land sales, he none-the-less chose to view the conflict of the 1860s as one of Imperial sovereignty. This somewhat guarded approach made him vulnerable to Fox’s attacks.
52 NZPD, 5 July 1861, p.158. Mr Richmond, Want of Confidence.
53 Josiah Firth (1826-1897). The son of a Congregational minister and himself President of the Auckland branch of the British and Foreign Bible Society (1860-65), Firth was also drawn by the lure of Maori land in Auckland and Waikato. He was thus a member of the ‘war party’ and, in the antipodean manner, although a leading member of a dissenting church, involved in support of the colonial State and its aims of ‘sovereignty, law and order, and civilization’.
54 NZPD 4 July 1861, p.138. Mr Firth. Want of Confidence.
and his ‘party’. This is not to deny that a certain wariness of Governor and Government’s opinions had arisen, yet Hadfield soon found himself again on the outer, especially when moves were made into the Waikato.

With the departure of Gore-Browne, there were further chances for political points to be scored. Addressing the Governor in the House, Alfred Domett, longtime opponent of Maori appeasement and aims, took the opportunity to commend Gore-Browne for his support of European “interests” and for his “most gallant stand” against the “Exeter Hall party whose machinations had been detrimental” to both settlers and Maori. Yet there was a widespread hope and expectation that with the arrival of Grey, both Maori and ‘Church Party’ would settle down. Consequently there were some moves towards appeasement, with calls for Selwyn to patch up the breach that had developed between his ‘Party’ and the settlers, and to try to understand the thoughts and feelings of his fellow (white) countrymen. However, intermingled with such calls, often in the same articles and editorials, were further accusations against the ‘Church Party’ - and their ultimate loyalty. These, often betraying a prevalent anti-Catholic opinion, did little to encourage such a move. Settler accusations of missionary ‘Jesuitry’ served only to harden opinions and widen the breach.

---

56 Alfred Domett (1811-1887). He was critical of the “humanitarian” party (later the ‘Church Party’) following the Wairau affair of 1843 when 22 settlers and 4 Maori were killed in an incident when settlers sought to arrest the Maori chiefs Te Rauparaha and Te Rangihoua for their opposition to a survey of the Wairau valley, east of Nelson. This, and Governor Fitzroy’s admission of European wrongdoing in the affair was to underpin his support of Gore-Browne’s Waitara stance - and his later opposition to Grey’s attempts to redress the situation.

57 NZPD 27 August 1861, p.341. Mr Domett, Address to His Excellency.

58 For example, the Taranaki Herald, 14 September 1862, p.2, in an editorial calling on Selwyn to heal the breach with the settlers, also states: “It almost tempts one to fear that the principles of the followers of Loyola are latent in the office of priest; that the clergymen of our English Church is only an inconsistent and unconscious Jesuit.”
The hoped-for event finally occurred on 26 September 1861 when Sir George Grey arrived in Auckland. While the ‘Church Party’ rejoiced with the arrival of “their man”, there were early indications that he would not prove to be either the mouthpiece, nor as malleable as they hoped. Gore-Browne, after consultation with his successor was almost jaunty with praise:

Sir George Grey keeps his own counsel but is extremely agreeable. I am almost amazed at his ability and his entire independence of all authority. As far as I can judge he is not at all inclined to adopt the Church views and will make a permanent settlement by fair means or foul. He is instructed to do so.60

So while the CMS missionary T. S. Grace61 could write to his London Secretary full of praise for Grey’s return,62 Henry Sewell noted with disapproval, “Another of Sir George’s charlataneries is, that he wants to bribe the missionary party with the prospect of unlimited land endowments.63 This, Sewell was relieved to note, would be opposed not only by the General Assembly, but also by Fox, Sir William Martin and Selwyn.

59 H. Sewell, 30 September 1861, p.302, Journal: “The Bishop of New Zealand, Sir William Martin, Archdeacon Hadfield and a sort (sic) detachment of that party, all in a great state of rejoicing at the arrival of “their man”.
61 T. S. Grace (1815-1879), CMS missionary in New Zealand from 1850, located in Taupo 1855-63 where he supported the economic independence of local Maori. Accused in 1856 of supporting the King Movement (which he rebuffed), Grace was opposed to the Government’s actions in Taranaki. In 1865 he was present at the death of the missionary C.S. Volkner.
62 Grace reads a providential act of God in Grey’s return, believing that if Maori confidence in the Government is restored, then there may occur “the salvation of the race”. S. J. Britten et al, eds. A Pioneer Missionary among the Maoris, p.103. Letter from T. S. Grace to Major H. Smith, Secretary of CMS, 28 October 1861.
Grey was perhaps remembering his conflicts with the missionaries in his previous term as Governor (1845-53) over claims they were indulging in large-scale land speculation and
The Bishop meanwhile, calling on past acquaintance, had begun to court the sympathy of the new Governor. This new dance of diplomacy clearly upset Sewell who observed it from amongst the political wall-flowers. Writing on the Grey-Selwyn discussions on religious endowments, Sewell states somewhat peevishly that Grey is being tutored too much by the Bishop who takes extravagant and wrong news of this question. It is very unhappy that the Missionary body as a class, do not scruple to traduce the settlers and the General assembly and responsible Government and all their motives and proceedings and this rouses indignation amongst the whole body of settlers, a feeling in which I greatly sympathise.\(^{64}\)

Grey, perhaps sensing that his wooing of the bishop was failing, had prepared an alternative plan. Although on arriving he had rescinded Gore-Browne’s plan to invade the Waikato, he was not prepared to back away from the possibility of conflict. There appears to have been an underlying determination to force Waikato Maori and the Kingitanga either to retreat in the face of British sovereignty - or, failing their acceptance of it, to fight. As a means of forcing the issue, two weeks into his second Governorship, he ordered General Cameron to move his troops from Otahuhu to build a road south towards the Waikato. Once they reached Te Ira, Cameron was to construct a redoubt outpost to stake a claim to the area - and to signal further intentions.\(^{65}\)


\(^{65}\) Grey officially became Governor on 4 December 1861; his order to Cameron issued 19 December 1861.
In 1862 questions continued to be raised on the issues of the Roman Catholic presence and influence in New Zealand. This attracted a good deal of attention later on in the following year with the publication of Bishop Pompallier’s Pastoral Epistle. Pompallier (1801-1871) had arrived in New Zealand in 1838 as Vicar Apostolic of Western Oceania. Although French, he had been a British citizen since 1850 and observed a high degree of neutrality, but his Epistle came at a time when settler suspicion of clerical motives (especially when refracted through anti-Catholic and anti-French sentiment) was at a premium. Although written as a letter of support to Catholic Maori, promising a return of withdrawn priests when warfare subsided, and stressing the equality of Catholics and Protestants before the laws and administration of the British Queen, he counseled Catholic Maori to leave the administration and guidance of secular life to the Governor and Queen, just as they had done in religious life to the Pope and Bishop.

However, the effect of a ‘French Catholic’ Bishop speaking out - even if only pastorally, was read by many in the tense environment as giving support to rebel Maori. In Auckland, the ‘old New Zealand’ identity, Benjamin Turner⁶⁶ declared:

> if Bishop Pompallier or any other Bishop, Priest or layman, be found poisoning the minds of the natives against the white inhabitants, let them be tried for high treason and punished accordingly.⁶⁷

---

⁶⁶ Benjamin Turner (1796-1876) had been active in New Zealand since undertaking sealing, whaling and dried Maori head trading in 1822. From 1828 he had been involved in the timber industry, primarily in the Bay of Islands. At this time he was a member of the Auckland Provincial Council for the Bay of Islands.

⁶⁷ Aucklander, 10 October, 1862, p.3. “Clergy and Politics”, Letter. This was in relation to Pompallier writing to the Maori King, welcoming him to the Catholic Church. Tawhiao, although baptised an Anglican, had apparently wished to become a Catholic. Pompallier had stressed that his Church had nothing to do with sovereignty or politics. E. R. Simmons, In Cruce Salus. A
Meanwhile, from the depths of Kingite territory, John Morgan continued his correspondence with Gore-Browne, now ensconced in Tasmania. Morgan stated that “Romish Priests” are unfriendly to “our Government” and were attempting to lure Maori with accusations that it is all the fault of a “Protestant Government”. He mentioned rumours that on Maori request, the priest at Rangiaowhia, Father Garavel had written to the French Government requesting assistance - which the French declined, as they were not at war with Britain. Yet this did not stop Morgan from further stating that, in the early stages of the war, Maori mentioned that they expected French assistance. Morgan was not alone in his suspicion; the CMS missionary Benjamin Ashwell wrote to his London Secretary that “the Romanists are taking advantage of Political agitation to tempt our people from their faith.” The Governor also entered the debate when, on a visit to Otaki in September 1862, he was reported to have stated: “wherever I go I find the Roman Catholic natives are at the bottom of all this work and disturbance.”

Some commentators attempted to support the Governor while also attempting to pacify the anger of Roman Catholic settlers. This was especially apparent in Otago which had recently experienced an influx of Catholics (nearly all Irish) during the

---


68 Joseph Garavel (1823-47-1885) arrived in New Zealand in 1850. He traveled widely in Maori territory, but fell out with Pompallier in 1862 over his administration of his diocese, and in 1863 was accused by Volkner of disloyalty because of his impartial transmission of both European and Maori letters. As Rangiaowhia is close to Morgan’s mission station, professional and personal jealousy could lie beneath this accusation.

69 Sir Thomas Gore-Browne Papers, Letter from John Morgan, 23 September 1863.

70 Benjamin Ashwell (1810-1883), prior to arriving in New Zealand in 1835 had been a missionary in Sierra Leone. A strong supporter of Maori, he held a variety of mission posts throughout the North Island.


72 Otago Daily Times (Dunedin), 9 October 1862, p.4.
goldrush. It thus led to the *Otago Daily Times* stressing the difference between “French” and “English” Catholicism, noting the latter’s “obligation of loyalty” to the Crown and hinting at the former’s unscrupulous “zeal to obtain converts”. It notes that while “Romish influence” had become more pronounced amongst Maori, priests were not to be accused of disloyalty, having been used by the Government to conduct negotiations. However the influence of them being both French and Catholic may have unwittingly encouraged “disaffection”.

Such sentiments were seconded by “An Observer” in Nelson, who claimed Maori were becoming Roman Catholic because they compared the example of the British, who brought the Gospel and then fought them, with that of the French who also brought the Gospel but lived peacefully amongst them. Others rebutted frequent claims (harking back to Pompallier’s letter to Tawhiao) that Kingitanga was also a Roman Catholic front. One pertinent rebuttal stated:

I had no idea that the few moneyless, landless Catholic priests had so zealously worked at their mission as to have converted such vast numbers, for generally speaking the rich, well-endowed Protestant pastors have been in the habit of claiming all, or nearly all the native race as their flock.

That it was at Hadfield’s Otaki mission station that Grey’s incendiary statement was alleged to have been made was a coincidence eagerly seized upon. Hadfield had been under public scrutiny for his alleged involvement in drawing up a petition of allegedly forged Maori signatures praying for the removal of Governor Gore-Browne. This,

73 Ibid., p.4.
combined with a further allegation of the flying of a King Movement flag at Otaki had reawakened public prejudice against him. How better, it was now asked, to draw off public attention than by influencing Grey into making anti-Catholic statements? Grey of course was fully capable of such insensitivity by himself, yet such was the lingering fear and lack of settler trust in both Maori and missionary motives that it was like living a perpetual game of Chinese whispers. Yet, given space from the actual persecution of a war, many in the colony took time to reconsider the root causes of the conflict. For the majority of the settlers it was clear - the missionary had been the ‘cuckoo in the nest’, opposing colonization from the start and so ‘poisoning’ Maori against the influx of settlers. Some did attempt a more balanced view, with the Ellesmere (Canterbury) MP, Fitzgerald, declaring in parliament:

> there has been in the whole, a tendency between the two races to unite themselves into one - a tendency which has been opposed from the first, partly by the influence of the missionary, and more recently by the operations of the Government.  

The fact that Selwyn accompanied the Governor on an unannounced visit to the Waikato in the first days of the new year of 1863 created conflicting opinions. The Press gave his presence measured support, favourably comparing Selwyn’s “Christianity” to that of the early church martyrs, and condoning his participation in politics in the name of “truth and law.” However the Nelson Examiner was far more scathing. According to it, Selwyn

---

75 New Zealand Advertiser (Wellington), 14 October 1862, p.3. Letter from “A Layman”.  
76 Lyttleton Times, 22 November 1862, p.3.  
77 NZPD, 6 August 1862, p.488. Mr Fitzgerald, Native Affairs Debate.  
78 Grey was visiting because of rumours the Waikato were about to rise up in opposition to the Government - a report quickly disproved with the enthusiastic welcome he received upon arriving.  
79 Press, 10 January 1863, pp.2-3.
did not confine himself to the generalities which clergymen generally bring to bear on politics; he did not attend as a spiritual adviser. His arguments are those of the politician, and his action is either authorized by the head of the civil government or it is an impertinence.  

This is an important insight into the dominant perception of the role of the clergy at this time. To speak out on the particularities of politics was outside the clergyman’s perceived brief. Their role was held by their fellow colonists to be that within the realm of spirituality - piety from the pulpit. The example set by the non-conformist churches in Auckland in beginning 1863 with “A Week of Special and United Prayer” was more in line with settler expectation. The contents of these prayers, as outlined in the daily press, were not so concerned with the local war, but rather with contemporary, international evangelical concerns: piety, the conversion of “the Jews and the Heathen”, the “revival of pure Christianity” in the Eastern Churches, and “the recognition of God”. All of this was to be underlined with a more marked separation of the “Church and the Christian” from the world.

Underscoring these examples is the persistent tension in the Judeo-Christian tradition between the role of the pastoral priest and that of the prophet. Selwyn would probably have been the last ever to call himself a prophet, yet there is the distinct air of the prophetic stance in his willingness to challenge the status quo, his willingness to involve himself in the political process to combat what he saw as injustice, and his continual challenging of the actions and intentions of those in authority. Hadfield too

---

80 Nelson Examiner, 7 January 1863, p.2. Editorial.
81 Held at the invitation of the Committee of the British Organization of the Evangelical alliance of London, it involved the local Methodist, Presbyterian, Baptist and Independent churches.
was of course undertaking a prophetical role, but his position was not so exalted nor his political skills nowhere as defined or as smooth as those of his Bishop. He also appeared to possess the intractable, intransigent manner of the zealot that meant that he could be accused of involving himself ‘in’ politics, but could never be accused of being ‘a politician’. He was viewed rather as a zealous lobbyist, who did not gain the guarded respect that Selwyn (increasingly) did from the settlers. To many of them, Hadfield was as much the enemy as those Maori resisting British sovereignty.

In the Waikato, the stand-off with the King Movement continued to deteriorate. The *Hawke’s Bay Times* called for both the recall of Grey and the exiling of Selwyn from New Zealand until the “Native question assumes a different aspect”. 83 Neither had any intention of doing so. In fact Grey soon undertook aggressive action that launched the colony into a new stage of bitter warfare. In March 1863 he had occupied (without resistance) the Tataraimaka block in Taranaki, confiscated by Maori since the end of the Waitara war. However, on 25 March, the Kingite supporter and Ngati Maniapoto leader, Rewi Maniapoto 84 seized the printing press of the Government newspaper *Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke* at Te Awamutu. This had only been in use since 2 February of that year, under the editorship of John Gorst, 85 but had obviously caused considerable resentment with its calls for Maori to bow to the Government and its policies. As part

---

83 *Hawke’s Bay Times*, 23 February 1863, p.2.
84 Rewi Maniapoto (c.1807?-1894) had protected John Morgan for two decades, but was also a prominent leader of the Kingitanga and had fought in Taranaki in 1860-61. His experience there convinced him that Pakeha were determined to crush Maori sovereignty and he was a famous and prominent leader of Ngati Maniapoto in the ensuing Waikato war.
85 John Gorst (1835-1916). On inheriting a considerable sum, Gorst emigrated to New Zealand in 1860 and was soon involved in colonial affairs as a government school inspector (1861), and subsequently as the resident magistrate for the Waikato (1862-63). During this period he lived with John Morgan and published the newspaper as a counter to the Kingite *Te Hokioi*. Gorst saw the lack of law and order as lying at the root of the Waikato affair - and although understanding Kingitanga concerns, came to believe war was the only option.
of the rise in tension, the government forces at Tataraimaka were warned on 1 April that they would be attacked if the Government failed to release its claim to the Waitara. Rewi Maniopoto also strode further to centre stage with a call for Taranaki Maori to kill the local Europeans. By 4 May, tensions had reached a point whereby Maori attacked and killed soldiers near Tataraimaka, which drew a British response on 4 June. The colony was again at war. Prior to this there had been the hope that if Maori could agree to the Government’s terms then conflict might be averted. Now, however, the general feeling was that Maori were exhibiting a stubborn unwillingness to submit to British authority. This being so, it was argued that they were wholly responsible for the outbreak of conflict - and for any eventualities. The Otago Daily Times (it must be said, from a safe distance) reiterated such a line:

The most rabid of the philo-Maori party cannot this time accuse the Colonial Ministry with precipitating hostilities; even the martyr-worshipping clerical party must submit to direct its sympathy towards its countrymen and co-religionists.

In July 1863, Grey decided to act decisively, forcing the Kingites to respond by ordering, on 9 July, all Waikato Maori to surrender their arms and swear an oath of loyalty to the Queen - or to retreat south of the Waikato river. On 12 July, the northern border of Kingite territory, the Mangatawhiri stream, was crossed by General Cameron. War was now inevitable, and though the first conflict soon occurred, (the

---

86 Hadfield of course dissented, writing to the Wanganui missionary, Richard Taylor: “I find difficult (sic) to decide which are the more unreasonable the Pakehas or the Maoris. - Fancy Grey and Bell taking troops to Tatiainaka (sic) and then not being prepared for hostilities! I shall soon cease to take an interest in what goes on.” R. Taylor, Correspondence 1827-1877, 1927, 1952 (MS-Papers -0076) (MS-Copy-Micro-0191) 1June 1863, pp2-3, Letter from Hadfield. Archives & Manuscripts, A.T. L.

87 Otago Daily Times, 18 May 1863, p4.
British defeating Maori at Koheroa) it took three and a half months for the troops to decide to move south.

The Waikato campaign was widely viewed as being of a different nature, aim and focus than that of the first Taranaki war. The common belief was that the issue was now one of sovereignty - was there to be room and allowance for double allegiance or not? Even Selwyn appeared to have accepted the imperialist rhetoric, with the *Nelson Examiner* reporting that he had preached sermons declaring the war to be “inevitable and justifiable”. Part of his response, (along with that of many clergy) was to become involved as a military chaplain to the British forces. As the *Times* of London had stated (and which had been reproduced in the New Zealand press):

> If the clerical advisers of the Maories cannot induce them to repent of their resolution they must be delivered over to the secular arm.

That Selwyn and other clergy chose to become military chaplains, thereby tacitly supporting the imperialist endeavour, underlines this claim. Their opposition to the earlier Taranaki campaign had been on the grounds that justice and land rights had been trampled upon. Now however, the issue was seen to be one of sovereignty. Ironically, John Morgan had long viewed both situations as essentially questions of sovereignty and so had chosen to act in a manner supportive of British sovereignty.

---

88 *Southern Monthly Magazine* declared in September 1863 that it was now “a war for the sovereignty of New Zealand.”(p.368).
89 *Nelson Examiner*, 18 July 1863, p.2. Warren Limbrick notes of Selwyn that he realized the King Movement was actually concerned with the rejection, and not the embracing, of amalgamation. W. E. Limbrick, ed., *Bishop Selwyn in New Zealand 1841-1868*, p.106.
90 *New Zealand Advertiser*, 29 December 1863, p.4.
However, as both he and Maori discovered, to challenge the established authority had serious consequences.

Yet outside the areas of immediate conflict, and especially in the South Island, there appeared to be some confusion as to what was occurring - and why. The *Otago Daily Times* called the “war policy” of the Government a “most profound mystery”. It also attacked the northern papers for pursuing a line that suggested acquisition and extermination were the aim - rather than establishing “the queen’s authority”. For the southern settlers were looking northwards with increasing financial disfavour and weariness - and an increasing intolerance for both the war and ‘North Island attitudes’.

The *Canterbury Standard* being prepared to state

> We are not ashamed to say that we have a great deal of sympathy with the maoris, and we are not prepared to endorse the silly ravings, or worse, of the Auckland papers. We can feel for a people who fancy they are fighting for what is just and right, and have shown such indomitable courage in the face of a superior force.

In the North Island however, the feeling remained strongly ‘pro-war’. Even the clergy support continued unabated. In turn this appears to have resulted in an improved

---

91 *Otago Daily Times*, 22 October 1863, p4. Editorial. The editor was Julius Vogel (1835-1899), who arrived in New Zealand in 1861 after almost a decade’s involvement in mercantile and journalistic life in Victoria, Australia. In Dunedin he helped establish both the *Otago Daily Times* and the *Otago Witness*. He later founded, owned and/or edited a number of other newspapers in the colony. A strong proponent of both Otago and South Island rights, he opposed the northern wars as a drain on the colony’s resources. Involved in both Provincial and national politics, he became a M.H.R from 1863-67, and again from 1884-89. He also twice achieved the office of Premier, firstly from 1873-75, and then in 1876.

92 *Canterbury Standard*, 5 January 1864, p4. The editorial (written by Joseph Brittan [1805-67] who was also a provincial councilor) continues on to state that there have been acts of Maori heroism to admire, that the Europeans have failed to act as well as they could have, and importantly, that the “rebellion” resulted, in large part, from past policy.
relationship with both the military\textsuperscript{93} and fourth estate. The \textit{New Zealand Herald} mentioning and praising “the ministers of all denominations” who were military chaplains, especially in their devotion to duty.\textsuperscript{94} Yet things did not run totally smoothly for the chaplains. Selwyn upset the troops at camp Te Rore by sermonizing the troops about their swearing and drinking - which, he said, made them worse than Maori. This prompted one of his audience to pen a letter of complaint to the \textit{Daily Southern Cross}, repeating a persistent critique that it was the missionary who brought the trader and the soldier to New Zealand in their wake, yet hypocritically condemned them, “forgetting” that they had brought them there. While the soldier is not without sympathy for Maori, viewing them as “an ill-fated race possessed of many good points”, he mentions a common complaint of the time: that an “Englishman’s character” has yet again been attacked, so “elevating Maori character on false grounds”.\textsuperscript{95}

There was still an underlying wariness, if not suspicion, of missionary motives. From the viewpoint of many settlers and soldiers, missionaries had failed to appreciate the difference between European and Maori. While willing to admit that Maori had many fine qualities, they refused (in the main) to believe that they (indeed anyone) were the equal of an Englishman. That the Bishop could state that British morals were lower than those of savage Maori only served to further demean missionary standing and opinion in the eyes of many Europeans. As conflict increased in 1864, ‘Church Party’-

\textsuperscript{93} John Lloyd \textquote[1810-1875], at this time vicar at St. Paul’s in Auckland and a military chaplain, wrote to a friend that: “All of them (the soldiers) so far as I could judge, seemed glad of the ministrations of a clergyman, and I hope some good was done amongst them.” J. F. Lloyd, 5 January 1864, “To Allen”. Correspondence 1849-1890 (MS-Papers-1786), Archives & Manuscripts, A.T. L.

\textsuperscript{94} \textit{New Zealand Herald} (Auckland), 7 January 1864, p.7, “Report from Wairoa”. This especially commends chaplains who “ride as far as a hundred miles a-week”.

\textsuperscript{95}
settler relations returned to their previous state. It was gleefully reported that Maori were now somewhat wary of the missionaries, such as the experience of Archdeacon Maunsell\(^9^6\) who found that Maori at the Waikato Heads refused to listen to his sermons or undertake work for him. This was described as “retributive justice” because Maunsell “discountenanced (not overcautiously either) white men coming about the place”.\(^9^7\) It was suggested that Maunsell had been taught what settler “already knew” - that Maori were not as good, nor Europeans as bad as had been represented by the ‘Church Party’ in the past.

Anti-missionary sentiment was on the rise again, with a common accusation being that the ‘Church Party’ had thwarted the Government in the first Taranaki war and were determined to do so yet again. This they were attempting, it was alleged, by their letters and influence which had made the British Government and public suspicious of the aims of the New Zealand settlers. In response, the old accusations of missionary avarice and desire for political gain were raised.\(^9^8\) The *Canterbury Standard*, previously quick to sympathize with Maori, was roused to attack missionary interference (especially that directed from Britain) in a statement representative of much settler opinion:

> Do they fancy that when we leave our native land we leave behind all the wisdom and

\(^{95}\) *Daily Southern Cross*, 8 February 1864, p.3. “A Word to the Bishop”, Letter.

\(^{96}\) Robert Maunsell (1810-1894), a CMS missionary in New Zealand since 1835 had supported Wiremu Kingi, and the Maori King, but fearing an attack on Auckland, had supported the Waikato campaign.

\(^{97}\) *Daily Southern Cross*, 11 February 1864, p.3. “Report from Waikato Heads”.

\(^{98}\) For example, the *Daily Southern Cross* spoke of the difficulties of separating “the mere ambition of ruling from the fear of seeing European vices spreading amongst... (Maori)”. *Daily Southern Cross*, 20 February, 1864, p.3.
humanity of the world? Do they imagine that in this distant land we are deaf to the claims of justice, and blind to our truest instincts?99

Likewise, Elizabeth Muter (admittedly the wife of a British Officer) was scathing of the opinions on New Zealand held in Britain. These, she stated, were derived from Exeter Hall:

Among them there is the strong impression that the spirit of contention in New Zealand has been raised by the grasping nature of the colonists, partly to secure to the struggling community a large expenditure from the Imperial treasury, and partly from the covetous wish to obtain the lands of the aborigines.100

The Southern Monthly Magazine noted that the fact that the British Government had raised taxes in Britain to pay for its New Zealand campaigns had done little to raise the opinion of settlers ‘at home’:

It may be natural that a view which represents the colonists of New Zealand as an avaricious, unprincipled race, who have picked a quarrel with the unoffending natives in order to become possessed of their land, should be somewhat popular just now...101

By the end of 1864 the Waikato campaign had ground to a halt, partly because the Imperial Government was loathe to issue more funds, but also because, as Belich states, the military were unable to destroy the Kingitanga.102 They were unable to

99 Canterbury Standard, 16 August, 1864, p.2.
100 Mrs Muter, Travels and Adventures of an Officer’s wife in India, China and New Zealand, vol.2. pp.277-78.
deliver a decisive blow against Maori Pa and this meant that while the Government
confiscated one million acres of Maori land, they were unable to overthrow and defeat
the King Movement, which retreated further back into what became known as the
King Country.

Unable to crush the Kingitanga, Grey ordered General Cameron to commence a
campaign in the Wanganui in early January 1865. This was directed against the South
Taranaki Maori who were considered to hold dangerous notions of independence.
Outbreaks of fighting had occurred in both Taranaki and Wanganui, which, in
European eyes, were the result of the rise of the Pai Marire (The Good and the
Peaceful). It is important to consider this indigenous response to the influences of
European culture, religion and settlement for it was to play a decisive part in
underlining the change of heart most of the ‘Church Party’ underwent in the mid-
1860s.

Pai Marire (or Hau Hau\(^3\)) was a religious movement initiated by the prophet Te Ua
Haumene (?-1866) of the Taranaki tribe. Captured and enslaved by Waikato raiders in
the mid-1820s, he was introduced by them to the newly arrived Christianity. In 1834
he was baptised by John Whiteley at Kawhia, and on returning some six years later to
Taranaki, served on a mission station. His association with the Taranaki “Land
League” (as Pakeha called those Maori opposed to selling land), and the effects of the
Waitara purchase drew him into Kingitanga, where he fought against the British in
Taranaki, and also acted as a chaplain to the Kingitanga troops. As with many
Christians living in times of conflict and rapid change, the apocalyptic, millenarian
prose of the *Book of Revelation* began to hold great appeal. This was also linked into a popular belief that there was a relationship between the Judeo-Christian God and Maori, echoing that of the Jews, and in which Maori land was ‘Israel’. For, just as the Jews had been restored to their land after the Babylonian exile, so too would Maori; this to be accomplished by Atua Marire (the God of Peace) as outlined to Te Ua by the Archangel Gabriel.

The catalyst proved to be the wrecking of the steamer *Lord Worsley* on the Taranaki coast in September 1862. While many local Maori argued that they should plunder the ship, Te Ua opposed such a move. When his stance was rejected, he fell ill and began to experience the visions of Gabriel and the millenarian apocalypse found in the *Book of Revelations*. What arose was a contextualized Pentecostalism, a local variant of that form of Christianity looking back to the glossolalia (‘speaking in tongues’) and charismata (‘the Gifts of the Spirit’) as outlined in the Bible in Acts 1-2. Yet there was a very strong identification with the biblical Jews, with worship often on the Jewish Sabbath, and his followers called the Tiu (Jews). It was a contextualized religion for it rejected “English” Christianity, which was declared to be false, with its scriptures to be burnt and its Sunday to be no longer regarded as the Sabbath. Guidance was to be gained from the Archangels Gabriel and Michael, in what was a theology of both “peace and deliverance”\(^{104}\) aimed at recovering lost land and mana. Te Ua preached that angels would descend from heaven to help expel the Europeans. Then when all Maori were converted to the new faith, there would be the granting of the gift of

---

103 Hau Hau is a reference to the spirit of God in the winds carrying prophecy throughout the land.
tongues, the revealing of the secrets of European knowledge, and the curing of all
disease and the gaining of those aspects of European culture they desired.

As part of their claimed link back to a Jewish identity, Pai Marire concentrated their
religious devotion upon the Pentateuch and the Psalms of the Old Testament, ignoring
most of the New Testament except for the Book of Revelations. Hadfield, for one, was
strongly dismissive of the new religion. In April 1865 he wrote to his brother:

The fanatics call themselves Jews. Some foolish people, without least ground for their opinion,
have given out that Maoris are part of the ten tribes. Some designing fellows have caught this
notion as a reason for repudiating Christianity.\(^\text{105}\)

Pai Marire became infamous in the settler community when, in April 1864, a party of
soldiers had been ambushed in Taranaki. While it was claimed by Maori that this was a
legitimate defence against an incursion to destroy their crops,\(^\text{106}\) it was the decapitation
and preservation of the head of Captain Thomas Lloyd that outraged the settlers.\(^\text{107}\)
This head was believed to possess prophetical powers and was to be circulated
amongst Maori to unite the tribes against the Europeans.

Te Ua still stressed that his was a peaceable religion, and it appears that he won over
the second Maori King, Matutaera to his creed, reportedly baptising him Tawhiao in

\(^{105}\) O. Hadfield, *Letters*, 4 April 1865, p.2: “To Charles”.


\(^{107}\) Paul Clark refers to this as “a studied insult that symbolized spiritual conquest by the
Victor”(p.13); and “It may have symbolized the conquest and acquisition of the power, material
and spiritual” that Lloyd, as a European, represented (p.84). P. Clark, *Hau Hau*. *The Pai Marire
This resulted in calls being sent out to Kingitanga for the fighting to stop in preparation of a millenarian deliverance. This linking of a new religion with the existing Kingitanga only served to harden settler suspicion and alarm; with the Taranaki Herald stating:

This is the secret of Pai Marire, that it removes the restrictions on free action imposed by Christianity, and gives a divine sanction to whatever they may choose to do.\(^{109}\)

Likewise, opinion back in Britain was hardly enthusiastic, with the Times (London) stating of Maori:

They have picked out from the Bible a religion, a morality, and a political system as grotesque as that of the Taepings (sic), and as convenient for their purposes.\(^{110}\)

The tragedy for Pai Marire occurred in March 1865 with the murder of Rev. C. S. Volkner at Opotiki by emissaries sent on a mission of peace to Gisborne by Te Ua. That this journey took on militant tones, instigating and inciting action against Europeans, and especially missionaries, culminating in the ‘Volkner incident’, tended to unite Europeans in opposition to Maori land claims and associated action. ‘Hau Hau’ became a byword for ‘fanaticism’ in the European press.

\(^{108}\) Tawhiao (?-1894) was son of the first Maori King, Potatau Te Wherowhero. A Christian, he became King in 1860 and reigned until his death. Also a prophet, in 1875 he adopted his own version of Pai Marire - Tario (Morning Star).

\(^{109}\) Taranaki Herald, 8 April, 1865, p.2. Editorial, “Pai Marire”.

\(^{110}\) Times (London), 16 December 1864; reprinted in the New Zealand Advertiser, 23 February 1865, p.4. The ‘Taepings’ is a reference to the Chinese movement, T’ai-ping (‘great peace’ or ‘great equity’) which was in rebellion against the ruling Manchu dynasty at this time (1850-1865). It combined Chinese traditions with Protestant Christianity and included a divine sanction in that the leader, Hung Hsiu-Chuan, believed himself to be the younger brother of Jesus Christ.
There are two major figures involved in the incident - C. S. Volkner and Kereopa Te Rau. Volkner (1819-1865) was originally sent to work in New Zealand in 1849 by the North German Missionary Society. After working with the missionary Riemenschneider in Taranaki, he began work for the CMS in 1852. Becoming an Anglican deacon in 1860, he was ordained a priest and sent to the CMS Opotiki station in 1861. The local Whakatohea Maori (Te Whakatohea) had remained peaceful through both the Taranaki and Waikato wars, but this did not stop Volkner acting as a Government spy in the area. As part of these duties, Volkner had accused the local Roman Catholic priest, Father Garavel (see footnote 66) of being the messenger of hostile letters from Waikato to Opotiki - which resulted in Garavel’s recall to Auckland by the Governor. Adding to the tension this engendered (Te Whakatohea considered Volkner had betrayed their trust and hospitality), issues of local tribal rivalry and power-politics, especially against the Arawa, arose. Disease and local economic decline only increased tensions in the area, into which arrived Kereopa Te Rau and the Pai Marire party in February 1865.

Kereopa (?-1872) was one of the original disciples of Te Ua, a Christian and a Kingitanga warrior. In February 1864 he had lost his wife and two daughters and his sister on successive days in action against the British forces. That Selwyn had been present at these battles at Rangiaowhia appears to have instigated a bitterness against missionaries in Kereopa. For although Te Ua’s instructions had been to proceed peacefully, Kereopa had twice already demanded that Pakeha (including a Catholic priest at Whakatane) be handed over to him.
Meanwhile, Te Whakatohea at Opotiki, on (false) reports that father Garavel had been hanged in Auckland, warned Volkner (who was visiting Auckland) not to return. Contrary to common contemporary opinion, Kereopa does not appear to have instigated the murder of Volkner; rather it was a Te Whakatohea decision - which he went along with once underway. Volkner returned by sea, accompanied by another CMS missionary, T. S. Grace. Warned not to land by Te Whakatohea on pain of death, they ignored the realities of the situation and landed. Volkner was captured and hanged from a tree. While this would have outraged settler opinion, it was the action of Kereopa (who had agreed to the killing but was not involved in the hanging) in swallowing the eyeballs of the decapitated head that really served to provoke Pakeha hostility. In this act, Kereopa had reportedly named one eyeball “Parliament” and the other “the Queen and British law”. This was a symbolic act of insult to a defeated enemy, yet only served, in Pakeha perception, to further expose the fanaticism of the Pai Marire.

The following day, Volkner was posthumously tried, with the three charges being that he had been a spy for the Government (correct); that because he had a cross in his house he was a Catholic deceiver (incorrect); and, that he had ignored instructions to stay away (correct). The role of Pai Marire in this incident is, Clark argues, that of providing an underlying religious justification for what was a local Te Whakatohea decision. Just as Volkner was in the wrong place at the wrong time, so it proved for Te Ua’s religion. If his Pai Marire party had not been at Opotiki at this particular time then perhaps the extreme vilification that his religion subsequently underwent in European eyes would not have occurred.

What did occur was the spreading of the news of Volkner's death to the main centres within a week, reports greatly added to with the escape from Opotiki of T. S. Grace on HMS Eclipse, under Captain Levy on 16 March. The Pakeha colony was horrified and the press did all it could both to express outrage and provide lurid details (often the result of hyperactive imaginations) of the incident. Volkner was eulogized as "one of the best friends the Maoris ever had", especially because "His teaching to them was that it was their inevitable destiny to submit, and that, however successful they may be for a time, resistance would ultimately lead to their discomfiture."\textsuperscript{112}

It is interesting to compare the responses of the two strongly opposed Pakeha camps to this incident. From the settler viewpoint, Robert Creighton\textsuperscript{113}, editorialized in the Daily Southern Cross that the rise of the Pai Marire signaled the end of civilization. It was a "delusion...opposed to Christianity, and to purity and morality of life..." and, even worse:

\begin{quote}
The lives of the colonists have been trifled with; and the enemies of God, the Queen, and white men - the open and declared foes of civilization and morality - have been allowed to do just what they please.\textsuperscript{114}
\end{quote}

A more complete description of otherness from a settler viewpoint could not be articulated. The 'holy trinity' of 'God, Queen and Race' had been challenged, and the familiar cry of "the barbarians are at the gate" issued in response. Such a line was followed in an article reprinted from the Melbourne Argus. This claimed:

\textsuperscript{112} Daily Southern Cross, 9 March 1865, p.2. 
\textsuperscript{113} Robert Creighton (1835-1893) had been a journalist in Ireland before arriving in Auckland in 1861. He ventured into the Waikato war as a correspondent, with his work being copied by the
The new religion is the blood-written protest of savagedom against civilization... (and)... the dark heart remained all the while heating under the whitened exterior, and, on the first occasion, the tiger revealed itself.\textsuperscript{115}

Hadfield meanwhile, whilst opposed to the actions of the Pai Marire, looked to blame the Government's action as root cause:

I have always anticipated some such result from this unjust war; the faith of many in Christianity has been destroyed by means of a Government professing it in the manner it has.\textsuperscript{116}

He also saw it as part of a wider theological controversy, as part of the contemporary challenge to, and attacks upon Christianity. As he wrote to his sister:

... every attempt has been made that is possible to set maoris against missionaries and religion. Would you believe that in such a place as this an englishman has been endeavouring to retail to the maoris the blasphemies of that miserable heretic Colenso! What object can people have? Is this not the work of the devil?\textsuperscript{117}

The Presbyterians at Wanganui were inclined to think so. At a "Presbyterian Tea Meeting", the minister, Rev. Mr. Allsworth attacked the "foes within" the church:

\textit{Times} (London).
\textsuperscript{114} \textit{Daily Southern Cross}, 24 March 1865, p.4. Editorial.
\textsuperscript{115} \textit{New Zealand Advertiser}, 30 May 1865, p.4. Reprint from "The Missionaries" in the \textit{Melbourne Argus}. This exposes the double condemnation that firstly, 'Christianity whitens the savage', and secondly, that 'savages are akin to savage brutes'.
First the neology of Germany, then the carpings of Colenso, and lastly, the subtle and insinuating scepticism of Renan, which affected the moral system as a deadly poison.\textsuperscript{118}

In New Zealand, for the settler, Hadfield continued to hold a similar place in their affections as Renan and Colenso did in his. The \textit{New Zealand Herald} continued the campaign against him, claiming he was prospering financially from his mission and farm at Opotiki.\textsuperscript{119} In so doing, the newspaper repeated those opinions that had dogged the missionaries from their first days in New Zealand:

\begin{quote}
We believe that with few exceptions, Bishop Selwyn for one, the whole meaning of the attempt by the Philo-Maori party in the colony to keep the natives apart from the Europeans, is to secure for themselves a monopoly of the worldly goods to be enjoyed in these districts - princely estates for them and their families.\textsuperscript{120}
\end{quote}

Little had therefore changed. Missionaries were still viewed with suspicion and distrust by the settlers, despite moves by many to work along-side the Government forces. As Archdeacon Brown\textsuperscript{121} noted ironically: “My journal looks more like that of an army chaplain than that of a missionary to the heathen”.\textsuperscript{122} To many Maori, such action merely underscored the difference between both religious and secular Europeans and themselves. The confiscation of land and the belief that missionary clergy were

\begin{flushendnotes}
\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{116}] O. Hadfield, 4 April 1865, p.4. “To Charles”, Transcripts of Letters 1862-1872 (91-316), Archives & Manuscripts, A.T. L.
\item[\textsuperscript{117}] O. Hadfield, 5 April 1865, p.4. “To Amelia”, Ibid.
\item[\textsuperscript{118}] \textit{Wanganui Chronicle}, 1 April 1865, p.2. The ‘neology’ of Germany was the rise of new and rationalistic theology there; while Renan’s \textit{Life of Jesus} (1863) did away with the supernatural and moral aspects of Jesus’ life as presented in the New Testament, instead concentrating on him as a purely human Galilean preacher.
\item[\textsuperscript{119}] It complained that Hadfield had 60 milch cows and earned 40 pounds a week from sending butter to Wellington. \textit{New Zealand Herald}, 20 March, 1865, p.4.
\item[\textsuperscript{120}] Ibid., p.4.
\item[\textsuperscript{121}] Alfred Brown (1803-1884) arrived in New Zealand as a CMS missionary in 1829. He served in the Bay of Islands, Waikato and Tauranga, serving as clerical support to the British troops from 1864.
\end{itemize}
\end{flushendnotes}
Government agents resulted in a decline in both missionary congregations and influence. To many missionaries it was evidence that they had been correct in their attempts, from the beginnings of the colony, to oppose the growth of European settlement. As Robert Burrows, who had ministered for the CMS in New Zealand since 1840 reported to his parent body:

The native pastor has become much more acceptable to all classes of the natives than we are. The cause is obvious: we are included in the suspicion and jealousy which exists in the native mind, in reference to the motives and intentions of the white man; and we are sometimes told by them, that as we were the pioneers of the colonists, we are chargeable with the evils that have come upon them.

This concludes our background narrative, for while conflict with Maori would continue, the main issues of settler-missionary conflict had been raised in this period and, if not settled, then at least articulated. Yet to take this chapter as the representative opinion on these issues is to do all participants a grave disservice. What is required is the recognition of the need for a more nuanced examination of the period and the opinions being voiced. For the issues are complex and need to be examined from differing perspectives. With this in mind this chapter has sought to provide a consensual background against which alternative readings of the period can be raised. Yet before representative opinions from ‘Church’ and ‘Settler’ can be examined, we must first turn to examine two crucial elements for understanding this period and these

---

123 Robert Burrows (1812-1897) was a CMS missionary in the Bay of Islands and was a military chaplain during the Northern wars (1845-46). From the mid-1850s until 1896 he was local Secretary of the CMS in New Zealand.
issues: the background of the role and position of Christianity in colonial New Zealand up to 1860; and the role of the newspapers in creating and presenting public opinion in the settler society. It is only once we have gained a knowledge of these two elements crucial for the ‘church-state’ debate that we can turn to critique the competing and diverse opinions of the period.
The perceptions underlining what can be called the 'competing narrative' of the churches in New Zealand are neatly summarized by Anthony Grant¹ (at this stage Vicar of Romford) who, lecturing before Oxford University in 1843, expressed the missionary motive thus:

...the Church must extend herself with the extension of our Empire, even to protect our country from becoming a curse to the pagan world, even, also, to save our countrymen from leaping into a state of apostate infidelity, more fatal than pagan darkness. The duty is no longer one of option, but of necessity, simply to check a national sin, and to preserve ourselves.²

Such a vision resulted in a dual focus for the churches in the New Zealand situation: on the one hand becoming the mediators between Government and Maori; and on the other becoming mediators (and critics) of Government policy and settler opinion. It must be stressed that not all church groupings were in favour of opposing the State, or even questioning its 'Maori policy'. Those most strongly allied to the settlers and their interests, primarily the Wesleyans, the Presbyterians and other non-conformists, tended to prefer not to criticize the State in the years 1860-1865. Their focus (and loyalty) was primarily directed at and amongst the settler community, those whose primary interest was in the acquisition of land and capital. Therefore, within the general 'Church' narrative, there are two differing strands; those missionaries and their

¹ Anthony Grant (1806-83), Fellow of New College, Oxford, combined pastoral duties (Canon of Rochester from 1860, and chaplain to the Bishop of St. Albans in 1877) with sermonizing on a wide variety of topical questions. He was twice select preacher at Oxford, and his 1843 Bampton Lectures had a wide impact on the concept of mission.
² A. Grant, The Past and Prospective Extension of the Gospel by Missions to the Heathens considered in Eight Lectures delivered before the University of Oxford 1843 (London: J.G. F. &
supporters known as the ‘Church Party’, and those Pakeha clergy and laity who were often in opposition to them. Both sides have been marginalized in the subsequent historiography. While the ‘Church Party’ have achieved some degree of post-1860 support because their opposition to the government, those clergy who supported the government have been effectively ‘written out’ or dismissed as inconsequential. In an interesting and somewhat ironic twist, those clergy who were vilified and castigated as traitors at the time have been somewhat reconciled into the ‘accepted narrative’, while those who received public and government support for their loyalty in the 1860s tend to have been conveniently marginalized in latter accounts.

To complicate the matter, a clerical narrative must often be sourced from allusion and reference. In many situations it is a case of ‘reading between the lines’, especially when Arcdeacon Hadfield is involved. Hadfield is a man who inspired strong passions and opinions, and, as his letters and pamphlets disclose, was more than capable of promoting his particular view of the war in both New Zealand and in Britain. Further more, the ‘Church Party’ although influential and capable of outraging settler and Government opinion, appears to have existed more in the abstract than as a real entity. Of course there was a body of primarily Church of England clergy and laity who were opposed to the Government and settler conduct in the wars of the 1860s, yet to call it a ‘Party’ is to overstate its cohesion and operations. In many cases it appears to be primarily a label applied by the press to Hadfield’s actions and writings, and the support given by Selwyn, Abraham and Martin. These gentlemen were also at times the

---

1 J. Rivington, 1844), Preface, p.xvi. Part of the 1843 Bampton Lectures.
2 An editorial from the Nelson Examiner 1 May 1861 refers to Selwyn, Hadfield “and their friends” as “a distinct and influential party in political warfare” and refers to their issuing of manifestos, their publishing in newspapers and the writing of “long and argumentative letters on the policy of Government to English Secretarys of State.” p.2.
leading figures, yet none of them were ever viewed or abused to the degree of exasperated opprobrium that Hadfield created and experienced.

The depth and degree of this response from the settlers has tended to be conveniently excluded from subsequent narratives. One possible reason is that the majority of it lies within the pages of the colonial newspapers which have been a much underutilized and under-examined source. While this chapter will present a clerical narrative, it is the subsequent chapter that will provide, in some depth, an examination of this anti-‘Church Party’ sentiment. In many ways this is another background narrative for while the Church has been adroit at forwarding its particular version of the events of the 1860s, the popular discourse of the settlers is distinctly under-represented. This is the result of not only a secular bias amongst historians, but also a wariness of engaging with the popular press for fears that it would be unrepresentative. Yet, I argue that it is the press that not only created the notion of an organized ‘Church Party’ but kept it in the public consciousness even in times of (relative) peace and inaction. This is the lost and excluded narrative of the New Zealand Wars. However, before this situation can be examined, another layer of the complicated context of the time must be examined. This is why we now turn to a (admittedly) somewhat general ‘Church narrative’. For it is only when this is in place that we can begin to investigate the settler response.
James Buller⁴, Wesleyan Missionary and clergyman, stated in 1857 that as a
“Christian minister he felt it his duty not to intermeddle with party or local politics…”⁵
He also later expressed the common sentiment that colonization was “one of the means
which God uses for the peopling of the earth”, and as Maori could not have made use
of the territory by themselves, therefore “colonization was the logical sequence for
their Christianization”.⁷ This was representative of the non-‘Church Party’ clergy in
New Zealand. As well as being clergymen they were also (primarily)⁸ British subjects
and viewed this as entailing responsibilities and loyalties to the Crown and its
endeavours. As stated, much of their enterprise was concentrated amongst the
scattered settler communities and so felt pastoral, racial and cultural ties to their
parishes, and British settlers and Government in general. For these clergy, the
expansion of settlement throughout the country would result in increased (British)
population and the spread of civilization. This would in turn offer new opportunities
for the expansion of their denominations.

The CMS missionaries however tended to be rather wary of large-scale European
settlement - and the aims of the Government. Governor Grey’s “Blood and Treasure”
despacht of 1847, attacking missionary (CMS) acquisition of Maori land had provoked
an uproar and left a legacy of missionary suspicion of the Government - and vice-versa.
This had arisen out of New Zealand Company pressure to discredit missionary

---

⁴ James Buller (1812-84) arrived in New Zealand in 1836. He was involved in both Maori mission
work and in ministering to colonists in Auckland, Wellington, Thames, Christchurch, Timaru
and the West Coast. He was later President of the New Zealand Methodist Conference (1875).
Zealand, The Future England of the Southern Hemisphere.” (Lecture in Wellington, 14 April 1857),
p.419.
⁶ Ibid., p.339.
⁷ Ibid., p.340.
opposition to their plans, which was effective in convincing Governor Grey that he had to make a stand against (alleged) missionary land-holding. Selwyn, at this time attempting to establish episcopal control over reluctant (often evangelically-inclined) missionaries, also attempted to limit missionary land-holdings. What resulted was the dismissal of Henry Williams, James Kemp, and George Clarke by the London CMS, which instilled and confirmed a notion in settler popular thought that the missionaries were primarily interested in personal gain. Although there is an element of 'truth' in this claim (they did after all gain rather large holdings - even if only 'to support their families'), it was rather a convenient 'stick' with which to beat missionary opposition to large-scale European settlement. Throughout the period of the 1860s wars, the claims of clerical avarice (dating from this period) were constantly raised as an attempted method of 'blanket' discrediting of the missionary position. Thus the attacks of the 1860s had their roots in earlier settler suspicion of missionary intentions and fears of an undisclosed missionary plan to establish a theocracy continue to appear throughout the 1860s.

8 Of course there were German missionaries and clergy in New Zealand, not to mention the French Catholic missionaries. However their opinions tended to be in support of the settlers and government, while evidencing pastoral support for Maori.
9 Henry Williams (1792-1867), had by 1815 achieved the rank of Lieutenant in the Royal Navy during the Napoleonic Wars. Ordained a CMS missionary in 1823, he arrived in New Zealand that same year at the Bay of Islands mission station that had failed to convert a single Maori in the past decade. He reorganized the mission away from Marsden's 'civilizing' focus and, by the late 1820s, was involved in peacemaking between Maori. Heavily involved in the Treaty of Waitangi, it was his purchasing of Maori land to support his family that was his undoing. He was reinstated to the CMS in 1854.
10 James Kemp (1797-1872), arrived with his wife in New Zealand in 1819 as CMS missionaries, where they helped found the second CMS station at Kerikeri. James was preacher, smith, and store-keeper for the CMS.
11 George Clarke (1798-1875), arrived in New Zealand in 1824 as a lay CMS missionary and catechist. In 1840 he became Chief protector of Aborigines which put him at odds with New Zealand Company aims and ambitions. He lost this position under Grey, and after his CMS dismissal was involved in Provincial politics and was a Judge of the Native Lands Court.
12 During this time the term 'missionary' became a rather all-inclusive term with which to attack and label those clergy opposed to settler and Government plans and desires. The 'Church Party' was also the 'Missionary Party' in popular discourse, while the term 'missionary' also became rather abstract.
We take up our narrative in 1860. The Government have decided to accept Teira’s offer to sell the Waitara, and the survey party have proceeded onto the disputed land. The seriousness of the situation was not lost on the local Wesleyan missionary, John Whiteley who wrote in his journal of the survey that

This is a decisive step and viewed in connection with the past career of Wiremu Kingi and the probable results which may arise from it, it appears to be in every respect retributive and solemn. May God interpose and save the people.

Subsequent events showed God rather inclined towards inaction.

Whiteley believed that Teira’s claim to the land was valid, that Kingi did not own the Waitara, but rather, having returned from the Kapiti coast, was only a squatter. He was also part of that school of mission who saw the only future for Maori as involving their acceptance of individual title. This meant that Maori were to sell land to the Government, and then buy it back as individual titles. Whiteley believed that this would instigate a move for Maori to adopt a lifestyle similar to that of the English village, involving small farming. It would also facilitate land for the settlers. The expansion of colonial settlement was to be viewed as a boon and not a hindrance for Maori. In this he represented the majority opinion of non-‘Church Party’ clergy. While sympathetic

in its usage. It could, in many cases, refer to any clergyman (real or imagined) who represented opinions at variance with whoever was commenting on the situation.

13 John Whiteley (1806-1869) was ordained into the Wesleyan ministry in 1832, thence sailing for New Zealand, undertaking mission work in the Hokianga, Kawhia, and from 1856, in Taranaki. His knowledge of Maori resulted in him being used by the Government as a translator and adviser. He had opposed moves in 1846 to view all unoccupied Maori land as Crown land, but by the 1860s viewed the Waitara affair as rebellion against the Crown and supported the settlers. In 1869, having been warned not to proceed to Pukearuhe, he was killed by a Ngati-Maniapoto war party.

14 J. Whiteley, 31 January 1860, Journal of the Rev John Whiteley, Missionary to New Zealand 1832-1869 (qMS-2212-2213), Archives & Manuscripts, A.T. L.

15 G. Brazendale, Land Sovereignty and the Land Wars of the Nineteenth Century, p.36 passim.
and concerned for Maori, there was a clear sense that it would be ‘in their best interests’ to accept colonial expansion and the associated benefits of British civilization.

Whiteley was to view the impending conflict in religious terms; namely that “God” was ‘watching over and protecting’ the settlers and would thus chastise Kingi, who had to repent (presumably for his claims to the land) and be saved. His excitement would increase as the tension in Taranaki grew, and by mid-March 1860, he was adamant that the situation was an act of divine judgment to draw Maori back into the Christian fold: “God is bringing upon this people a trial that shall test their religion as it has never been tested before. May they be found faithful and may the Divine Spirit direct them in the right way.”

Whiteley was also involved in using his influence in attempting to halt the involvement of the King Movement in the conflict. John Morgan, the CMS missionary at Otawhao, whose vision for Maori was remarkably similar to Whiteley’s, reported that Whiteley had written to Alexander Reid, the Methodist missionary at Te Kopua, requesting him to involve the missionaries in the Waikato in using their influence to prevent “a union” between Taranaki Maori and Kingitanga. Although Morgan was a

16 Ibid., pp.33-34.
17 J. Whiteley, 9 March 1860, Journal: “…the time has gone past for neutrality or vacillation…the greatest question is (sic) Wiremu Kingi right? My conscience says No and I believe God will chastise him. May he repent and be saved.”
19 Alexander Reid (1821-91), originally a Presbyterian, he converted to Methodism and arrived in New Zealand in 1849. In charge of the ‘native teachers’ training institute in Auckland, he took charge of the Te Kopua mission on the Waipa river in 1858. Involved in establishing Maori sheep farming, he supported Maori wishes for self-government. However, he disagreed with opposition to the Queen’s authority and withdrew from the area in 1863. He briefly became a military chaplain, then undertook a wide range of Methodist postings and responsibilities.
CMS missionary, he was by no means a ‘Church Party’ member. He was opposed to Kingi and the Kingitanga, believing that, if fighting did occur, “the Aborigines [must] be humbled, and really feel themselves beaten”; that Maori should make payment in land to cover the expenses of the war and, if the Kingitanga joined the Taranaki conflict, that their land be occupied by Government troops. Underlying this was a belief that

> It is no kindness to the Aborigines to allow them to think that they are able to cope with Europeans...[they] must be made to feel that they are subjects, not rulers, & [sic] the peace of the Colony will not be secure until then. 21

Not surprisingly, such sentiments, being contrary to those forwarded by the CMS and, coupled with his willingness to report on Maori movements to the Government22, led Morgan into conflict with the CMS hierarchy as time progressed.

This points to the heart of the ‘Church-State’ issue. For the Government and settlers, action and opinion such as Morgan’s was the acceptable involvement of the churches in politics, as supporter and aid to the status quo. Yet such a position was regarded as analogous to disobedience by the CMS. For Morgan, and others like him (this included most non-Anglican missionaries), the claims of Empire were as strong as those of the church.23 For, in many minds the two were still closely intertwined to the point where

---

21 C. W. Richmond, 5 March 1860.
22 Ibid., p.532.
23 In the same letter Morgan states his intention, as postmaster at Otawhao, to intercept letters from Kingi to Kingitanga, which he will send to the Post Master General. p.532.
24 The Catholic missionaries, being predominantly French, were viewed with ‘double suspicion’ by both the ‘Church Party’ and the Government. While separated into opposing groups by questions of politics and action, they managed to unite under the twin banners of religious and national bigotry. James Buller (though not a ‘Church Party’ member) stated of the Catholic missionaries:
being a 'good citizen' was basically the same as being a 'good Christian'. Robert Maunsell,²⁴ CMS missionary at Kohanga in the Waikato, was one who felt the tug of dual loyalties. He had been approached by Archdeacon Kissling²⁵ to send in daily reports as to the state of 'Maori affairs' in his district. Whilst refusing "to be employed as a spy by anyone", he still felt Maori should be made aware that "the Pakeha" would meet any attack. Therefore he would send "early notice as duty bound" if he observed any change in Maori opinion.²⁶

Meanwhile, the difference of opinion between Anglican and Methodist as to the 'rights and conduct' of the war were becoming increasingly open and apparent. The Methodist clergy in Wellington decided to 'stay out of politics', but would exert a "moral influence" - seeking the "loyal submission" of Maori to "righteous laws".²⁷ Likewise, Henry Sewell, although an Anglican layman, believed the Government was acting correctly in Taranaki and was pleased to report that Thomas Buddle²⁸ believed "an outbreak was certain" and "could not have been better timed", for it could have occurred "when we [Pakeha] were far less prepared'. This was in response to

²⁴ Robert Maunsell (1810-94), Irish born CMS missionary, active in New Zealand from 1835. Although opposed to the Taranaki war, he was equally opposed to the Maori King, and supportive of the Waikato invasion.
²⁵ George Kissling (1805-65), German-born, Moravian-educated missionary, firstly for the Reformed Lutheran United Church in West Africa and Sierra Leone, then as a CMS missionary in New Zealand from 1842.
²⁸ Thomas Buddle (1812-83), WMS missionary in New Zealand from 1840. From 1844-65 he was head of the Wesleyan Native Institution in Auckland. Opposed to the King Movement, which he saw as a quest for sovereignty, he believed that it would collapse in on itself, and was therefore not an advocate of war. He did however convey information to Governor Grey.
Kissling’s reported statement that it was Gore-Browne’s agreement to buy the Waitara that caused the conflict.  

Such statements and opinions led Mary Martin, prominent Anglican lay woman and ‘Church Party’ member, to privately (and then publicly) castigate the Wesleyans “for all toadyling to a man as they do to the Government”. She was roused by such events as the “Meeting in Aid of the Sufferers at Taranaki”, held in Christchurch on 25 July 1860. Attended by most of the leading citizens of the town, including Bishop Harper, the meeting heard of James Buller’s determination to pursue a middle-ground, for:

...he was not less an Englishman because he was a missionary. He had never allowed an insult against himself or others on behalf of the natives to pass unreproved. Nor did he think it right to do so. It was our duty to weep as well as rejoice with those who rejoice.

In a similar vein was John Whiteley’s earlier response to the murder of two men and two boys at Omata, eleven kilometres from New Plymouth on 27 March 1860. This, decided Whiteley, was the ‘final straw’; he was to abandon his mission house and retreat with his family to New Plymouth. He confided to his journal his reasons for doing so: firstly to let the New Plymouth settlers know that he was “one with them and

---

30 Mary Martin (1817-84), wife of Sir William Martin and daughter of an Anglican clergyman. Arrived with her husband in New Zealand in 1842 as part of Selwyn’s party. She later wrote Our Maoris (1884) as a defence of the ‘ability’ of Maori to be converted to Christianity.
32 Henry Harper (1804-93) had become friendly with Selwyn whilst a Chaplain at Eton. Appointed Bishop of Christchurch in 1856, he consolidated the Anglican presence in Canterbury. He was later involved in the ‘Jenner Controversy’ when the Dunedin synod declined to accept the Anglo-Catholic H. L. Jenner as their bishop (1865-9).
prepared to share their fate”; and secondly, having stood by Maori “in all that is right”, it was now his ‘duty’ “to turn my back upon them - to set my face against them and by every means testify my disapproval and disavowal of their conflict”.34

It is one of the characteristics of this period that opposition to the Government’s policy and pursuit of the war was commonly lumped under a variety of blanket-terms - ‘Church Party’, ‘Missionary Party’ or ‘Exeter Hall Party’. Whatever the nomenclature, in most settler and Government minds it encompassed those who followed the opposition line of Bishop Selwyn and Archdeacon Hadfield. Also prominently involved was the Bishop of Wellington, Charles Abraham, and his wife Caroline.35 They were slightly more tempered in their opposition, never being attacked as Selwyn and Hadfield were. There was a degree of measured reticence on their part, perhaps, as she once hinted, arising out of attempting to control Hadfield’s outbursts: “the Archdeacon [Hadfield] being so vehement that C. J. W.[her husband] has to hold him back”.36 Yet Hadfield was not the only outspoken one. Selwyn was upset with the Governor - and not bothering to hide his sentiments from his clergy. Vicesimus Lush,37 Vicar at the

34 J. Whiteley, 28 March 1860, Journal. There is interesting use of biblical language here; it was common for the ‘God of the Israelites’ to ‘turn his back upon them, to set his face against them’ (i.e. Leviticus 17:10; 20:5). Whiteley appears to be perpetuating (perhaps subconsciously) the commonly repeated ‘belief’ that Maori were some sort of latter-day ‘Israelites’ - and that the missionaries were ‘God-appointed’ prophets, called to both lead and chastise.
35 Charles Abraham (1814-1903), a contemporary as pupil and teacher of Selwyn’s at Eton, he was Principal of St. John’s College, Auckland 1850-53. Consecrated the first Bishop of Wellington in 1858, he was heavily involved in the ‘Church Party’. He later served under Selwyn’s Bishopric in Lichfield and declined a diocesan Bishopric himself because of what he saw as unwarranted interference by Parliament and the Judiciary in the affairs of the church. Caroline Abraham (1809-1877) married Charles in 1850. While her husband was a friend of Selwyn, she was a cousin of Sarah Selwyn, and also, a noted water-colourist.
36 C. H. Abraham, 24 April 1860, pp.3-4, letter, quoted in Extracts of Letters from New Zealand on the War Question. Sarah Selwyn wrote to a friend (included in the same collection) that “The paper’s assertion, that he [Hadfield] is fitted for the cloister rather than the world, is not worded by anyone who really knows that fiery spirit; we never saw him so well as now that he has donned his armour for the Battle.” “To M.A.P.” 30 August 1860, p.26.
37 Vicesimus Lush (1817-82), Cambridge educated, wrote offering his services to Selwyn. Accepted, his family sailed for New Zealand in 1850, where he became Vicar of the Military Pensioner settle-
Howick outpost, called on his Bishop in April 1860 and found “he is very angry with the Governor for bringing about this native war.”

Hadfield had decided that the best way to oppose the Government’s actions - and the Governor- was to appeal directly to British opinion and power. He outlined his position to the CMS:

> I feel so deeply on the subject, and think the Governor’s conduct so disgraceful, that I am prepared to bear any amount of blame in discharging what I consider an imperative duty... I know more on this particular subject than any other person in New Zealand.

What this involved included his open letter to the *Times* (London), addressed to the Colonial Secretary, the Duke of Newcastle. Headed *One of England’s Little Wars*, it asserted that “Colonel Browne has committed an act of injustice in the name of Her Majesty the Queen”. It was an impassioned cry for justice, mixed in with somewhat intemperate abuse of the Governor. The ‘mix’ worked - Hadfield’s work, now in pamphlet form, became something of a ‘cause celebre’ in London - and the object of vilification in New Zealand. The body of opinion located around ‘Exeter Hall’ loudly approved of Hadfield and his publication, with the *Aborigine’s Friend and Colonial Intelligencer* stating in its summary for the year 1860 that Hadfield’s pamphlet

---

ought to be in the hands of every Member of parliament, Minister of the Gospel, and English citizen, who is solicitous for the honour of his country, or desirous of performing his duty in relation to it.\textsuperscript{41}

The general response from the New Zealand press was to accuse him of treachery and treason, with the \textit{New Zealand Advertiser} being especially critical:

\ldots{} like all the efforts made by violent and unscrupulous men, the Archdeacon, in the publication of his pamphlet, has defeated his own object, and shown how dangerous it would be to intrust (sic) men of his stamp with any secular authority.\textsuperscript{42}

This is the heart of the problem for the ‘Church Party’ in New Zealand. Any attempt to become involved in or criticize what were viewed as questions of State was regarded with deep suspicion in New Zealand. The pages of the newspapers throughout the colony were unrelentingly adamant during the 1860s that there were two separate spheres, the religious and the secular, in colonial life. From the settler viewpoint, the role of the clergy was that of spirituality, not politics. There were two elements to this. On the one hand there was a sense of regret that missionaries and clergy were becoming involved in ‘earthly’ issues that they were incapable of properly understanding. This is the argument that clergy were well-meaning but misguided, often, it was insinuated, by the trickery of Maori playing upon missionary sensibilities. The other argument was that missionaries were malicious, greedy, treacherous and desired the expulsion of the settlers so that they could establish a theocracy over Maori. Selwyn was commonly viewed as an exemplar of the first perception, while

\textsuperscript{41} \textit{Aborigine’s Friend and Colonial Intelligencer}, January-December 1860, p.130.
\textsuperscript{42} \textit{New Zealand Advertiser}, 17 November 1860, p.2.
Hadfield was given no such latitude. To the settlers he symbolized all that was potentially difficult and dangerous when a ‘parson became political’. The vehemence aroused by the ‘Church Party’ and by Hadfield in particular is one of the missing narratives in New Zealand history. To read the newspapers of the period is to perceive a secondary conflict within colonial society – and between colonial society and ‘Home’. The ability of the ‘Church Party’ to not only publish their opinions in Britain, but to be seen to have influence there upon ‘Home’ perception of the colony and the colonists, deeply disturbed settlers and Government. Their fear was that their situation and concerns, if not unheard, were being deliberately misrepresented. Caught between the opposing faction was the Governor who wrote to his superiors in London of his perceptions:

You will see by the despatches that the high Episcopal party are not very reasonable in their views and a glance at the newspapers will convince you that the settlers are not more so. I cannot adopt the views of either party and do not therefore expect to find satisfaction but my conscience tells me I am right.43

Yet just as the private correspondence of the Governor reveals a more thoughtful and considered man than either ‘Church Party” or settler opinion would allow, so too was Hadfield a different character to public perception. He wrote privately of his concern for the “good name of Great Britain” and, what is more, his concern for the settlers. For these reasons, he had written to Gore-Browne opposing his policies.44 However

43 T. Gore-Browne, Letterbook 1855-1861. 27 June 1860 (qMS-0284) A.T.L. ‘To Mr Gardner’.
44 O. Hadfield, January 1861. “To Charles”, Transcripts of Letters 1861: “I do not write so much to defend the natives, who are perfectly able to take care of themselves, as to save Great Britain from the disgrace in which Browne’s proceedings will involve the home government if they support him; and also to avert from the unfortunate settlers the ruin that must indubitably overtake them if the war is allowed to continue much longer.”
Hadfield was also very sure of his own virtue and right in expressing his view of the situation, and was extremely confident that not only would he and his views prevail, but that he would not be bettered in the process. Hadfield’s concerns are a direct result of his evangelical attitudes. Not only did such piety engender notions of national honour and public probity, but it also tended to result in a belief that ‘normative Christianity’ involved “a combative mentality, as well as an uncomplicated confidence” in what was being attempted. Such self-belief, passion and confidence was easily transferred to the secular conflict that Hadfield and his colleagues found themselves in. By April 1861 he had fired off another open letter to the Duke of Newcastle, which had the somewhat unimaginative title *The Second Year of One of England’s Little Wars*. This had two targets: firstly the attacks made against him by Gore-Browne’s brother, E. H. Browne, Professor of Divinity at Oxford, who used extracts from speeches by Stafford, Dillon Bell and McLean to promote his brother’s case. The second target was the controversy aroused by the questions arising over his handling of Kingi’s letters and Hadfield’s subsequent appearance before the House of Representatives. Hadfield had also gained considerable support from the prominent lay

---

45 Ibid. June 6 1861. “I sometimes almost wish I had not read so much in political philosophy—ignorance might have been bliss. To see clearly and distinctly calamities about to befall a country which might be averted - to see the government of the country in the hands of men with abilities hardly qualifying them for attorney’s clerks - men too ignorant to understand what is told them and too prejudiced to benefit by it, even if they could - I say to see all this and much more and then to see no human help is a source of very great pain and anxiety to me.”


48 O. Hadfield, 2 January 1861, “To Charles”, Transcripts of Letters 1861: “I have as you suppose had plenty of abuse out here - the most unscrupulous assertions have been made by the Governor and his ministry and agents; but my position is too good to admit of being damaged by such means, and my character is too well known to suffer from them. However I have not been very nice but have refuted any insinuations or statements made by them and always go the best of it.”

49 E. H. Browne (1811-91), younger brother of the Governor, who, after an academic and clerical career was consecrated Bishop of Ely in 1864, and Bishop of Winchester in 1873. He took the conservative side in the Colenso debate, and wrote and published widely.
member of the ‘Church Party’, Sir William Martin who had written *The Taranaki Question*, a pamphlet which the *Taranaki Herald* described as “the most temperate and able statement of the missionary view, on the subject of the war, that has appeared or is likely to appear”. Hadfield, though full of gratitude for such support, was determined to be forthright in his accusations against the Government; stating in his second pamphlet:

> I have no faith in soft words or disguised censure conveyed in circumlocutions: I believe that great crimes ought to be called by their proper names; and that the interests of truth and justice ought to be paramount to every other motive.

While many settlers castigated the clergy for their oppositional involvement in politics, others, perhaps more aware of the waning influence of religion in national life, could see little problem with this. One such person was Thomas Nicholson, the Presbyterian Minister at Wairau in Malborough, and a supporter of the Government. Nicholson’s Free Church sentiments are behind his opinion, stating “Bishop Selwyn is a member of the community, a subject of the state, a free-born citizen; and he has a

---

50 William Martin (1807-80), a contemporary of Selwyn at Cambridge, he emigrated to New Zealand in 1841 as Chief Justice of the new colony. Closely involved with both Maori and Anglican affairs, Martin was, with his wife Mary, a prominent member of the ‘Church Party’. In 1860, Lady Martin wrote of her husband: “Though not as rapid as dear C. J. W. (Bishop Abraham) and more lawyer-like and deliberative, William has come to as strong a feeling of the impolicy and injustice of the war...and he has been busy for some weeks with a statement of the whole matter, which is to be printed and sent home to influential men.” Lady Martin to Miss Palmer, 28 August 1860, p.15, quoted in *Extracts of Letters from New Zealand*.


52 O. Hadfield, 28 February 1861, “To Charles”, Transcripts of Letters 1861: “I should be more desirous of writing than I am were it not that I think Sir William Martin’s pamphlet such a complete sledge-hammer that I really don’t know what more can be needed to prove the injustice and folly of the war. (p.2).


54 Thomas Nicholson (1817-64) was appointed by the Free Church Colonial Committee to Nelson. He arrived in 1848 and, as minister for Wairau was responsible for a large area, including Kaikoura and Picton.
perfect right, as such, to give utterance to opinions in civil matters." Nicholson's basis was a belief that the time had passed from when one 'Church' (or clergy thereof) were able to "control or direct" a civil government. The status of the churches in New Zealand clearly supported such a view. This, Nicholson argued, meant no cleric should be "branded or stigmatised" for offering their opinions on the conflict. The problem was that the majority of settlers – and also the members of the 'Church Party' - appeared to fail to properly appreciate the realities of the separation of 'Church and State' in New Zealand. The settlers, in their fear, granting the Church more influence than it possessed; the 'Church Party' in their outrage, claiming more influence than they could achieve.

Selwyn himself sent conflicting messages to the Premier, Edward Stafford, over his perception of the role of the church (Anglican) in these matters. Although peace had been declared in Taranaki in mid-March 1861, Selwyn was determined that the 'Church Party' should be able to speak out on matters political, especially the Native Offenders Bill. Selwyn had claimed a 'special right of interference' for himself and the clergy of the Church of England in dealings between the Colonial Government and Maori. This was strongly rejected by Stafford. Selwyn's argument firstly stated that while "rejoicing" in their "freedom of connexion" with the State, the clergy of the Church of England would be betraying Maori if they failed to speak out on their behalf. This support of Maori was based on the clergy being "the earliest settlers" in New Zealand and acting as "agents employed by the Government in Native Affairs", as a result of being "intimately acquainted" with Maori "language, customs and feelings."

56 Correspondence on Tribal Right 1860-1861 Between E. W. Stafford, Colonial Secretary and
Yet this was secondary to their role as "above all Ministers of the religion" which resulted in their asserting "the privilege" allowed by the law to all, to petition the Crown and legislature. Selwyn appears to have heard Stafford's point and hinted at a possible change, stating that if Waitara was not to prove a precedent, then his clergy "will feel it to be a religious and social duty to assist the Government, in our independent line of influence, in maintaining the Supremacy of the Crown and the authority of the Law." 

In a sense, the 'Church Party' bluff had been called. With no 'connection' to the State, they could not claim any 'special rights' as a religious body. As individuals they could speak out - this had been Nicholson's point, and one supported by Stafford. Yet the 'Church Party' had wished to do more, using their corporate identity as a Church to gain a special right. This rebuttal is at least as significant as the 1854 General assembly decision on the position of the religious bodies in relation to the State. For this was basically a test case which firmly served to underline the separation of Church from State affairs. The correspondence is also crucial for Selwyn's concluding remarks quoted above, for this would become the general policy of the 'Church Party' when the Waikato campaign commenced.

G. A. Selwyn. (Auckland 1861, s. n.). Letter VI, Stafford to Selwyn, 3 May 1861. (P Box q993.1 COR P.) A.T. L.

57 Ibid., Letter VII. Selwyn to Stafford, 6 May 1861.
58 Ibid., Letter VIII. Stafford to Selwyn, 20 May 1861.
59 Ibid., Letter IX. Selwyn to Stafford, 23 May 1861.
Yet there is a certain inconsistency in Selwyn's remarks. John Morgan had, all along, viewed the Waitara as fundamentally an issue of (in Selwyn's words) "the Supremacy of the Crown and the authority of the Law". His undoing was to challenge his Church hierarchy in New Zealand by somewhat unwisely writing a detailed letter to the CMS leadership in London setting out his opinions. His primary argument was that that the King Movement needed to be crushed for "the peace of the Colony and the preservation of the Maori race." His second argument promoted socio-economic assimilation, stating that Maori should be "persuaded" to sell three-quarters of their "waste lands", the profits of which to be invested in sheep and cattle farming, enabling endowments for churches and schools. Yet Morgan could also write to Gore-Browne stating that he wanted peace, "but on terms honourable to both races" as he feared the annihilation of the Waikato and his labours if war with them occurred. This, he felt, should assure Selwyn that even if he disagreed with him "it is because I feel and know that my people are wrong". Such a reading of the situation did little to gain him any support from the 'Church Party'. The fact that Morgan was supplying information on Waikato opinion and movements to the Governor did little to further his cause. His crime was to hold a consistent set of opinions at variance with those held by his superiors. Morgan was seen as an embarrassment and this set in motion the flow of 'official' CMS opinion that would result in his being removed from his position. The nub of the problem for Morgan was that, in the current situation, he belonged to the wrong Church. That Wesleyan societies and missionaries would disagree with the Anglican CMS and side with the Government was (from a CMS perspective) almost to be expected, and if not tolerated, at least treated with disdain. However, for one within

61 Ibid., p.712.
the Society to disagree with 'official policy' would prove too much to countenance.

The sense of CMS outrage was similar to that felt by settlers when clergy sided with 'rebel savages' against 'civilized Europeans'; party lines were firmly drawn on all sides and you crossed them at your peril.63

The lines between clergy and laity were also still firmly drawn - despite the declaration of peace. Vicesimus Lush noted in his journal that

In a ride yesterday I met Mr Albyn (sic) Martin who surprised me by declaring that the dissatisfaction felt by a large body of the Laity toward the Bishop and almost all the Clergy, for siding with the Maories, was so deep and encreasing (sic) that he thought it would end in an alarming secession from our body.64

While any secession that occurred was individual and not corporate, the strength of anti-'Church Party' feeling did not diminish with the onset of peace - and neither did 'Church Party' activity.

H.T. Purchas, writing on the centenary of the Church of England in New Zealand, in 1914, singled out this period of peace (October 1861 to May 1863) as "being the last occasion in our history when it can be said that the voice of the Church was really

---

63 Morgan was worried what the removal of Gore-Browne as Governor would entail, writing in a desperate appeal: "I believe that all the Auckland clergy and very many private friends are opposed to my views. Should therefore circumstances allow I should be much obliged if Your Excellency will explain to Sir George Grey the views I have taken on the war in order that his mind may not be prejudiced to the opposite party."
Sir Thomas Gore-Browne Papers. 6 August 1861. Letter from Morgan, p.74.
Albin Martin (1813-88), the son of a clergyman, was an artist (studied in London and Italy) and friend of William Blake. He arrived in New Zealand in 1852, farming in East Tamaki. He joined the Otahuhu Royal Cavalry and was a prominent member of the Anglican Synod.
effective in guiding the policy of the country.”\textsuperscript{65} This ‘effectiveness’ included the proving of the illegality of the Government’s actions in the Waitara, Grey attempting to instigate the runanga system of Maori local self-government and his attempt “to atone for the misdeeds of the past.”\textsuperscript{66} As a result of such action the ‘Church Party’ was continually attacked in the newspapers of this period, and yet ‘Church Party’ influence upon George Grey was decidedly limited. Likewise, missionary influence and action amongst Maori was on the wane\textsuperscript{67}, while in November 1861, on a visit to Taranaki, Selwyn was jeered by the settlers. However if the newspapers of this period of peace are consulted the feeling against “missionaries” and the ‘Church Party’ is as vehement as it ever was. There are two reasons for this. Firstly a general feeling that ‘Church Party’ support had encouraged Maori resistance in Taranaki and so contributed to a drawn-out and costly war; secondly, that ‘Church party’ (and especially Hadfield’s) lobbying of opinion back in Britain had not only besmirched the colony and the colonists, but also betrayed a desire to create a theocracy of influence, if not of total rule, here in New Zealand. It is out of such opinion and fears that the common rhetoric of “missionary influence”, “jesuitical ambition” and “treacherous actions” arose and circulated. From a contemporary viewpoint such statements seem rather hyperbolic, yet within the context of the time such fear and anger is understandable. For the ‘Church Party’ was acting in such a way, and making claims in support for its action, that appeared to directly challenge settler assumptions and expectations as to not only the role of clergy, but also those of white settlers in such a conflict. There was a general sense on all sides that this was not a new stage of lasting peace. Therefore the paper warfare continued right through this period as it was felt that especially with the

\textsuperscript{65} H. T. Purchas, \textit{A History of the English Church in New Zealand}, p.178.
\textsuperscript{66} Ibid., p.179.
recall of Gore-Browne, the pendulum of influence had begun to swing in favour of the 'Church Party'.

Tensions between the Government and the King Movement were also increasing during the period. This, coupled with a growing wariness of many Maori of 'missionary Christianity' convinced many of the 'Church Party' that there was now a new issue - one of 'sovereignty' and 'law and order'. John Morgan had of course viewed it as such right from the first days of the Waitara, yet his opposition and opinion had put him decidedly on the outer and in conflict with Selwyn. In July 1863 he wrote to Gore-Browne (now in Tasmania) that

All parties now agree that the Maoris are fighting for supremacy, but the Bishop's party say that the war ought not to have been commenced [and] The [public] feeling against the Bishop is very bitter. 68

The major problem now confronting Selwyn was how to attempt to take a balanced view of the situation. He still desired to press the cause of Maori grievances, yet was aware that (for him) the issues were different than at Waitara. He was also of course on record as having stated to Stafford that he and his clergy would maintain the "Supremacy of the Crown and authority of the Law." Selwyn was therefore caught in no-man's land between Maori expectation and settler suspicion. As the Anglican priest J. F. Lloyd 69 commented:

67 Benjiman Ashwell wrote to the London CMS of the "lukewarm state which now characterises the Maori New Zealand Church". Letters and Journals. 12 April 1862, p.404.
69 J. F. Lloyd (1810-75), Irish- born Anglican priest, vicar of St. Paul's Auckland 1853-65, then arch-
The poor Bishop gets badly abused now; he has been busy endeavouring to separate the friendly from the hostile natives, and the people here [Auckland], who are now for the most part very firm against the natives, imagine that he favours the native race more than his own countrymen, which is of course not true.\(^7\)

One missionary who endeavoured to clearly state his position was Rev. John Warren.\(^7\) A Wesleyan, Warren had, with Morgan, opposed the 'Church Party' line. He was determined to articulate an alternative view and to promote the role of the missionary as one who, while working for Maori, never did so at the expense of the colonist. On 9 July 1863, he delivered a lecture at the Auckland YMCA. His topic, "The Christian Mission to the Aborigines of New Zealand", was obviously a pertinent and popular one, not only achieving a four-column spread in the *New Zealand Advertiser* (6 August 1863, p.4), but also being privately published as a 37 page pamphlet. Warren set out his position at the beginning of the lecture:

> As an old missionary, it may be reasonably concluded that I am the sincere uncompromising friend of the natives, but not more so than I am of the colonists, than whom, as a people none have been more shamefully maligned.\(^7\)

He was aware that his sentiments differed from those of many other missionaries, but was also of the strong conviction that the present troubles were "the natural result of

---

\(^7\) J. F. Lloyd. Correspondence 1849-1890. 1 August 1863, p.2. "To Ellen", (MS-Papers-1786, A.T.L.)

\(^7\) John Warren (1814-83), Wesleyan missionary in New Zealand from 1840, working in Northland until 1855 when he was appointed to Nelson; while in 1860 he was appointed Superintendent of the Wellington circuit. From 1865, he worked with European congregations in Auckland.

\(^7\) J. Warren, *The Christian Mission to the Aborigines of New Zealand: Its connection with the colonization of the country, and the Results which have followed*. (Printed by request, Creighton & Scales, Publishers, Queen Street, 1863), p.2.
an infirm and inefficient Government”\textsuperscript{73} (the ‘Church Party’ was very likely to agree on this point). Warren’s stance in relation to questions of ‘church and state’ was clear: “The Gospel was never intended to supersede civil government, and must be comparatively powerless unless it rests upon law.”\textsuperscript{74}

It was, therefore, the result of weak government that Maori were deserting Christianity. His solution of law and order echoed that of Morgan. The Government should declare a district of Maori land “gone forever” to the Queen as a result of rebellion, “unhesitatingly put down” proclamations of Maori sovereignty, and declare Maori in possession of arms (after a certain date) “to have forfeited all right and title to land.”\textsuperscript{75} Warren stated that he was a ‘man of peace’, yet did not find it inconsistent “with my character as a Christian man, or with my position as a Christian minister” in looking “for the settlement of the present troubles to the blessings of God upon the wise head, and brave heart, and good sword of General Cameron.” Warren might have been the only one to have publicly stated such a position from a missionary viewpoint, but Selwyn and many CMS missionaries were also moving towards such a position. The difference to the Waitara situation was that now there was a challenge to missionary influence and activity by disaffected Maori who increasingly viewed the conflict along the same racial lines as the majority of the settlers. Missionaries were Pakeha first and foremost and as such under suspicion, if not yet totally unwelcome in many areas. The ‘Church Party’ response was to belatedly fall in behind settler

\textsuperscript{73} Ibid., p.63.
\textsuperscript{74} Ibid., p.3.
\textsuperscript{75} Ibid., p.30. He looked for “what Nicholas of Russia called a material guarantee that there would be no resurrection” of Maori sovereignty, then he would treat Maori with “justice, mercy, kindness, and generosity”. (p.35). Warren is referring to Nicholas I (1796-1855), Tsar of Russia (1825-55), a despotic ruler who attempted to ‘Russianize’ all inhabitants of his Empire. He is an interesting choice of role-model, especially as Britain had recently fought him in the Crimean War.
perception, if not the rhetoric of the situation. They too came to view the Waikato and
Kingitanga as impediments to the enforcement of British sovereignty – and (most
crucially for them) Christianity - in summary, as a rejection of 'civilization'. The
sentiments grew that, regretfully, the dissident King Movement 'had to be taught a
lesson'.

In response, the clergy (of all denominations) became increasingly involved in the war
effort. Already there was a Roman Catholic priest providing services, now Selwyn or
his clergy provided a Sunday service at Headquarters and the troops requested a
Protestant chaplain as well.77 The newspapers were supportive of Wesleyan statements
of allegiance to the colonists' cause - the Otago Daily Times reporting in depth Rev. I.
Harding's78 talk "The Maoris in their relations to the Gospel, and the present war".
Without naming names, Harding referred to "unprincipled men", "bad or thoughtless
Englishmen" and,

...some good men...held in high places in the community, whose erroneous sympathy for the
Maori led them far on, in a dislike for colonization into the very verge of disloyalty; in some
instances giving a more than tacit encouragement to the disaffection of the native mind.79

Likewise, the New Zealand Herald referred to the Wesleyans as "devout and self-
denying men"80 (which most undoubtedly were), yet was extremely unlikely to refer to

---

76 Ibid., p.35.
77 Daily Southern Cross, 8 August 1863, p.3. "The War in Auckland".
78 Issac Harding (1815-97), Methodist clergyman in England, Australia (1852-8) and then New
Zealand. Extremely active throughout Otago, he later transferred to the North Island. He was a
regular correspondent to the Times (London), and also published lectures and pamphlets in New
Zealand.
79 Otago Witness (Dunedin), 25 August 1863, p.6.
80 New Zealand Herald, 16 November 1863, p.3. "WMS Attitudes".
members of the ‘Church Party’ in such supportive terms. The Taranaki Herald was most supportive of Warren’s pamphlet, naming only Selwyn, Hadfield and Grace as being numbered among

only a few who have been so blinded by ambitious dreams as to forget that Christianity must be accompanied by civilization… but these few have been so entirely mischievous that they have given a bad name to the whole body.\(^8\)

Within the CMS however, it was John Morgan who was considered to have “given a bad name to the whole body”. Always prepared to stand outside the party line, he was now to suffer the consequences of his independent position. It appears that letters had been sent to CMS Headquarters in London by the CMS New Zealand Secretary, Robert Burrows, and others, regarding Morgan and his activities. Aware of such criticism, Morgan detailed in a letter to Burrows, the five areas he believed were of concern to the CMS and had elicited the complaints. The first was that he had resigned the control of his mission school to John Gorst, Government Agent and editor of the ill-fated Government Maori newspaper Pihoihoi Mokemoke. This was seen as an indication of pro-Government sympathies. Secondly, concerns had been raised about the “low standard” of his mission area. This was linked to the third point, which was an implication of his “responsibility” for the “political excitement of the Waikato” (Morgan’s territory being in the heart of Kingitanga territory). Fourthly, there was his “improper correspondence with Gore-Browne”, which, it was felt, was of a nature that should not be entertained by a member of the CMS. Finally, this correspondence had, it

\(^8\) Taranaki Herald, 22 August 1863, p.2.
was felt, resulted in the CMS losing influence with local Maori. In total, the CMS believed that it would be good for the district if Morgan were transferred elsewhere.82

Morgan believed that the fundamental issue was his correspondence with Gore-Browne. This, he stated, was the result of his venturing “to have and to hold” his own opinion (“not a political one”) arising out of his location, and the associated knowledge of Maori movements and sentiments. He wrote to the Governor “as to the warlike movements of the natives” because he considered it “his duty” to do so.83 This information he gathered on the request of Archdeacon Kissling.84 Morgan also wrote to the London CMS Secretary, defending his actions. These involved providing Governor Grey with information so that Auckland could be protected and redoubts built.85 In a later letter to London, Morgan again defended his position. He acted, he claimed, out of a sense of duty “to my Queen and fellow countrymen”, out of a belief that “the Church ought not expect to lead, or govern the Government”, and because he could not forget that he “was an Englishman” owing duty to “Queen and countrymen as well as to the Maoris”.86 Morgan’s protests were of no avail. The CMS forced him to relinquish his Waikato post for one in Auckland, where in 1864 he resigned from the CMS.87 A short career as a military chaplain followed, before his death in Auckland in

83 Ibid., p.734.
84 Likewise, Robert Maunsell had reported that Kissling made a similar request to him in 1860. (see footnote 22).
87 Morgan stated in a letter to the local CMS Secretary that his decision was a consequence of the differences in opinion between himself, other missionaries, and Bishop Selwyn over the past four years: “The Taranaki War, and the course adopted by the Bishop and some of the missionary body, placed me in a peculiar position.” J. Morgan, Letters and Journals: 3 October 1864, p.756. To Rev. H. Venn. In a letter to the London CMS, Morgan quotes a commendation of his work, extracted from a letter
1865. It is a tragic irony that Morgan’s long-held belief that the Kingitanga was a movement for sovereignty, and not just a localized attempt to impose law and order had come to be accepted by the majority of the ‘Church Party’ and the CMS missionaries by mid-1863. But his correspondence to the Governor (seen as an act of partisan political involvement) could not be forgotten nor forgiven.

Yet the attitudes of the ‘Church Party’ were changing. Selwyn, in a private letter to the Bishop of Adelaide, stated that ‘rebels’ Maori were

baptised men, whose love has grown cold from causes common to all churches of neophytes\textsuperscript{88} from Laodicea\textsuperscript{89} downwards. Such Christian knowledge as remains does them harm rather than good, because it exalts them in their own eyes.\textsuperscript{90}

As Selwyn concluded, in a somewhat depressed manner - “We are now pulling against the ebb, and, for aught I know, may soon be left aground.”\textsuperscript{91} Soon reports were circulating that Selwyn had “made a strong war speech.”\textsuperscript{92} Another cleric to do so was the Onehunga Presbyterian Minister (and military chaplain) Thomas Norrie.\textsuperscript{93} He stated that war with Maori was inevitable - “The Maori, now, must either thrash, or be

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{88} new converts'.
\textsuperscript{89} Laodicea, a city in Asia Minor, inland from Ephesus. It is the subject of an Apocryphal Epistle referenced in \textit{Col.} 4:16] purported to have been written by St. Paul. It is also addressed in the \textit{Book of Revelation} (Rev. 3:14-22), rebuked for allowing its wealth and comfort to turn it from its Christian confession so that it became ‘spiritually lukewarm’.
\textsuperscript{90} \textit{Colonial Church Chronicle}, January 1864, p.20.
\textsuperscript{91} Ibid., p.20.
\textsuperscript{92} \textit{Otago Witness}, 1 January 1864, p.5. Reprint from the \textit{Spectator} (London).
\textsuperscript{93} Thomas Norrie (1825-1905). Ordained in 1855 by the Free Church, arrived in New Zealand later that year and was minister to the South Auckland area. He was heavily involved as a military chaplain once the Waikato campaign commenced.
\end{footnotesize}
This was a time for missionaries, having “laboured long with the Testament”, to bring out “the taws” (a leather strap), which were to be used until Maori returned their allegiance to the Queen.94

Not all however became amenable to the Government’s policy. Hadfield continued to stand in opposition to Government action. He attacked the Waikato campaign as primarily a venture to capture more land - a point, he claims, on which the military agreed with the clergy.95 There was certainly a large component of such avarice behind much popular (and populist) sentiment - yet it is also too much of a simplistic generalization. As Belich states, it was also (primarily) undertaken as “the logical way to go about destroying Kingite power”.96 In fact the two aims coincided. The settlers desired more land, which, fortuitously, was under Kingitanga control. This resulted in a campaign being undertaken for Imperialist reasons resulting in the fulfillment of settler desire. It was thus a campaign fought for a variety of aims and expectations. At one level there was the Imperialist rhetoric of sovereignty which seduced Selwyn and many of his clergy into giving guarded support to the campaign. On another level there was the populist rhetoric of colonial expansion and acquisition. Yet there was also an intermediate point where the two rhetorics overlapped and the talk was of destroying ‘Maori power’ which impeded both ambitions. It is from this perception that Hadfield’s critique arises, yet it is simplistic in its analysis. For the issue is not the aimed for result of capturing more land, but rather the question of why such an attempt was undertaken. Both Selwyn and Hadfield misread the situation – the former concentrating on the Imperialist rhetoric, the latter on the populist. The situation is

94 Daily Southern Cross., 29 January 1864, p.4. The fact that the Pukekohe East Presbyterian Church had been besieged by Maori on 14 September 1863 might have influenced his thinking!
somewhat ironic as it could be argued that there had also been a concentrated move in both Imperialist Government and populist newspapers to set about ‘destroying’ what was regarded as ‘missionary power’. In fact Hadfield wrote to his sister that

> It appears certain that some malicious persons have been representing the missionaries to the natives as those who were playing into the hands of the Government for the purpose of making them submissive...\[^97\]

If the invasion of the Waikato was to complicate the issues for the ‘Church Party’, the rise of Pai Marire was to push them firmly back into the settler fold. Yet among the settlers Pai Marire was widely regarded as the result of missionary ‘failure’ to ‘properly Christianize’ Maori, due to a (believed) preference to ‘politically activate’ them instead. As the *Daily Southern Cross* stated ironically in a ‘representative’ opinion:

> It was the missionary influence that opposed Governor Browne’s course: for if William King and his followers were in rebellion - if they did do a little barbarous murdering now and then - they were without question excellent Christians!\[^98\]

There was a common feeling, amongst both settlers and clergy, that the situation had entered a grave new era with the rise of Pai Marire. Whilst the murder of Volkner had shocked the colony, it offered little respite to the missionaries. On the one hand they were attacked for failing to properly ‘Christianize’ Maori, for encouraging their opposition to the Government, and for defending their actions. On the other, the

\[^95\] O. Hadfield, 4 February 1864. “To Charles”. Transcripts of Letters 1862-1874 (91-316) A.T.L.


alleged actions of the missionary T. S. Grace following the incident, only served to provide an outlet for settler frustration and shock.

Grace had been captured with Volkner, but had escaped on *HMS Eclipse*. Once returned to Auckland, he wrote a letter of thanks, published in the *Daily Southern Cross* on 22 March 1865. Grace however failed to mention the role of Captain Levy in his rescue. Outraged correspondence arrived immediately, all stating a belief that this omission was deliberate because Levy was a Jew. Grace replied that he “forgot” in the haste in which his letter was written. To many, this excuse was read as a typical piece of missionary arrogance. The *Wanganui Chronicle*, whose editor was soon to enter the Presbyterian ministry, saw it as a matter concerning “the European community at large in their character of Christians” and, as “a slur” upon Grace and all Europeans. The *Hawke’s Bay Herald* stated that there would be two related outcomes of the Volkner and Grace incidents. Firstly, that the murder of Volkner would finally result in a lack of sympathy for Maori back in England. The settlers were both weary and indignant that accusations were still being made in England regarding their character and actions. These were raised by lobby groups such as ‘Exeter Hall’, and believed to be reliant on what settlers regarded as biased missionary mail. The

---

99 Morris Levy (1821-1901), born in Jersey and, after a period in Australia, moved to Invercargill in 1861. Later moving north, he ran the Eclipse between Opotiki (where his brother owned a store) and Auckland. As Jews, he and his brother were well-treated by the Pai Marire.
100 Grace’s letter (dated 20 March 1865) was published in the *Daily Southern Cross*, 22 March 1865, pp.4-5. The letters in response published on 23 March 1865, p.3, as was Grace’s reply. Grace did write a second letter acknowledging Levy.
101 James Taylor, ordained in 1865 and left to minister in the Waikato before leaving for Australia in 1869.
103 The *Taranaki Herald* stated: “This deed will, perhaps open the eyes of people in England who would look upon the murder of a settler as a natural occurrence because he is “rapacious” and “oppressive”, but when they find an unoffending Minister of the Gospel has been treated in the same way they will begin to realise the state in which the Maoris are and the worse state to which
murder of Volkner, although viewed as a tragedy by the settlers was also perceived as perhaps the event that would force a reconsideration back in England of what they believed was uncritical Missionary support for Maori, and overcritical missionary judgement on settlers. The second point raised is one that says a great deal about the feelings of the time. It was felt that Grace’s omission of Captain Levy in his reports would result in the missionaries being distrusted by the settlers; that all missionaries would be tarred by this, even though some are “kind hearted, well meaning, but mistaken”.\textsuperscript{104} It was a common settler critique that the missionaries themselves were responsible for the distrust and suspicion visited upon them from the settlers. It was felt that if clerics would limit their utterances and actions to issues of religion, not politics, and piety, not public opinion, then settlers would not have to attack them and their influence. Grace’s action served only to confirm many settler suspicions that missionaries were inclined to tamper with the truth for ulterior motives.

What was preferred, by the colonists at least, was the example set by Rev. Walter Douglas who (described as a ‘non-sectarian evangelist’) was visiting New Zealand at this time. In reviewing his address “Jesus as Saviour of Mankind”, the \textit{New Zealand Advertiser} reported:

> What his discourses lack in order, refinement, and the general graces of rhetoric, they make up for in masculine thought, pertinent illustration, racy excursion, touching pathos, and searching appeal.\textsuperscript{105}

\textsuperscript{104} \textit{Hawke’s Bay Herald}, 13 April 1865, p.1. Editorial.
\textsuperscript{105} \textit{New Zealand Advertiser}, 11 October 1865, p.4. Reprint from \textit{Southern Record} (Christchurch).
This could be regarded as an indictment of the New Zealand situation. What the settlers desired were clergy concerned with piety, not politics. Clergy who displayed the common touch, who identified with the settlers and their life, not those who looked down on and vilified colonial society. Even though the *Daily Southern Cross* was prepared to publish "*Four Prayers for New Zealand*", their contents called upon the 'Christian churches' to "establish, strengthen and settle" their duties not only to Maori but to also "our own country and Government". The war was viewed as an act of 'righteous providence' for the "transgressions of the nation" and "God" was asked "to make the natives contented with their lot, and to enlarge the hearts of our own countrymen towards them".

The situation in which the 'Church Party' found itself by 1865 was one in which a sense of alienation seems prevalent. Selwyn forlornly stated of the Maori churches in 1865: "Our congregations melted away; our advice was disregarded..."; likewise, Robert Burrows states "The native pastor has become much more acceptable to the natives than we are". T.S. Grace, in the same series of reports, attempted an explanation: "The cause which have led to the present state of things for which the missionaries suffer both from natives and Europeans, are entirely political and have been caused by the war."

107 Ibid. Prayer no. 2. The three prayers were drawn up by Rev. C. S. Harrington, curate of Hurstmonceaux and forwarded to the *Church Missionary Intelligencer* by Rev. Thomas Vores of Hastings. Presumably, it was from that source that the *Daily Southern Cross* printed them. (There is no further information provided).
108 *CPNZS* 1865, Selwyn’s Presidential Address 1865.
109 Ibid., p.194.
110 Ibid., p.186. Grace is quoting from a letter he wrote on 5 May 1865.
Yet Grace’s conclusions are too simplistic, for the relationship of the ‘churches’ to both Maori and Pakeha had been somewhat uneasy and uneven from the first. The missionaries often appear to have ‘misread’ Maori responses and rejections of Christianity. Half a century of endeavour had only ‘shown results’ for probably twenty years - and just as the in-rushing tide of converts had been great in number, so too was the recession when Maori compared Pakeha action with (stated) Pakeha belief. Just as the Kingitanga was a quest for Maori political autonomy and sovereignty, so can be read the rejection, the falling away, and the lukewarm state of Maori “Pakeha” Christianity. In evaluating this situation, politics was certainly an important factor, but it is not the whole story. A crucial element was the close identification of ‘Christianity and civilization’ stressed by many missionaries which had resulted in a situation where, by the late Waikato campaign, both were irrevocably tainted in Maori eyes. Likewise, the zeal of new conversion, often underscored by an evangelical enthusiasm, had begun to wear off when confronted with both the vices and alternatives offered by Pakeha settlement. For the settlers were never a very religious group, with church attendance in the 1870s never surpassing 24.3% (1878) of the total population. There was also a very important underlying settler suspicion of the motives of the CMS from the first days of settlement. Charles Hursthouse was expressing a popular sentiment when he informed prospective emigrants that

---

111 The ‘Western District” report of the CMSP 1865-6, states of Maori that “many cast aside the Christian religion as identified with their national humiliation”.
The Wesleyans are also a numerous, and a most deservedly influential body; and maintain a far better regulated, and a more colonially popular “Missionary Establishment” than the Church does.\textsuperscript{113}

Of course the cracks in any possible ‘Church-State’ relationship (especially since the legal breach of 1854) were already evident before the New Zealand Wars began. The importance of Waitara, the defiance of the ‘Church Party’ against Government policy and the uproar that this caused in the popular press and in public sentiment, is the degree to which this underscored and reiterated this separation for the settlers. The situation was further stressed and complicated when, by the time of the Waikato campaign and beyond, the ‘churches’ needed the State to quell the unrest so that their missionary activities could continue. Without military protection, it was increasingly difficult, indeed dangerous, for missionaries to continue in some areas. The important point here is that it was the Church that broached a possible rapprochement, not the State, and that it did so in the midst of strident settler opposition and critique of its clergy and activities. The situation devolved into one of ironic tragedy, which resulted in the State becoming the arm of ‘justified action’ that would enable the ‘churches’’ missionary calling to continue - yet in the process, serving, by association, to alienate much Maori sentiment. The missionary was now caught in a ‘suspicion sandwich’.

The problem in attempting to construct a ‘church narrative’ is the range of competing voices and opinions. The ‘missionary narrative’ was one, to use Tom Griffith’s term, bound up with notions of “boundaries of the sacred”.\textsuperscript{114} Throughout the wars (and

\textsuperscript{113} C. Hursthouse, \textit{New Zealand; the “Britain of the South”}, 2d ed. vol.1, p.179. The “Church” is the Church of England.

peace), questions arose: To what did they owe their allegiance - their 'church' or their
'new nation'? How were they to define themselves - as 'men of God' or, more
completely (from a settler viewpoint), as 'men of Britain who were men of God'?
Were in fact the 'aims of God' and those of Imperialism (or at least of Empire)
different - or was it all just the outworkings of Providence? To whom did one's
allegiances lie - to one's religious charges or one's fellow colonists?

These were, and are, complex questions. Both denominations and individuals
wavered and changed their answers as time and circumstances progressed. That there
is no clear answer, no single 'church narrative' is underlined by the variety of differing
approaches adopted. Yet to state this is not to deny the crucial importance that these
often contradictory narratives played at this time. For the sense of outrage from both
settler and 'Church Party' is too widespread, influential and sustained to be ignored.
The danger is to reduce it to dualistic simplicities and blanket-abuse. It must always be
remembered that while the Pakeha laity may have been vehemently opposed to the
actions and opinions of some of their clerics (especially in the Church of England),
they would still often continue to seek and find solace in their local parish setting. Yet
it is clear that this involvement in issues of politics, by representatives of the
'churches', sat uneasily with a large body of settlers - and indeed, from 1863 onwards,
with Maori. By 1865, perhaps the only opinion uniting both Maori and Pakeha was
that 'political parsons' had crossed the 'boundary of the sacred' - challenging beliefs
that (if clergy would not support 'your' view) the 'role' of the clergy was piety, not
politics; belief, not belligerence; and religion, not radicalism (or 'racialism').

In 1849, E.G. Wakefield critiqued colonial 'party politics' as being:
remarkable for the factiousness (sic) and violence of politicians, the prevalence of demagoguism (sic), the roughness and even brutality of newspapers, the practice of carrying on public differences of making war to the knife, and always striking at the heart.\footnote{E. G. Wakefield, \textit{A View of the Art of Colonisation}, p.185}

These words proved to be remarkably prophetic. For having considered the existence and promotion of an alternative reading of the New Zealand Wars from a variety of 'Church' views,\footnote{As has been discussed in the chapter on New Zealand historiography, the 'standard' accounts of the wars are overwhelmingly secular in focus and orientation. Yet as this chapter shows, such a focus is a latter-day imposed secularization upon a conflict that had a very strong and influential religious element running through it. In fact it is very difficult to claim to understand the settler experience of this period unless one acknowledges this 'second-tier' 'Church Party'-Settler conflict. Such omission is the result of not only what appears a most doggedly secular mindset amongst New Zealand historians, but also of ignoring the popular and populist opinion and debates of the colonial press.} we must now engage with what could be termed the competing narrative\footnote{The term 'competing narrative' is of course one open to critique. For if there is no clear and easily separable 'church narrative' how can there be a 'competing settler' one? My reason for using such terminology is that, in entering new historiographical territory, some generalizations must be made, even if I myself later critique them. What such generalizations do is to define, even if only provisionally, some new areas under consideration. For while there was never a reduction in the period to such potentially simplistic dualism, it is important to at least acknowledge that clerics and settlers were often in quite vehement opposition during this period - and that this conflict affected all strata of colonial life. So by erecting the potential 'straw men' of competing narratives I seek to examine and underline the division that existed - a division that has been effectively marginalized, if not totally ignored in New Zealand historiography.} of settler popular opinion. For the settlers were highly critical of 'Church Party' involvement in the wars and from their responses and articulations some alternative readings of the period and of the roles given to and expected of the clergy and their Churches in a colonial context can be mapped out.
It is an anomaly in New Zealand historiography that its approaches to issues and events, let alone opinion, tend to be extremely partisan and strongly delineated. Therefore, issues such as at the centre of this thesis, the issues of ‘Church and State’, tend either to be told from within a “church” narrative - or from within a “constitutional” narrative. That is, there is a reliance upon “official” voices and documents. Yet these narrative gate-keepers tend to marginalize, if not exclude, the vast majority of participants, opinion, and opinion makers. What tends to eventuate is a narrative that not only details one or other side of the relationship, but does so in a manner that tends to posit its conclusions as a fait accompli and the only possible interpretation of those events.

Just as it is a contention of this thesis that the issues of ‘Church and State’ at this time are issues of competing narratives, it is also a contention that there is a crucial narrative to be found outside the “official” voices and sources. New Zealand at this time was subject to a constant barrage of critique, evaluation and opinion from within and outside the colony, in books and newspapers, and privately in letters and journals. All were part of attempts, both consciously and unconsciously, to ‘create’ a ‘new country’. Everyone seemed to have an opinion - and was ready to express it. This is true of the New Zealand Wars of the 1860s, and especially so of the issues raised by the involvement of the ‘Church Party’ in questions of politics. Yet mention of the ‘Church Party’ in secular historiography is meager, which is a direct misrepresentation
of the degree to which this 'party' excited settler and Government passions in the years 1860-1865. The reason for their exclusion can be traced to the location of the majority of this sentiment available to the contemporary historian - the colonial press. For to read the colonial newspapers is to gain an alternative view of the issues of 'Church and State', a view that is corroborated in reading the many settler publications that attempted to describe the colony to those 'back home'. From these sources an alternative reading arises, one that gives voice to settler grievance, concern and anger, a third narrative that is entitled 'views from the pew - and the paper-pulpit of the press'.

I coined this somewhat unwieldly term because it covers the two major loci of settler opinion; that of dissatisfied laity, and that (often encompassing the first) of the newspapers, who were as inclined to 'sermonize' on matters of the day as their clerical colleagues. While the theory of such an approach has been discussed in a separate chapter, it is important at least state to some theoretical 'pointers' to this narrative in order to explain what is presented.

The first area that needs to be briefly acknowledged is that which could be called the problem of theory and narration. That is - what is there to narrate? The philosopher Christopher Norris, in discussing the situation in which philosophy and theory find themselves after the advent of deconstruction, makes the crucial point that
As the idea gains ground that all theory is a species of sublimated narrative, so doubts emerge about the very possibility of knowledge as distinct from the various forms of narrative gratification.¹

The focus of this chapter is that “narrative gratification” which articulated, and created, settler opinion. For, as Benedict Anderson notes, print-capitalism, in linking “fraternity, power and time meaningfully together”, enabled larger numbers of people to embark upon both self-reflection, and inter-relationships with others “in profoundly new ways”.² In other words, newspapers were writing a narrative of Imperialism for the settlers. While this was primarily a justification of Government policy, it also included the articulation, justification and reassuring confirmation and creation of settler sentiment. Thus, in the isolated settler communities, people, by reading the newspaper (or being part of a later discussion of its news) could position themselves in response to a perceived situation, and not only have a sense of what was occurring, and of what the events were in their world – but also have an opinion on these matters. While historiography has tended to be concerned with presenting an ‘official’ and ‘factual’ picture of what actually occurred, it has neglected the crucial area of what some people, whose views seldom surface in other accounts because of this historiographical reliance on ‘official’ versions, thought and believed to have occurred. Too often historians have been over-eager to refute the myths and too quick to dismiss populist public opinion – and news sources. Yet these are crucial to gain an understanding of the cultural currency of the period. It is in such an understanding that J. M. Carey can speak of the “ritual view” of communication. This views

reading a newspaper less as sending or gaining information and more as attending a mass, a
situation in which nothing new is learned but in which a particular view of the world is
portrayed and confirmed. News, reading and writing, is a ritual act and moreover a dramatic
one. What is arrayed before the reader is not pure information but a portrayal of the contending
forces in the world.¹

For the settler, there were three contending forces in their immediate world at this
time - the Maori, the ‘Church Party’ and the settler (which included the Government).
The newspaper was not only a conveyor of information and opinion but also a field of
battle, where the settler could launch attacks upon Maori and especially upon a
‘Church Party’ which rules of probity exempted from the physical attack which could
be and was launched against Maori. The newspapers are therefore a forum for dissent,
an arena for conflict, and crucially, a method whereby settlers could articulate their
own competing narrative to that being forwarded by the ‘Church Party’, both in New
Zealand and back in Britain.

There were two methods of doing so; firstly, all newspapers republished reports and
articles from other newspapers, both from within New Zealand and from overseas.
This meant that those settlers at considerable physical distance from the conflicts could
still be emotionally involved, for there was a constant flow of edited opinion circulating
in the settler communities. Settlers in Dunedin could read reports and editorials written
in New Plymouth; those in Hawke’s Bay could be aware of Auckland opinion;
Canterbury colonists could become intimately associated with the Waikato campaign.

² B. Anderson, Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism
As well as this flow of local news and opinion, the colonial newspapers were very partial to republishing articles of interest from overseas sources - whether it was opinion in Britain and Australia concerning New Zealand, or items of wider interest and importance such as Garibaldi’s triumphant march through Italy or the progress of the American Civil War. They were especially on the look out for two types of foreign articles. Firstly, those attacking the settlers, and secondly, those critical of the ‘Church Party’ (and ‘Exeter Hall’). The first were greeted with outrage, and printed as examples of missionary chicanery and of the type of problem confronting the settlers in attempting to make their position heard and understood in Britain. The second were naturally greatly enjoyed, reprinted with relish, and often with an accompanying editorial comment stressing and supporting what was seen as the truth of their conclusions.

The second type of competing narrative occurred in the common practice of a newspaper compiling a monthly review of events (often thinly-disguised opinion), which would be sent not only to interested parties in New Zealand, but also wider afield, throughout the Empire. These were definitely settler narratives and were used to provide counter opinion to ‘Church Party’ influence. Each review included not only local news and opinion, but also that culled from other newspapers in the Colony. There was thus a continual refraction of opinion and information occurring, both within the settler communities, and further afield.

A third method of compiling a narrative was to write your own - a challenge many colonists took up. There are a large number of books written by colonists (especially

politicians) which attempt to provide a coherent settler narrative. These were joined, mainly after the wars, by reminiscences of soldiers, all contributing to a narrative of Empire. The colonial memoir, and those books aimed at prospective emigrants, provide an important source of settler sentiment and description. That most are somewhat propagandist in tone does not lessen their worth, for many were written by (primarily) men who considered it their task to provide a comprehensive survey and consideration of the new colony. We are therefore granted insight into a wide variety of descriptions, from the geographical and biological, to the socio-economic, cultural and religious factors of New Zealand life at that time.\(^4\)

A prime example of such a work is William Fox's 1851 review of the short history of the Colony, *The Six Colonies of New Zealand*. Published while he was visiting England, it shows Fox wearing his two hats of journalist and settler agent. Fox's two main targets are the missionaries, and the Colonial Government. While he acknowledges that the missionaries did "make Maori willing" to tolerate strangers, which enabled the settlement of New Zealand, his view of the missionary enterprise is less than charitable. Their aim, he claims, was "to erect the New Zealanders into an independent state - a sort of Levitical republic, like that of the Jesuits at Paragua (sic), guided, and in fact ruled, by the missionaries themselves."\(^5\)

---

\(^4\) James Belich in *Making Peoples* (p.281) mentions that over 40 books and at least 100 pamphlets were published in Britain by what he calls "crusaders", between 1837-80. They also published newspapers such as the *New Zealand Examiner* (London) in the 1860s.

\(^5\) W. Fox, *The Six Colonies of New Zealand* (London: Smith, Elder & Co, 1851), p.76. In Paraguay, in South America, the Jesuits controlled a system of native South American villages called reductions. Ruled in a theocratic manner, they directly occupied almost 54,000 sq. km, with influence over 315,000 sq. km and a population of 150,000 in 1743. In 1767, following a period of struggle with local landowners who wanted to break the Jesuit monopoly of trade with the natives, the Jesuits were expelled from Paraguay by the Portuguese and Spanish Kings.
Given that Fox was not only a settler agent at this time, but also had strong links into the recently wound-up New Zealand Company, his book was quite influential. His attacks on the missionaries, his belief in their (supposed) theocratic aims, and the association of their aims with those of the Jesuits were all to appear regularly, from other mouths and pens, a decade later.\(^6\) Fox, of course, cannot be given complete responsibility for such views (they seem to have been especially representative of New Zealand Company sentiment\(^7\)) but it is important to note their articulation in what is an important early work of crusader literature. Fox was also critical of the first six years of the colony, decrying a suggestion that it was “government by moral force”. He states that it would be much better described as “government by moral laxity” because of a perceived missionary bias in favour of Maori, which was “to destroy all prestige of the moral and intellectual superiority of the Europeans”.\(^8\)

While later attempts to represent the period tend to present a latter-day liberal humanitarian view favouring the missionaries and their opinions, the dissatisfaction of the settlers with the missionaries must not be forgotten. Many of those critical of the missionaries viewed themselves as Christian Gentlemen; Fox, himself, had three

---

\(^6\) Such attacks were to be found in newspapers throughout the colony and not just concentrated in the anti-clerical Auckland Examiner. There were two reasons for the labeling of the ‘Church Party’ as “theocratic” and “Jesuitical” in intention. The first was based on the well-recorded issue of Grey’s “Blood and Treasure” despatch, and the second centred around suspicion of High Church sympathy and practice amongst members of the ‘Church party’. Such a position was popularly represented as basically being a front for the advancement of Roman Catholicism, a suspicion that deepened when those under suspicion involved themselves in oppositional politics. Of course Hadfield, being of evangelical persuasion, was as wary of High Church practice as many who opposed him. It is one of the ironies of this time and situation that in the populist opinion of the press, Hadfield’s persistent involvement in politics would be not only represented as theocratic in nature but Jesuitical in intent. Yet, underscoring the conflicting opinions of the times, in 1862 his mission at Otaki would be criticized as the source of persistent anti-Catholic rumour and statement concerning the forces behind Kingitanga.

\(^7\) Fox mentions in regards to his stated missionary ‘aim’ that “colonization was death to such a scheme”, resulting in missionary determination to “dwarf” its progress.\(^9\) (p.76).


“As to the interference of the missionaries in political affairs, it has been solely and extensively
brothers who were Anglican clergy. Their issue was not with the religion, but rather with the public representatives of their faith involving themselves in politics in a manner their laity deemed unbecoming. Perhaps in a secular age there is a tendency to romanticize and promote the aims and actions of those missionaries in our past who seem to offer a beacon of hope amidst a commonly perceived liberal dismay (especially in the academy) of our settler ancestors. Yet this is to de-humanize the missionaries, to make them caricatures and not real people. Religious office does not necessarily entail an abundance of fair-mindedness and virtue. For other early chroniclers were already viewing the missionary endeavour with, if not the suspicion and hostility of Fox, then at least with caution. Arthur Thomson, an army surgeon, wrote in 1859, the first major work of history concerned with New Zealand. It propounded a view that “capitalism, not Christianity was transforming the Maori world”, so that Maori rejection of Christianity, increasingly apparent in the 1850s, was “the secular world of trade replacing that of theology”, not a turning away from European culture.

In 1860 the Auckland newspaper, the New Zealander, under the ‘philo-Maori’ influence of John Williamson, printed an abridged extract from Thomson’s work

mischevious.” (sic). (p.83).
9 A. S. Thomson (1817?-1860), having trained as a doctor at Edinburgh University, joined the British Army in 1838. He served as surgeon firstly in India (1838-47), in New Zealand (1847-58) and then, until his death, in China. He was very interested in climatic effects upon health, and with the statistics these provided, published a number of important scientific papers.
12 The term ‘philo-Maori” was another in common usage at this time; sometimes used of the ‘Church Party’ but more often toward those settlers who expressed some sympathy with Maori. Like many terms existent in this period it encompasses a wide variety of opinion and sentiment.
13 John Williamson (1815-75), trained as printer in Northern Ireland and arrived in New Zealand in 1841. He established the New Zealander in 1845, and was joined in the venture by W. C. Wilson. Being a Wesleyan, Williamson was ‘philo-Maori’, but assimilationist - sentiments evidenced in his organ. These sentiments resulted in a split with Wilson in 1863, for Wilson desired strong Government supremacy over Maori. Williamson was also a provincial and National politician 1853-75.
which makes an important comment on settler-church relations both pre-conflict (when it was written) and in 1860. Given that Williamson was a Wesleyan, the extract's tone makes it an interesting choice:

In the questions that have arisen between the white man and the Maori, neither missionary nor settler can be taken as an unbiased witness. The settler only thinks of the native as the 'nigger', whose absurd rights of property cramp his enterprise; while the missionary mentally curses the settler for the introduction of a busy, worldly activity which tainted his once simple followers, and substituted agriculture for church going. The surgeon's art gives him friends and interests among the Maoris, while the innate antagonism between doctor and clergyman imbues him with a certain sympathy for the settler's grievances.¹⁴

Thomson, in this extract, is of course making claims for the objectivity of the man of science. It is Thomson's conclusion of sympathy for the settlers due to the "innate antagonism" between "doctor and clergyman" that is fascinating. Why publish such an extract unless you wish to align your newspaper and your acknowledged Wesleyan connections in a guarded, critical sympathy with settlers - and so be distanced from the implicitly Anglican "missionary" and "clergyman"?

The settler narrative is therefore not a single-stranded, straight-forward one; rather it is composed of various strands, often willing to re-use material, events and opinions in ways which create a new and different reading. Some narrators are willing to state the "indifferent" attitude of the colonists to religion; Thomas Cholmondeley proclaiming in

¹⁴ New Zealander (Auckland), 4 April 1860, p.6.
1854 that “there is no religious character in the British Colonies; and those are especially indifferent who in the old country belonged to the Church of England.”

Likewise, William Swainson, who wrote of his fellow colonists in 1859 that they were “a civilized race, who, though professing Christianity with their lips, deny it in their hearts.” Cholmondeley was of the opinion that it was the church (Anglican) that had to change:

let our church only be herself, and the sons of her people will return to her; let her remain in her present unformed condition, they will become either Roman Catholics, or Atheists and materialists.

The question for Anglicans was, should their church “change” - and if so, how? Should it abandon its missionary endeavours amongst Maori because such close contact often led to accusations of bias, and their being viewed with suspicion by the settlers? Were the ‘Church Party’ “hedged in with bigotry”(?), as William Grayling, a member of the Taranaki Rifle Volunteers (and hence no neutral) claimed in 1863 - with the result that “The whole power of their eloquence has been spent in extolling the half-naked savages, and in depreciating without adequate cause their fellow countrymen.”

---

15 T. Cholmondeley, Ultima Thule, p.272.
16 William Swainson (1809-1884), appointed the second Attorney General of New Zealand in 1841. Both a radical and a humanitarian, Swainson took the Treaty of Waitangi as the sole authority, stating that those Maori who had not signed it were not under the Queen’s sovereignty.
18 T. Cholmondeley, Ultima Thule, p.281.
The term “fellow countrymen” is one of prime importance to the settler narrative; for the letters and editorials in the newspapers of the period are full of such a sense of betrayal. The settler might not be especially religious (certainly in regards to weekly attendance), but they tended to view the churches as a comfortable patch on the fabric of society. The churches and their physical presence provided a sense of continuity, a sign of continuing civilization here on the borderlands. Therefore, any attempt by these institutions and their clerical representatives to extend their activities outside what can be described as the mental comfort-zone assigned to them by the settlers, caused considerable anguish.

While the ‘Church Party’ tended to view the outbreak in the Waitara as primarily a local question of disputed land rights and ownership, in which the Government had agreed to what was (in effect) a false purchase; the Taranaki Herald, under the editorship of G.W. Woon, provided a concise and coherent statement of the underlying thesis of the settler narrative. Considering the issue important enough to warrant three separate editorials in the same edition, the Herald states

We are not at war to settle who shall possess the land of New Zealand, but whose the sovereignty shall be. Not to tear the country - or a district, or an acre, from the Natives, but to determine whether or not two independent races are to exist and quarrel here, side by side, or whether these islands are to be one Colony under one rule.21

---

20 Garland Woon (1831-95), son of the Methodist missionary William Woon, was born in Tonga and arrived in New Zealand with his parents in 1834. In 1852, in partnership with W. Collins, he established the Taranaki Herald, which Woon edited from 1854 - 67. During the Waitara War, Woon was a member of the Rifle Volunteers.

This issue of disputed sovereignty is the crucial one throughout this period. The 'Church Party' misread the situation in their belief that the Waitara was only a localized issue. This naivety only served to confirm settler belief that parsons were ill-suited for politics. For the issues were actually those of competing attempts to define and delineate the nature of the colonial entity. As James Belich states, there was no single New Zealand in existence at this time - rather there was "Aotearoa, or independent Maoridom; the persisting Old New Zealand interface; and the New New Zealand of mass European settlement." A careful reading of the colonial press confirms such a view. It is very apparent that, as conflict developed, the settlers increasingly reaffirmed their identity as being strongly distinct from both Maori and missionary. To the settler, both commonly appeared as impediments to progress and nation-building, determined to hold onto land to which (in settler eyes) nothing was being done - and yet opposing any attempts to permanently settle that land and create a new society.

It was apparent to the settlers that such desires could indeed be met; they had only to view the South Island where a lack of both Maori and missionary had resulted in the widescale sale of land, the creation of large towns, great estates - and moves towards the establishment of a "Britain of the South Seas". The North Island was, in many senses, a different country. Here, European settlements were pimply outbreaks of pink upon a brown face. Towns hugged the coast, not so much owing to inclination as to

---

22 J. Belich, Making Peoples p.192.
23 This is not to say that either Maori or missionary were non-existent in the South Island, but rather that their numbers, in comparison to the North Island were, in the main, small enough to cause little concern or impediment to colonial ambitions - the Wairau Affray of 1843 notwithstanding.
24 While the South Island was also primarily settled around the coast, this was due to geographical factors that affected infrastructure and transport, not to a substantial Maori presence as existed in the North Island.
the denial of opportunities to spread inland. Often the only Europeans to successfully penetrate the hinterland were the missionaries. New Zealand was thus a land of competing narratives. As Edward Said has noted: “The power to narrate, or to block other narratives from forming or emerging, is very important to culture and imperialism, and constitutes one of the main connections between them.”^25

The role of the settler newspapers was this dual one of narrating and yet also blocking in the attempt. That is, promoting a settler viewpoint while undermining and attacking those narratives of Maori and especially ‘Church Party’ which threatened its success. While New Zealand historiography has traditionally recognized the settler narrative directed against Maori (as was outlined in that first Taranaki Herald editorial), it has, if not ignored, then neglected the importance of the secondary narrative written against the ‘Church Party’. Yet for the settlers this was perhaps the more crucial group to combat. Maori might be physical adversaries here in New Zealand, but the ‘Church Party’ were political ones who could also arouse opposition to settler ambition back in Britain. Likewise, while Maori grievances were heard in Britain, this was primarily due to ‘Church Party’ influence, contacts and campaigns. Thus to counter, oppose and discredit Maori claims, the settlers had to kill the messenger by countering, attacking, blocking and undermining ‘Church Party’ narratives and personalities. In the early stages of the Waitara, the critique was more advisory than overly critical,^26 yet as

---

^26 Taranaki Herald, 19 March 1860, p2. Editorial no.3: “We should be thankful if we could hope that any reliable adjustment could come from the influence of religion and reason in the hands of the Bishop and Missionaries. We do not wish to undervalue their work or their motives, but the New Zealander is too much the nurse-spoiled child to be open to such influences where his self-will has been thoroughly roused.”
conflict increased, the narrative against the ‘Church Party’ became increasingly vitriolic. 27

Leading the charge was the Auckland Examiner, a newspaper that in its current form was not to last out the year; yet, driven by the Freethinker and radical, Charles Southwell, 28 it repeatedly attacked the ‘Church Party’ during this first year of conflict. In an editorial scathingly entitled “Missionary Ridden Officials and Missionary Made Traitors”, Southwell raises the soon-to-be persistent claims that missionaries, i.e. the ‘Church Party’, are “traitors” and, that a “devotion to mammon” lay at the heart of the ‘Church Party’ support for Maori. 29 Allied to such an approach were claims, as a later heading stated, of “Missionaries Versus the Progress of the Colony”, that they desired a return to the days when they had a dominant hand in the proceedings of the Colony. This also raised the issue of whether the missionaries, by their actions, were alienating their European congregations, and instead of working for peace, were actually “fanning the flames of unrest”? 30

---

27 Likewise, the attacks upon Maori became highly racist and degrading, the Taranaki Herald writing of the need to anticipate Maori actions “as any other animals of wild and ferocious natures”. (7 April, 1860, p.2). The “Noble Savage” was all too quickly reduced to the “Savage Animal” as soon as docility was cast aside.

28 Charles Southwell (1814-60), youngest child of 33, an ultra-radical, anti-clerical journalist and campaigner, was imprisoned for blasphemy in Britain for an article in his weekly Oracle of Reason which aimed to spread atheism. Linked with the Owenite Socialists (pioneers of the co-operative movement), he launched other anti-clerical papers following his release, and then, after a period in Australia, arrived in New Zealand as part of a theatrical troupe in 1856. David Berman, in reference to Southwell states “There was something theatrical about Southwell’s atheism, as perhaps befits a former Shakespearian actor”. (A History of Atheism in Britain. London & New York: Routledge, 1990, p.207). In December 1856 he launched the Auckland Examiner, strongly anti-clerical (and especially anti-missionary) in tone. The paper temporarily collapsed in mid-1860, followed soon after by the permanent collapse of its founder. Although only in existence for four years, it was the leading anti-clerical voice in the Colony. Berman states that Southwell was not a “dogmatic atheist”, rather an atheist because there was insufficient reason for belief - not directly denying that there was a “God”. (p.212).

29 Auckland Examiner, 11 April, 1860, p.2.

Just what the action and participation of the ‘Church Party’ in supporting Wiremu Kingi really represented was constantly debated. The Wellington paper, the New Zealand Advertiser, under the editorship of Edward Roe, stated of missionary visits to Kingi that although undertaken with the “best intentions”, such action opened them “however unjustly, to the charge of being either spies on the Maories, or traitors to their country”. These were to be the two charges later laid against missionaries - that they were working for the Government against their Maori congregations (as in the Waikato), or that they were working for Maori against the European laity. As for Maori, according the Advertiser, they apparently had little to complain about. For they had “been better treated than any barbarous race with whom Europeans have hitherto come in contact”, while still owning “all the best land” in the North Island, yet spending their revenues from land sales on horses while still continuing to “live in a state of idleness”.

This again raises the spectre that missionaries, by supporting Maori, were attempting to restrict the progress of the Colony. The Auckland Register claimed the ‘Church Party’ were deluded and misguided, rapidly alienating the British immigrants by their statements, actions and opinions. In contrast, the role of the settler was portrayed as truly philanthropic, involved in causing “the wastes to bloom and blossom and give bread to their fellow men to eat and to spare.” Yet, it went on to claim, it was

---

31 Edward Roe (7-7) had been an associate in London of Samuel Revons (1808-88), who had been a Chartist before supporting the New Zealand Company and coming to New Zealand as its official journalist. Roe worked with Revons on the New Zealand Gazette and Wellington Spectator, then helped establish the Wellington Independent in 1845, and the New Zealand Advertiser in 1859.

32 New Zealand Advertiser, 7 April 1860, p.4. “Taranaki Affairs”.

33 New Zealand Advertiser, 31 March 1860, p.4. “The Taranaki War”.

34 Auckland Register, 5 May 1860, p.2. Editorial, “True or False”. The editor was David Burn (1805-75), an ex-naval officer who was also a Shakespearian actor and playwright. Burn was also involved with the New Zealander, the New Zealand Herald and
because such aims were opposed by the “idiosyncratical philanthropy” of the “church missionaries”, that settlers were “branded” as “greedy, grasping and overreaching”.

Southwell had meanwhile moved into extreme anti-clerical mode. Not only was this all the fault of “political parsons”, but the accusation of jesuitical motives was invoked:

Clerical politicians who justify rebellion and plead the cause of traitors, are much excited.
Their quick has been touched. Exposure of episcopal avarice and episcopal jesuitism, and episcopal fraud they cannot quietly bear...[for they are] ecclesiastical jobbers in native humbug.35

The Examiner continued to print and publish anti-clerical letters36 and articles; missionaries “as a class” were denounced as “hypocritical, avaricious, addle-pated, domineering and vengeful”.37 There was a “black elite of clerical demagogues...whose ambition is for Maori supremacy” with an aim “to transform this colony into a priestcraft El Dorado”. Its call was simple: “Let the ministers of religion banish politics from their pulpits...[for] If the Government hope to put down rebellion the political and clerical styles must be first cleaned to effect it.”38

Southern Cross, and was editor of the Government Maori newspaper Te Karere o Nui Tireni (1855-63), which underwent a number of changes including the best known: Te Karere Maori, or, Maori Messenger.

36 The fact that letters attacking the missionaries were printed suggests that Southwell’s diatribes were accepted by a certain coterie of the Auckland settlers. While the Examiner was only one of a number of papers in both Auckland and the colony, the anti-missionary sentiment it presented was by no means the only examples available. All the newspapers printed letters and articles that, if not as vehemently anti-clerical, still raised questions concerning the motives and actions of the ‘Church Party’ - and its various members. It is also important to remember the common practice of reprinting editorials in other newspapers, thus circulating such sentiment throughout the colony.
37 Auckland Examiner, 9 May 1860, p.2. “Grave Accusations Gravely Met”.
38 Auckland Examiner, 9 May 1860, p.2. Letter: “Political Parsons” from ‘Colonist’.
Not all however agreed with the vehemence of the *Examiner’s* attacks. The Governor was also a target, for the paper felt war was a threat to Auckland’s eminence, safety and progress. As Gore-Browne wrote privately: “So you see I am between three foes, the settlers, the missionaries and the Maories, but whether Archdeacon Hadfield or the *Examiner* newspaper is the fiercest would be difficult to decide.”

The attacks on missionaries printed in the *Auckland Examiner* worried many of the colonial elite. Their concern was that such sentiment would be used against the colonists by missionaries in their reports back to Britain. For just as there was no single unified Church narrative, neither is there a single settler one. Varying shades of opinion and concern are evident amongst the settlers. While there were those settlers holding violent opinions against both missionary and Maori, there were others prepared to take a more tempered line.

The *Canterbury Standard*, under Joseph Brittan, whilst scathing of some missionaries (for example giving the sacrament to “a hoary polygamist chief and...his four wives”, and also raising claims of missionary infidelity), condemned the *Examiner’s* tactics, worrying that its statements were so extreme and so “very injudicious” that they would not only undermine the plausibility of the colonist’s defence, but will also invoke further Maori support of “their missionaries” in a “kind of...
crusade of sanctity”. Likewise, the Taranaki settler, Jane Maria Atkinson, in writing to Emily Richmond (wife of her brother C.W. Richmond and sister to her husband, Arthur) felt little was gained by the “tongues and pens” of “the violently anti-missionary people such as the Auckland Examiner represents”. Yet their existence made her convinced of the need for statements from “the tolerably moderate and temperate party amongst the Colonists”.

Such statements, many colonists felt, were needed to combat the impact of the high-profile and well-connected ‘Church Party’ opposition - especially that of Selwyn. For through their Church contacts, their sentiments and opinions were being heard in Britain. Jane’s brother, William Richmond, then both colonial Treasurer and Minister of Native Affairs, was worried about the “great weight” Selwyn carried “at home”, and feeling (as his wife put it) that it is so difficult for an unknown person to counteract the impressions given by anyone so widely known and admired as Bishop Selwyn who knows the natives so well and who knows nothing of the settlers, their burdens and their wants.

---

41 Canterbury Standard, 10 May, 1860, p.4: “For the Northern Maoris know everything that is published as well as the Europeans”.
42 Jane Maria Atkinson (1824-1914), sister of the ‘Taranaki Richmonds’, emigrated to New Zealand in 1853. In 1854, aged 28, she married the 19 year-old Arthur Atkinson (1833-1902), who was to become editor of the Taranaki Herald, a provincial politician, and MHR for Omata 1866-68. He then trained as a lawyer and settled in Nelson. Jane was critical of her brother C.W. Richmond’s caution as Native Minister, believing the Waitara was an issue of British law and sovereignty.
44 C. W. Richmond (1821-95), educated at University College, London, and having trained as a lawyer, arrived in New Zealand in 1853. By 1855 he was elected MHR, in 1856 joining Stafford’s ministry, appointed Colonial Treasurer (1856-61) and Minister of Native Affairs (1858-60). A believer in strong central government, he also believed it essential to ‘civilize’ Maori, and so defended the Government over Waitara. In 1861 he became a Supreme Court Judge in Dunedin, then Nelson, and from 1873, Wellington.
45 Henry Sewell, writing in his Journal of a public meeting in Auckland (20 May 1860) that abused Selwyn and his clergy stated: “The Bishop I think has not been discreet but one cannot bear to hear such a man abused by more vulgar clamouers”. (Journal, 21 May 1860, p.86).
This was an increasingly common lament; that the clerical opposition was biased against the colonists, of whom they knew very little, having been swayed by their long residence amongst Maori.  

The Governor meanwhile was feeling himself in an increasingly helpless position, believing, by June 1860, that little could be expected of either ‘Church Party’ or settlers, for both were “not very reasonable in their views”. He saw that problems would only increase due to a combination of settlers demanding more land, many newspapers indulging in what he termed “violence and extreme indiscretions” and the Government statements and actions being misrepresented by “the insidious advice of masterful traitors”. At the same time, some missionaries had shown a “great want of wisdom”. Yet he could still write to the Colonial Secretary of the “highest respect” in which he held Selwyn and most of his supporters, believing that it was their “zeal and horror of war”, and concern for Maori that led them into the “impolicy” and “disloyalty” of their cause. By the end of the year, Gore-Browne was remarking to Lord Belhaven (1793-1868) of his surprise that, as a loyal “Episcopalian” he was “opposed so violently and I may say unreasonably” by its dignitaries, yet was

---

47 As the *Auckland Register* stated, attitudes towards the ‘missionaries’ might improve “If they mix a little more with their white brethren and preach at them less.” (13 May 1860, p.2).
49 Ibid., 5 July 1860, p.3. “To Mr Gardner”.
50 From a letter Gore-Browne wrote to Selwyn, but did not send, it appears that “most’ did not include Hadfield: “My dear Lord; if I remember rightly you informed me that only one half of the one hundred pounds per annum which you are good enough to administer for me was devoted to the maintenance of a Native Clergyman at Otaki. [Hadfield’s mission]. I do not wish to subscribe to anything at Otaki and shall be delighted if you will transfer that half of my subscription to the Melanesian Mission.”
supported by Presbyterians and Methodists.\textsuperscript{52} While in another letter, he states that he almost expects a crusade of Maori, supported by the Anglican clergy.\textsuperscript{53}

However, if any crusade was to be conducted in this first year of conflict, it was the verbal one in the House of Representatives against the ‘Church Party’, and primarily, Hadfield. What roused Parliamentary and public opprobrium was the appearance, in April 1860, of a 500-signature petition from Otaki Maori, praying for the recall of the Governor and complaining of his proceedings to the Queen. Although Hadfield denied any direct involvement, this was not believed - with Henry Sewell stating, in what was representative of settler opinion: “No doubt this memorial has been instigated, if not got up by Archdeacon Hadfield, who seems to be rabid and as wrong as he is rabid.”\textsuperscript{54}

The common settler sentiment was that Hadfield had drawn up the Petition.\textsuperscript{55} This arose out of two views; firstly that Hadfield was an meddler in politics, and secondly,


Henry Sewell, referring to the ‘Otaki Petition’ of April 1860 mentions “The Wesleyans and all other missionary bodies side with the Governor’s tendencies”. (\textit{Journal}, 25 April 1860, p.68).

A letter to the \textit{Auckland Register} from a Taranaki settler (“Miles”), states that it is only Church of England missionaries opposed to the Governor “for it is well known that missionaries of the other denominations are most loyal, most energetic, and most devoted on the Governor’s behalf”.

(\textit{Auckland Register}, 28 May 1860, p.3. Letter).

While a letter to the \textit{Hawke’s Bay Herald} makes a clear distinction between “missionaries” and the Anglican clergy in the towns who are “worthy, sincere and universally respected”. It states that they are different groups, therefore the actions of the “missionaries” cannot discredit clergy ministering to the settlers. (\textit{Hawke’s Bay Herald}, 15 December 1860, p.2. Letter from Robert Donaldson).

\textsuperscript{54} H. Sewell, \textit{Journal}, 25 April 1860, p.68.

\textsuperscript{55} Gore-Browne wrote to the Duke of Newcastle of his suspicions that this was so because it was “an evident translation from English,...[and] a great proportion of the names are in a European’s handwriting”. This made him question the “genuineness (sic) of the signatures”.

\textit{AJHR 1860}, 1E - No.1A No. 1., Appendix 2. 28 April 1860.

Copy of despatch from Gore-Browne to the Duke of Newcastle, No.42.

On 25 May 1860, on forwarding the Petition, the Governor states “It may be necessary to say that Otaki is the residence of Archdeacon Hadfield, but your Grace will not desire that I make any other comment”. \textit{AJHR 1860}, 1E -No.1A No.2., Copy of despatch No.52.
betraying a racial and cultural bias, that Maori were incapable of such action under their own volition. In prominent opposition to Hadfield over this matter was the Reformed Presbyterian minister, James Duncan. Duncan had, by this time, encountered sixteen years of opposition to his mission from Hadfield, and so we enter the murky world of inter-denominational rivalry. Both privately and publicly, Duncan stated that the Petition was a forgery in which Hadfield played a major part. Hadfield always denied this, especially the claims made by Duncan and Henry Turton that Ihakara (a Manawatu chief and past Maori Mission teacher for Hadfield) had stated that Hadfield was behind the Petition, and that the names of Manawatu Maori were fraudulently affixed to the Petition. Hadfield vehemently denied this, writing directly to the Duke of Newcastle denying any involvement, claiming that Ihakara, having been dismissed from his post by Hadfield, “for reasons immaterial to the present question...has never lost an opportunity of endeavoring to thwart me”. He states that

---

56 James Duncan (1813-1907), arrived in New Zealand in 1843 as the Reformed Presbyterian Church’s first missionary to Maori. Educated at Glasgow University, Duncan undertook his mission in the Manawatu and Rangiteiki, having had his presence at Kapakahia opposed, on denominational rivalry, by Hadfield. In 1848 he established a mission at Foxton, was still opposed by Hadfield yet continued his labours in the area until his death. He was twice Moderator of the General Assembly of the northern Presbyterian Church (1863 and 1888).

57 J. Duncan, Papers. (MS-Papers-0032-0252; MS-Copy-Micro-0535-050) A.T.L., 30 October 1860, p.2: “I can assert as a fact that the names of most of the native men residing in my immediate neighborhood at Te awa hou, Manawatu, were affixed to the Petition without their having heard or seen, or been in anyway consulted in the matter.”

58 Duncan was reported in the New Zealand Advertiser (15 September 1860, p.2) as stating that nearly 400 of the 501 signatures are false. He accuses “native teachers” of forgery and states that Hadfield “must have known [it] was really ficticious”.

59 Henry Turton (1818-87), son of a Wesleyan minister, he too was ordained and arrived in New Zealand in 1840. Active as a missionary in both Northland (1840-45) and Taranaki (1845-56), he then retired from mission work in 1858, becoming a government interpreter. He was Resident Magistrate in the Manawatu.

60 Turton wrote to Gore-Browne, 12 May 1860. AJHR E - No.1A Enclosure 3 in No.2. While Duncan wrote to Turton, 24 May 1860. AJHR E - No.1A Sub Enclosure 1 to Enclosure in No.3.

the Petition is neither a translation, nor in a European’s handwriting, believing it “was a genuine and spontaneous expression of the opinions of the natives of that district”. 62

It is a complex issue - did Hadfield aid the petition - or was Ihakara lying and misleading Duncan and Turton? Hadfield’s mention of a grudge directed by Ihakara towards himself may be true, yet Duncan was later prepared to state that Ihakara was known amongst the Europeans of the Manawatu “for his truthfulness”. 63

The truthfulness of Hadfield was increasingly questioned by settlers, 64 this Petition being the bellows that fanned the sparks of suspicion. Soon there were reports that the Kingitanga flag was spotted flying over the Otaki Mission, Hadfield it seemed, had gone over to the Maori cause. Yet these accusations were but a prelude to two events which were to agitate settler opinion vociferously against him. The first was the suspicion that he had knowingly withheld letters from Kingi to the Governor, the second was his open letter to the Duke of Newcastle; One of England’s Little Wars, sent to the Times (London) in May 1860.

The issue of Hadfield and Kingi’s correspondence became embroiled in the debate on the Native Offenders Bill and provided opportunity for a series of attacks upon the character of both Hadfield and the ‘Church Party’. The letters seemed to suggest that Kingi was prepared to continue talks with the Governor on the issue of the disputed

62 Ibid.
63 J. Duncan, Papers. 30 October 1860, p.2.
At this time he was still asserting “as a fact” that, at least some names were fraudulently affixed to the Petition.
64 The New Zealand Advertiser, 10 October 1860, p.3, carried a report of a public meeting held in Napier on 15 September 1860, that, upset over the Petition, moved and carried “That this meeting is in the opinion that Archdeacon Hadfield has, in reference to the war in Taranaki, acted in a
ownership of the Waitara. This had been forwarded to Hadfield to relay to the Governor. This he failed to accomplish, his excuse being that Abraham had told him to wait until the Governor was more freely available and so his good intentions were overtaken by the speed of events. This failed to convince many of the settlers. Hadfield, they felt had ulterior motives to withhold such correspondence. If conflict did eventuate then either the Government forces would be defeated and Kingi would be left alone, or that conflict would be halted by a combination of ‘Exeter House’ lobbying and Colonial Office disinclination to become involved in a costly colonial war. All of this was and is of course conjecture – yet the underlying issue is that Hadfield was trusted by neither settlers nor Government. He seemed too quick and enthusiastic to involve himself in matters of politics, and to evince an air of smug superiority that his was the only right, just and true cause and action to take. The general line of settler attack was that if Hadfield had knowingly withheld the letters, then “on his head shall rest the guilt of blood”. As Henry Sewell noted: “It looks as if [Hadfield] had been backing up the rebels by sympathy, if not counsel...This is not I am sure, the duty of clergymen.”

The predominant opinion was that the actions of Hadfield and his colleagues “had damaged themselves and their influence, [and] brought reproach upon the Church”.

---

65 NZPD 1860: 3 August, p.201. Mr Weld, House, Native Offenders Bill.
67 NZPD 1860, 30 August p.411. Mr Harris, Address To His Excellency, Council.

John Harris (1825-86), arrived in Dunedin in 1850, practising as a lawyer. He was one of the ‘Little Enemy’, Dunedin Episcopalians who acted against the Free Church ethos and influence in the settlement. Heavily involved in provincial politics, he was also a member of the Legislative Council 1858-64, and again in 1867.
Hadfield was castigated as the exemplar of the political parson, he was a “firebrand”, almost a “maniac”, who “overflowed with bitterness”.  

Yet Hadfield and his ‘Party’ were to receive support from somewhat unexpected quarters. Two parliamentary pressure groups saw in Hadfield’s hostility to Gore-Browne’s actions, and in his considered rebuttal of the ‘89 questions’ before the House, a situation which could be exploited to put pressure on both the Governor, and especially the Stafford Ministry. In Auckland there had arisen the direct purchasers, who desired the end of the Crown’s pre-emption in buying Maori land. If Maori could be induced or allowed to sell directly to settlers, there were large profits to be (potentially) made for Pakeha speculators. Leading the charge were T. S. Forsaith and Hugh Carleton who, as editor of the Southern Cross had a permanent vehicle to express his opinions, which, for a time, meant it became known as a “missionary organ”. In Wellington, Hadfield entered into alliance with the Wellington Provincialists - led by Fox, Featherston and Fitzherbert. They had long been opposed

---

68 Nelson Examiner, 5 September 1860, p.2. As it also stated: “The proceedings of Archdeacon Hadfield, and the attitude taken by most, if not all of the clergymen of the Church of England party in this matter, have produced a most painful impression on the minds of many people who have a sincere regard for religion, and wish to be able to look upon its ministers with respect and veneration.”

69 Thomas Forsaith (1814-98), from a Primitive Congregationalist background, arrived in New Zealand in 1838. Having been a settler, he was, in 1843, appointed a protector of Aborigines. He was then a prominent Auckland draper, then in 1854 elected MHR, forming a very short Ministry (31 August to 2 September) that same year. In 1858, elected again to the House (having acted for a year as editor of the New Zealander), his strong pro-Maori sentiments soon caused his defeat in 1860. By 1865 he was Congregational pastor in Port Chalmers.

70 The Auckland Examiner, (naturally) attacking ‘Church Influence’ on the newspapers stated: “The Southern Cross is the Church organ. The New Zealander is the Wesleyan organ”. (18 July 1860, p.2).

71 Issac Featherston (1813-76), trained as a doctor, arriving in New Zealand in 1841 as a New Zealand Company ship’s surgeon. First editor of the Wellington Independent in 1845, his attacks on New Zealand Company ship policy led to a duel with Colonel William Wakefield in 1847. In 1853 he was elected first Superintendent of Wellington, and a MHR from 1853-70, firstly for Wanganui and from 1855, for Wellington.

72 William Fitzherbert (1810-91), though trained as a doctor, became a merchant in Wellington from 1841. Active in both provincial and national politics, he was later both Colonial Treasurer and Speaker of the House and Legislative Council.
to Hadfield, but pragmatism and political opportunity forced a new alliance in opposition to the Government.\textsuperscript{73} The lines between ‘Church Party’ and settler were always fluid in the pursuit of mutual advantage. It must be stressed however that such fluidity occurred at what could be termed the elite level of a small colonial society.

Those settlers and (especially non-conformist) clergy without entrance to such a level, in tandem with those settlers outside Auckland and Wellington tended to be resolute in their opposition to ‘Church Party’ actions and alliances – and always somewhat suspicious of the political and personal motives of politicians from those two centres.

For while such support and alliances (pragmatic though they may have been) were a victory for the ‘Church Party’, it only further incensed the opposition who saw it as further evidence that clergy were “inter-meddling” in politics.\textsuperscript{74} The publication of Hadfield’s pamphlet only served to harden such opposition,\textsuperscript{75} and when it was followed by Sir William Martin’s denunciation of the war (\textit{The Taranaki Question}, 1860),\textsuperscript{76} the political leaders of settler opinion were provoked into providing their own narrative.

\textsuperscript{73} Emily Richmond wrote to Harry Atkinson: “The ministry will have a hard fight for life...The Wellington men are taking part with the Bishop, they call the war unjust and unholy...the wretched Auckland members are almost to a man for peace at any price.” G.H. Scholefield, ed., \textit{The Richmond-Atkinson Papers}, vol.1., p.629. Emily Richmond to Harry Atkinson, Auckland, 25 August 1860.

\textsuperscript{74} \textit{NZPD} 1860, 11 September, p.479. Mr C.W. Richmond, House, Native Offenders Bill: “...he much regretted that the clergy should leave their true place and compromise their real utility by descending into the dust and heat of the political arena.”

\textsuperscript{75} The \textit{Taranaki Herald} forcibly stating: “It is however transparent through every word this arrogant person has spoken or written, that what he calls opinions are the passionate feelings of a man who combines womanly weakness with priestly presumption.” (24 November 1860, p.2). Likewise, the \textit{New Zealand Advertiser} labeled Hadfield “violent and unscrupulous”, while his pamphlet showed “how dangerous it would be to intrust (sic) men of his stamp with any secular authority”.(17 November 1860, p.2).

\textsuperscript{76} There were those who were, if not welcoming, then accepting of the past Chief Justice’s pamphlet. The \textit{Taranaki Herald} stating “It is the most temperate and able statement of the missionary view, on the subject of the war, that has appeared, or is likely to appear”. (12 January 1861, p.2). At the same time, it rebuked Hadfield and Selwyn for their “railing” at their opposition and for being “seduced” by their “clerical positions” in their ‘blanket’ attacks against their “fellow countrymen
Martin's pamphlet carried considerable weight\textsuperscript{77} because of his past position as Chief Justice. His appeal was a moral one, based on Treaty obligations toward Maori tenure, viewing them as "a question of title".\textsuperscript{78} By such reasoning, he was directly opposing the predominant settler sentiment that Waitara was actually a question of sovereignty.\textsuperscript{79} Martin's view was based on a belief and notion of the communal nature of Maori land ownership\textsuperscript{80}, that is, the land belonged to the whole tribe. His point was that this included the need to consult the local chief if the land was to be offered for sale.\textsuperscript{81} Kingi therefore, as local chief, had the right of veto - a right that the Government (and Teira) did not respect. As he saw it, such a failure to observe and protect "the Native owners" also meant that the Government failed to protect "itself and the Colony".\textsuperscript{82} He acknowledged that the situation was both difficult and complex, but did state that, at heart, it was a question about land and "had no connection with the Queen's sovereignty".\textsuperscript{83} His conclusion argued that:

\begin{quote}
What is needed for the government of the New Zealanders is neither terrorism nor sentimentalism, but simple justice:- that plain promises be plainly kept; that our policy be
\end{quote}

in the mass, and rebuking them as a generation of vipers". (ibid.).

\textsuperscript{77} Claudia Orange mentions that it was twice reprinted in London and at least once in New Zealand in 1861, and was also tabled in the House of Lords. (\textit{The Treaty of Waitangi}, p.286; reference 70).

\textsuperscript{78} C. Orange, \textit{The Treaty of Waitangi}, pp.154-55.

\textsuperscript{79} As a letter from 'X' to the \textit{Otago Witness} stated of the 'Church Party' stance: "...its sanction of William King's asserted legal position as regards the land, is that rebel's strong point...New Zealand cannot contain two Empires - one representing Constitutional Government, the other sacred totalitarian domination; the one European, the other native." (27 October 1860, p.5. Letter: "Military Operations at Taranaki").


\textsuperscript{81} Ibid., p.3.

\textsuperscript{82} Ibid., p.62.

\textsuperscript{83} Ibid., p.95. In discussing "The Consequences", Martin states that Waitara occurred not because of any "disloyalty, disaffection or resistance to the law" by Kingi or his people, "but simply because it was desirable to open the Waitara land". He interestingly states "The purpose was good and laudable in itself", thereby stating that his concern is ultimately with the method and not the motive of the action (p.95). His pamphlet is thereby a sub-narrative of the 'Church Party' approach, and it is sentiment such as this that gained him the begrudging admiration of the settlers; for , to them, his argument was seen as one borne of a sense of 'reason and legality', not 'emotion'.
perfectly open and friendly and straightforward; that we deal with the Natives as our fellow-
subjects and fellow-men.\(^{84}\)

Leading the opposition to Martin's memorandum was C.W. Richmond,\(^{85}\) author of
his own memorandum, and attributed influence (and author?) behind another. In that
issued under his own name, he stated his opinion from the outset - it was a "struggle"
for sovereignty and part of a war "which threatens to become National".\(^{86}\) Taking the
line of the lawyer that he was, his overall argument was that Maori, having ceded
sovereignty to the British in signing the Treaty, were in a state of rebellion if they
opposed the Crown's assertion of British law in land dealings.\(^{87}\) Whatever occurred, a
successful outcome ("To have saved and civilized the Native Race") could involve
actions "as selfish, and almost as shameful, as tyranny itself".\(^{88}\) The other work of
concerted opposition was a Government treatise, originally attributed to Richmond,
but now considered the effort of Francis Dillon Bell,\(^{89}\) Frederick Whitaker\(^{90}\) and

\(^{84}\) Ibid., p.130.
\(^{85}\) The impetus behind Richmond's actions are stated in a letter to J. S. Atkinson (London): "The
Philo-Maori party rather stole a march upon us with Sir William Martin's pamphlet"
G. H. Scholefield, ed., The Richmond-Atkinson Papers. vol.1, p.678. C. W. Richmond to J. S.
Atkinson (London), 16 January 1861.
His brother was less circumspect, stating of "the Hadfield Featherston faction": "They are terrible
traitors and Martin must be sadly wanting in depth to have acted and thought as he has done".
Richmond, 27 January 1861.
\(^{86}\) C. W. Richmond, Memorandum on the Taranaki question; reviewing a pamphlet by Sir William
Martini, D.C.L., late chief justice of New Zealand (sic) on the same subject (Auckland s. n. 1861),
p.1. (A.T.L.)
\(^{87}\) C. Orange, The Treaty of Waitangi, p.151.
\(^{88}\) C. W. Richmond, Memorandum on the Taranaki question..., p.25.
\(^{89}\) Frances Dillon Bell (1821-98), having worked for the New Zealand Company in England, arrived
in New Zealand in 1843, and by 1847 was New Zealand Company agent in New Plymouth,
followed by a time in Nelson. A member of both the Legislative Council and the Wellington
Provincial Council, Bell was also a land claims Commissioner. In 1860, now farming in Otago, he
was elected MHR and also administered the Native Office1861-2. Minister of Native Affairs under
Domett, he advised Grey of the invalidity of the Waitara purchase,(having previously defended it)
but supported the war in Waikato. After a long involvement in colonial politics, he was appointed
to London in 1880, but returned, finally, to New Zealand in 1896.
\(^{90}\) Frederick Whitaker (1812-91), a lawyer, arrived in New Zealand in 1840. A long serving member
of the Legislative Council, he was Attorney General on seven occasions and Premier 1863-4 and
Governor Gore-Browne. They too, regarded the Waitara as a question of sovereignty, especially as the King Movement was involved, and quoted a number of missionary sources (Morgan, John Wilson, Richard Taylor) to support this view. The authors were also highly critical of 'Church Party' publications, calling them “one of the most serious embarrassments against which the Government has had to contend”, for (they contend) such publications lead Maori into believing there is a new course of Government policy which will “wrestle” their lands from them “and subverting the rights they possess under the Treaty of Waitangi”. Their conclusion was that “the existence of British law” has not been what it could or should have been - being “practically a fiction except in the immediate neighborhood of the English settlements”. Yet they denied that any Governor or Government of New Zealand had ever committed an act of injustice against Maori.

It was the continued involvement, and rise, of the Kingitanga that hardened settler opinion. To them this was clear evidence that the issues were those of sovereignty. As Gore-Browne’s wife stated, to have “neglected Terra’s right” (to sell the Waitara) would have encouraged both the Land League and the King Movement “which has as its aim distinct and separate nationality independent of English Law and the Queen’s supremacy”. Martin had taken the opposing view, stating that it was of little wonder that Maori, having gained “so little good” and being threatened “with so much evil”

1882-3. A member of the Auckland “war party”, he aimed at large-scale Maori land confiscation. He was also involved in industry, mining and banking.

91 Notes on Sir William Martin’s Pamphlet entitled The Taranaki Question, (Published for the New Zealand Government), Auckland January 1861 (Revised Copy). [Dunedin: Hocken Library Facsimile No.18, University of Otago, 1968], p.2.
92 Notes on Sir William Martin’s Pamphlet...p.28.
93 Ibid., p.130.
94 Ibid.
95 H. L. Gore-Browne, Narrative of the Waitara Purchase and the Taranaki War, ed. W. P. Morrell
from European Government, had wondered if they could implement a better system than that enforced by the Europeans. As he stated: “Can we wonder that, under all these circumstances, the King Movement and other forms of jealous and unfriendly combination have arisen and gathered strength?”

Martin’s terminology is interesting, for it is a public signaling of the wariness with which the ‘Church Party’ viewed Kingitanga. Robert Burrows, secretary of the New Zealand CMS expressed similar sentiments; on the one hand commending Kingitanga for their desire to protect their land from uncontrolled sale, and for the establishment of law and order in the face of Government neglect, and yet expressing opposition to what could be termed Wiremu Thompson’s “acts of sovereignty.” He also implied a general ‘Church Party’ agreement that the King Movement should be put down.

Harriet Gore-Browne had expressed a certain sympathy with such aims, for “some of the leaders were actuated by a patriotism as disinterested as any shown by the Hannibals and Wallaces of the Northern world.” However her opposition was based on a sentiment remarkably similar to that expressed by the ‘Church Party’ - that


Mary Hobhouse (1818-64), wife of Edward Hobhouse (1817-1904), Bishop of Nelson, expressed similar criticisms, stating privately: “The Maories wisely enough have profound contempt for the collective wisdom of the millers and public-house keepers of New Zealand as expressed in the debates of the Assembly and unless a Governor can have full powers to conduct native affairs I don’t know how they can be conducted. How can the natives expect justice when the people who covet every inch of their land, are the makers of laws?” quoted in S. Tunnicliffe, ed., The Selected Letters of Mary Hobhouse, (Wellington: Daphne Brasell Associates Press, 1990), p.72 [8 April 1861].


While calling the Maori King a “great man” and “a clever, shrewd fellow”, Burrows states that the ‘Church Party’ want him “to do away with the name King and pull down what is known as the King’s flag”. ‘Wiremu Thompson’ and ‘William Thompson’ are the same person as Wiremu Tamihana.

98 Ibid., p.4. In writing of the Governor, Burrows states: “In trying to put down the King movement we are all with him and we shall use all our persuasive powers to put a stop to it.”
Kingitanga would prove itself “a source of ruin” to Maori, as well as resulting in loss of settler life and property. John Morgan, of course, had been in no doubt that it was such, having informed the London CMS in October 1860 that Waikato Maori had left his mission “with the expressed intention of endeavoring to take and hold the whole province of New Plymouth”. This signaled to him that it was no longer a war concerning the Waitara, “but a war to establish the ‘mana’ or sovereignty of the Maori King, and hold New Plymouth by conquest”. Gore-Browne certainly agreed, quoting Morgan in his lengthy despatch to the Duke of Newcastle of 4 December 1860. Wiremu Thompson had meanwhile answered the Governor: “I do not desire to cast the Queen from this island, but, from my piece [of land]. I am to be the person to overlook my piece.”

In the settler communities debate still raged over whether clergy could “overlook their piece”- and what exactly this “piece” entailed. There were claims that “Selwyn’s policy” aimed at “Domination of the native race under Church missionary influence” and also at “political influence”. The ‘Church Party’ was described as “a distinct and

99 H. L. Gore-Browne, Narrative of the Waitara Purchase and the Taranaki War, p.9.
100 J. Morgan, Letters and Journals, 23 October 1860, p.649. Letter to London CMS.
By September 1861 he was reporting that Kingites were altering services by omitting prayers for the Royal Family and praying “O Lord, save the King”. Morgan stated he was frequently requested to omit prayers for the Queen, and that (during the war) part of his congregation would leave the chapel while prayers for the Queen were read: “Nothing proves more than this the feeling and infatuation of the people”. (Letters and Journals, 4 September 1861, pp.729-30. Letter to London CMS).
Morgan states the issue for Kingites is “whether the King or the Queen shall possess the mana of New Zealand”. Gore-Browne also refers to a statement he made very early in the war (22 March 1860) “that the question of the purchase is an insignificant piece of land is merged with the far greater one of nationality”. E-No.1. p.24, point 116.
102 AJHR 1861, E - No.1 B. No. 20. Copy of a letter from William Thompson to his Excellency the Governor. Ngaruawahia, June 7, 1861.
influential party in political warfare”. In the settler press such involvement was often perceived as jesuitical in influence- if not intent.

But it was not only local, colonial opinion that circulated, there was increasing recourse to publishing articles from English newspapers, especially those supporting settler sentiment. This was often in response to what was viewed as unwarranted English-based opposition - as the Southern Cross stated:

We can stand our own clergy taking us soundly to task, and have had occasion to do so; but are not bound to stand whatever men at home may choose (sic) to say merely because they have subscribed money and associated themselves from a good motive.

In an attack clearly directed at Hadfield, the CMS were accused of acting as “political emissaries and spies”, involved in “misrepresenting all we do, and sending home garbled, if not false accounts of everything done”.

As well as the expected support for the colonist’s position from the New Zealand London Examiner, there were reprints from the Morning Chronicle such as

---

104 Nelson Examiner, 1 May 1861, p.2.
105 By December 1863 the Otago Daily Times would print an editorial congratulating English journalists for overcoming their “strong anti-colonial bias” and recognizing that the North Island conflicts were actually a struggle for supremacy, and not due to colonists coveting Maori land. Otago Daily Times, 26 December 1863, p.4.
There is a certain degree of self-congratulation about such sentiments as only two months earlier the same newspaper had editorialized against a general lack of clarity in the Government’s war policy. The paper stated that, in its perception it was to establish the Queen’s authority. This was contrasted with the newspapers of the North Island who, it claimed, spoke only of securing the “possession of the fair domains of the Maoris” with the aim “to sweep them from the face of the earth”. Otago Daily Times, 22 October 1863, p.4.
It can therefore be seen that each newspaper was not only promoting colonial causes but inter-island and provincial ones as well; issues of identity being paramount in a small, scattered society.

106 Southern Cross, 9 April 1861, p.3. Editorial: “Religion and New Zealand”. This was in opposition to what was seen as CMS England and ‘Exeter Hall’ interference in New Zealand affairs.
107 Ibid. Carleton having resigned as editor, the Southern Cross now obviously felt free to attack
"Ecclesiastical Usurpation of Authority"\textsuperscript{109}, the \textit{Saturday Review}: "An Expensive Governor"\textsuperscript{110}; and in the \textit{Taranaki Herald}, even the \textit{Economist}: "The Bishop of New Zealand and his Maori Clients", which stated "...spiritual friends are not always wise, but sometimes very foolish [and so]...fall into the habit of regarding all conflicting views as the offspring of selfish cupidity or restless ambition."\textsuperscript{111}

The appearance of such a piece in a small, colonial, provincial newspaper is explained by C.W. Richmond's friendship with Richard Holt Hutton, who was helping to edit the \textit{Economist} at this time. Richmond's brother-in-law, Arthur Atkinson, was a partner (and future editor 1863-6) in the \textit{Taranaki Herald}. In 1861, Hutton, soon to become editor of the \textit{Spectator}, wrote to Richmond stating:

\begin{quote}
In England, there is but one opinion amongst any who understand the question on the ability, high principles & just prudence which you have displayed throughout your difficult reign. The only paper (except the ultra-radical organs) that have assailed you here has been the \textit{Saturday Review} which is I believe connected through Mr Selwyn with the Bishop of New Zealand. In all the other papers there has been no difference of opinion & it has been an easy task to defend you.\textsuperscript{112}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{108} This printed articles such as "Priestly Interference in New Zealand" (14 January1861), reprinted in the \textit{Otago Witness} (30 March 1861, p.10); and, in a series of extracts presented in the \textit{New Zealand Advertiser} (16 March 1861, p.3), "conceives that there could be no case where the influence of the Church with the civil administration was calculated to do a greater act of mischief".

\textsuperscript{109} \textit{New Zealand Advertiser}, 11 May 1861, Printed as a second Editorial.

\textsuperscript{110} \textit{New Zealand Spectator}, 9 March 1861. Reprint from 8 December 1860: "...the Bishop of New Zealand has done all that human ingenuity can do to prejudice the world against a reasonable case. The Maoris have already to contend against the stigma - fatal in English eyes - of being under ecclesiastical patronage; and if anything was wanting to confirm that prepossession (sic), the Bishop has been careful to supply it."

\textsuperscript{111} \textit{Taranaki Herald}, 8 June 1861, p.4. Reprint from the \textit{Economist}, 23 February 1861.

\textsuperscript{112} G. H. Scholefield, ed., \textit{The Richmond-Atkinson Papers}, vol.1. p.713. R. H. Hutton to C. W. Richmond, 1861. "Mr Selwyn" most probably refers to Sir Charles Selwyn, youngest brother of the Bishop, who was at this time member of the House of Commons for Cambridge University. By 1864, the \textit{Times} (London) had joined the \textit{Saturday Review} in criticizing the war, especially the
It took the *Times* to put the matter into perspective, stating:

> The difficulty of getting to the bottom of a colonial question is proverbial. Everyone in a colony has an opinion; most have strong prejudices; and the facts of a case reach us involved in such a cloud of interference and theory that they are scarcely available as evidence.\(^{113}\)

It could have been expected that the declaration of peace in Taranaki on 8 April 1861 would have resulted in the end of settler attacks upon the ‘Church Party’, but, if anything, they increased. There was “a babel of opinions”,\(^ {114}\) in which the ‘Church Party’ were to celebrate the peace and the recall of Gore-Browne as a victory\(^ {115}\) - and which the settlers saw as the inter-meddling of political priests. The debate continued as to what exactly were the settler expectations of ‘their’ clergy. Those of the *Nelson Examiner* were clear; it looked back wistfully to the days when ‘the Church’ (Anglican) had been “the haven of order and moderation, a beacon in time of convulsion”. Yet it argued that its leaders ignored “the opinions and feelings” of its laity - and was attempting to reinstate a clerical influence that was anathema “to Englishmen”.\(^ {116}\)

\(^{114}\) H. Sewell, *Journal*, 5 May 1861.
\(^{115}\) *Taranaki Herald*, 12 May 1862, p.2, talked of “…our Church militant,- a little wearied with its long watch over our late recusant Governor, and lulled, perhaps, by its victory into a little false security.”
\(^{116}\) *Nelson Examiner*, 19 February 1862, p.2. “To Englishmen, the idea of a priesthood must be diluted before it is acceptable”.
The accusations of clerical “treason” continued unabated, for a variety of reasons. Firstly there was a general expectation amongst the settlers the conflict with Maori was far from over. It seemed a question of when conflict would break out, not if. The settlers were aware of the impact the ‘Church party’ had made back in Britain and were determined that, in any future conflict the only opposition they had to worry about was that of Maori which they could combat with physical force. Associated with this was a sense that the nature of the future direction of the colony was at stake. Were missionaries to gain what was perceived as an undue influence upon affairs of State? The Lyttleton Times went as far as to label Bishop Selwyn “A Traitor” for his inferred action against “the Queen’s government”\textsuperscript{117} while the spectre of the Paraguayan Jesuit theocracy was continually alluded to. Yet missionaries were not only attacked for their success, the rise of Pai Marire and the continuation of the Kingitanga provided examples by which the settlers could attack the ‘missionaries’ for a perceived failure amongst Maori. So on the one hand undue influence over settler lives was criticized, while a lack of influence over Maori was lamented. The underlying message was clear, missionaries were there to domesticate Maori to British civilization, expectations and rule, not to act as moral and spiritual policemen over settler lives. Such interference became a national debate:

Missionary Influence! What an expression this has now become! I am haunted by it. In every newspaper it stares me in the face, at every fireside it is hurled at me as the source of all Colonial woes, and in every hotel and café it is a staple topic on which to heap maledictions and execrations!\textsuperscript{118}

\textsuperscript{117} Lyttleton Times, 21 March 1862, reprinted in the New Zealand Advertiser, 31 March 1862, p.3.
\textsuperscript{118} Wanganui Chronicle, 27 March 1862, p.3. “Missionary Influence”. This article is a succinct summary of sentiment common throughout the colonial papers at this time. From Auckland to Dunedin, from Hawke’s Bay to Taranaki, the tirade of abuse directed against the missionaries occurs
However there was also now an inter-Island divide developing. The South Island, experiencing new found prosperity from the Otago goldfields, was increasingly wary of further involvement in what was now being seen (and promoted) as a North Island conflict. The *Otago Daily Times* could now present sentiment critical of both missionary and Government handling of the Kingitanga, because the missionaries, while recognizing "the convulsion...in the native mind" failed to see its "revolutionary elements"; while the Government, saw its "subversive tendency, but failed to ascribe it to its proper cause". As the Canterbury politician, Fitzgerald, claimed in the House, both missionaries and Colonial Government had pursued and created "a policy of disunion and severance between the two races".

The situation was that there were now two claimants to sovereignty in New Zealand - the King, and the Queen. In colonial eyes, even to tacitly recognize the King would undermine the sovereignty of the Queen, encourage further Maori moves, and give another victory the 'Church Party'. For most colonists, especially those in the North Island, there was no alternative - the King Movement had to be crushed, or peace would never properly eventuate. The complexity and emotion of the period is well summed-up by the Wesleyan missionary Alexander Reid. As he lamented:

> If he said one thing; it would be said that he was a peace-at-any-price man; and if he said another thing, he would be put down as a war man; whereas he was neither. He did not want to

---

119 *Otago Daily Times*, 15 October 1862, p.4.
120 *NZPD*, 6 August 1862, p.487. Mr Fitzgerald, Native Affairs, House.
introduce politics; but, in the present state of affairs he was sorry to say they could not be avoided, if anything was to be said concerning the natives.\textsuperscript{121}

Selwyn was also to experience similar difficulties when, according to his biographer, Tucker, "he could not allow 10,000 men to go to battle with no one to care for their spiritual interests", even though he did not agree with the Waikato expedition and he knew that this "would be misconstrued by his Maori flock into an espousing of the cause of their enemies".\textsuperscript{122} In May 1863, fighting had begun again in Taranaki, while the Government invasion of the Waikato commenced in July. This was an act of "calculated aggression",\textsuperscript{123} a move designed to impose British sovereignty and one which, in the settler mind, veered sharply towards a crusade for civilization.

But before this occurred, settlers were growing increasingly uneasy with what was seen as the damaging influence of the 'Church Party' (and especially Selwyn) upon Governor Grey and his policies. The familiar accusations of unwarranted missionary influence at Government House reappeared,\textsuperscript{124} with even calls circulating for the recall of Grey and the exiling of Selwyn "until the Native question assumes a different aspect".\textsuperscript{125}

The Taranaki outbreak was seen as precipitating a new stage and type of conflict. The fact that soldiers were ambushed outraged the settlers:

\textsuperscript{121} \textit{Otago Daily Times}, 17 December 1862, p.6. "Wesleyans at Waipu".
\textsuperscript{123} B. J. Dalton, \textit{War and Politics in New Zealand 1855-1870}, p.178.
\textsuperscript{124} \textit{Lyttelton Times}, 1 July 1863, p.4, in referring to past Governor Gore-Browne stated: "In withholding from the colonists the management of native affairs he was chiefly guided by the Missionary party, which has so often and so mischievously interfered with secular affairs in this colony.
\textsuperscript{125} \textit{Hawke's Bay Times}, 23 February 1863, p.2, Editorial.
The most rabid of the philo-Maori party cannot this time accuse the Governor or the Colonial Ministry with precipitating hostilities; even the martyr-worshipping clerical party must submit to direct its sympathy towards its countrymen and co-religionists.¹²⁶

One response was the increased vilification of Maori: "they are in short as a nation, heathens whitewashed, and savages with the thinnest possible veneer of civilization..."¹²⁷ The 'Church Party' were increasingly referred to as "fanatics".¹²⁸ This linkage enabled settlers to narrate their campaign as one of reason and civilization. As the Nelson Examiner stated: "The conviction of an external power must be forced upon the Maori mind, before you can begin to build up habits of legality."¹²⁹

What was occurring was the collapse of the old “tri-partite New Zealand” which could no longer hope to co-exist peacefully.¹³⁰ Underlying the issue, no matter if it was relabelled as 'sovereignty' or 'civilization' was the issue of land. Hobsbawm has attributed such conflict in “new lands” to a changing conception of land due to the influences of the Enlightenment and a general, attendant, bourgeois revolution. When such concepts were transplanted to the colonies, conflict occurred between those

¹²⁶ Otago Daily Times, 18 May 1863, p.4. Editorial on the outbreak of war.
¹²⁷ Daily Southern Cross, 29 June 1863, p.3.
¹²⁸ Lyttleton Times, 5 September 1863, p.2. This states that missionary teaching has resulted in Maori comparing their situation to that of Ahab and Naboth's vineyard (1 Kings 21). Classical allusions were also used, with Selwyn "and his co-adjusters" accused of scattering "the fabled dragon's teeth"- which are seen to be "everywhere whitening for an abundant future". The New Zealand Herald, 30 November 1863 stated that as Maori "are a singularly imaginative race" their religious instruction has resulted in their drawing 'preposterous conclusions'. One of which, it was claimed, was that the colonists were the 'Philistines', with General Cameron as 'Goliath.' Maori were 'the children of Israel' and Tamihana was 'David'. Therefore, just as "God" had fought 'through' David and the Israelites, so "he would fight for the Maori and overthrow the Pakeha." (p.3).
¹²⁹ Nelson Examiner, 2 May 1863, p.2.
¹³⁰ J. Belich, Making Peoples, p.192.
regarding the natural and rational view to be that property was individual and perfectly alienable - and those that did not.\textsuperscript{131} Hence the Colonial Government’s moves to encourage Maori land selling (and aims to promote individual title), and their opposition to ‘Land Leagues’ and Kingitanga whose views were opposed to this.\textsuperscript{132} Supporting such views was the Victorian Chain of Being’, that conceptual slide-rule that enabled and facilitated the categorization and classification of all that was encountered. In the colonial situation, Europeans gave themselves the task and right (often out of a mixture of ‘measures’ including religion, science and technology) of defining the meaning of a civilization - and of civilization itself. This was considered both important and necessary in the colonial encounter which occurred in “spaces of dissolution”, those areas where, it was felt, “civilization could so easily dissolve into barbarism”.\textsuperscript{133} The ‘Church Party’ attacks on the “rapacity and greed” of the settlers reinforced the need for such a division to be made - they had to show that they were different, that physical transplantation had not resulted in cultural regression.

Therefore, William Fox could claim in 1851 that in the “escape” from “barbarism” there were three stages, all capitalist in orientation, to be passed. The first was that Maori had to “tolerate” the presence of those “bringing” civilization. The second was the acceptance and use of barter with the “civilizer”. Finally, there was what he called “the constructive stage”, the learning of “the arts of civilized life - how to make for

\textsuperscript{132} Thomas Cholmondeley, wrote in 1854 of Maori land -selling: “I cannot believe that they ever thought of selling land after our own fashion, out and out to a purchaser, until they got hold of the idea from us. The early European settlers on the other hand, of course regarded the sale of land as we ourselves do. When for a keg of brandy or tobacco, or a few old clothes, trinkets or muskets, they had obtained a claim to a vast tract of country, they really believed themselves entitled to turn the Maories out, and take exclusive possession of the purchase. All the native troubles in New Zealand have arisen from this one source - disputes about land. (\textit{Ultima Thule}, p.187).
\textsuperscript{133} A. Pagden, \textit{European Encounters with the New World} (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1993), p.3.
themselves those things which they desire.” Maori, Fox asserted, were not yet beyond the second stage.\textsuperscript{134}

Such thinking “guaranteed the pre-eminence” of Europeans, but the protection of such a perception became a moral \textit{raison d’être}.\textsuperscript{135} So if sovereignty and nationhood were the marks of a civilized, Christian society, then-there was no way, for the great mass of Europeans, that Maori could make such claims for their own, independent efforts. Rather, such moves were read as a step backwards, as a falling away from what had been achieved - and was still held possible. For the future of Maori - Pakeha relations was (in the settler narrative), held to be found in Maori acceptance of both European ways and settlement. This was articulated in the promotion of cultural evangelism as outlined in the \textit{Daily Southern Cross}:

\begin{quote}
Commerce and the arts of civilized life are the best evangelisers; and if the savage is to become a Christian - that is, to practice the ‘golden rule’ of life, whether from a wholesome dread of the law combined with his own sense of right is immaterial - the Government of the colony, by establishing what are called military settlements in the heart of the country, will have done more towards that end, than has hitherto been accomplished by the agencies of well-meant but mistaken benevolence.\textsuperscript{136}
\end{quote}

This was a common lament, - that the missionary had failed in his task of pacifying, elevating and Christianizing Maori. The experiment had failed - for “Modern civilization was essentially aggressive, and the mistake committed was the losing sight

\textsuperscript{134} W. Fox, \textit{The Six Colonies of New Zealand}, p.60.
\textsuperscript{136} \textit{Daily Southern Cross}, 27 August 1863, p.3. Editorial.
of this fact". Yet this was part of the role required of a "civilized man" in a barbarous world, for "It is the highest duty of a powerful nation to extend the blessings of Civilization and Christianity to the utmost of its means...".

This meant "our present war then is waged in the cause of civilization, and against, not Maoris, but barbarism." The continued rise of Pai Marire, and the Volkner incident, only strengthened such opinion amongst settlers. The common opinion was that this had now become a war for righteousness, which, taking as its bottom line that there are only certain things which force can achieve, aims at unlimited expropriation. As William Fox, in his capacity as Colonial Secretary, wrote to the Aborigine's Protection Society, the aim was "a final, permanent and complete subjugation" of the Waikato, which would "not be done by treaties of peace which might leave the impression that they (Maori) are an independent people and at liberty in any future casus belli to take up the sword". What was needed was "some more substantial and material guarantee" that Maori would not renew hostilities. Therefore, confiscation of land was planned, because to fail to do so would be "...practically to

137 Otago Daily Times, 2 April 1864, p.4.
139 Southern Monthly Magazine, April 1864, p.80. 'Our Colonial Scheme'. As the Daily Southern Cross, 21 April 1864, p.4, stated, whilst "no fault of the settlers", the clash between "civilization and barbarism" meant that "it is in the nature of things that such a collision should take place...it is a conflict for superiority".
141 A Petition, on behalf of the Society, praying for peace and opposing confiscation of Maori land, had been received by the Governor on 26 January 1864.
142 AJHR 1865, E - No.2. Correspondence And Memorial On Address From Aborigine's Protection Society No.4. Memorandum by Ministers in Reply, p.19.
143 Ibid. p.20. On 17 December 1864, the Government of F. A. Weld confiscated 1,200,000 acres of land under the Settlements Act.
announce that British rule over the Maori race must cease, and the Northern Island be abandoned as a safe place of residence for Her Majesty’s European subjects.”

Thus, for the settlers, the rise of Maori opposition to both land claims and sovereignty was a reminder of just how tenuous their hold on the North Island was. For a people who had effectively been so marginalized at ‘home’ that a journey of 12000 miles appeared the ‘best’ option, to be opposed in their dreams by a people perceived as beneath them on the ‘great chain of being’ was an arresting and insulting affront to their sensibilities. That Maori should be aided and supported in their efforts by missionaries only served to embitter the conflict.

It is somewhat ironic that it was in his book *The New Zealander* (1855-6) that Anthony Trollope claimed that the great strength of an Englishman (*sic*) lay in his invincible self-confidence: “Out of this no sermon will shake him. No latterday pamphlets will drive him to despair”. It is ironic because he was proved wrong by events in New Zealand, by those sermons and pamphlets to which the Englishman (*sic*) was meant to be invincible. To the colonist, the churches were commonly seen as duty bound to support settler civilization and society - yet the ‘Church Party’ seemed to have willfully and willingly turned against this - opposing settler aims and attacking their character. Many of the settlers had arrived feeling somewhat distanced from the churches and often harbouring anti-clerical feelings. These were to be confirmed in their experience, reading and debate of the actions and statements of the ‘Church Party’. These clerics, these missionaries were, it appeared, more interested and allied

---

144 Ibid.
with 'half-naked savages' than with 'their own kind'.

Why would any 'Englishman' (sic) do so (especially when the 'dissenters' supported the Government') unless they desired to preserve, if not increase their personal power and influence? 147

What was occurring was the birthing pains of a new society that became articulated in issues that were fundamentally concerned with the lack and loss of trust. Both settler and missionary lacked trust in each other's aims and ambitions. For the settler, the 'Church Party' was attempting to limit progress, opportunity, civilization and prosperity - while attempting to keep their own land, power and influence. For the 'Church Party', the settlers seemed hell-bent on overturning all that they had worked for, all they had striven to achieve and create. In a sense it was a romanticized utopian past (missionary) clashing with a pragmatic utopian future (settler); and like all utopias, neither was to be ultimately achievable.

It was thus a problem and situation borne out of three broad viewpoints struggling to exist in the same land: could Maori continue to hold out against European encroachment; could missionaries protect their converts, their own personal influence over these people and be true to their religious beliefs? In opposition to these views, could settlers move in from the periphery onto those 'waste lands' that they both

---

146 The *New Zealand Advertiser*, 29 December 1864, p.2 stated that it was the profession of Christianity by Maori that had enabled the situation in New Zealand to develop as it did: "...had they been Australian blacks or Sepoys the sympathies of the British public would never have been excited in their behalf. The whole of the evils under which the Colony now groans have almost exclusively arisen from the influence of the C.M.S at home and its agents in the colony have exercised on its affairs."

147 In 1864 the *Hawke's Bay Herald* stated in an editorial: "We see the Missionary, while with one hand they hold out the Gospel, and with one mouth the speak of righteousness,- with the other hand they drive their own interests, and with another tongue they speak of nothing but Mammon and uncleanness. O Religion, Religion, what a deal of dirty work is done in thy name!" (*Hawke's Bay Herald*, 2 September 1864, p.2)
considered and believed to be their right to settle and till? Underlying all this were conflicting notions of, and desires for, sovereignty: who was to have the power and control in the ‘new land’ being created - Maori, missionary or settler? It is therefore no wonder that both physical and intellectual conflict occurred. All were caught up in a maelstrom of change, expectation and suspicion; a conflict which, in the end, the resources and numbers of the Colonist State ensured, if not a victory, then at least a long-term, far reaching advantage.

Yet this conflict has been relegated to the periphery of New Zealand historiography for not only does it involve issues of religion which are marginalized in the predominantly secular focus of this discipline, it is also a conflict to be found predominantly outside the traditional and official sources. Such oversight has ignored the importance of this conflict that occurred at a crucial stage of the struggle to create a new colonial society in which the issues of an ongoing push to secularization were debated and fought over in the public forum of the colonial press. It has thus become an unofficial conflict on two counts. Firstly, it was a conflict that was fought over the degree and limits of the interaction of religion and politics in colonial society – and one involving questions of colonial Pakeha identity. That such an conflict was being fought within colonial Pakeha society has tended to be ignored in favour of a concentration upon the larger and more officially recognized conflict of Maori and Pakeha. Yet the two are inter-related to a degree most often ignored by historians. The second reason why this is an unofficial conflict is that the majority of the battles took place within the pages of a colonial press that has been predominantly regarded by New Zealand historians as a distinctly secondary and unofficial source. Yet to consult the opinions and concerns of the colonial press is to re-read New Zealand history through new eyes.
and to become aware of the concerns, issues and debates that might have galvanized colonial society but which have been almost completely overlooked by later historians. Such has been the result for the issues of ‘Church and State’ in this period due the sidelining of the sources and disseminators of colonial news and opinion which are the many colonial newspapers.
8: CONCLUSION

Pieter Geyl, the Dutch historian has described history as “an argument without end”, yet to attempt the conclusion of a historical work is a paradoxical counter to this. The temptation is to provide a mere trail of dots ........, thus saying that the task is unfinished, uncompleted, “without end”- and that it is the task of the reader to make their own conclusions. On the other hand, as a history is a created document, a textualized fiction, there is also a directional function and aim inherent in the authorial task of the historian - and a personal authorial responsibility for what one has created.

The problems arise when one posits fictions of multiple narrative threads that stress their provisionalities. For, in a postmodern historical sense, nothing can be proved and so the why of the text becomes merely the public presentation of the text that has meaning, conclusions and indeed a thesis read into and out of it. For as soon as a historian provides a variety of fictionalized narratives within the same, singular text, the possibilities inherent within the text increase to a degree whereby the why can only be presented as the act of presentation of fictionalized narratives.

Yet this is not to say that conclusions cannot be presented and promoted within the text, for the choice and presentation of narratives, narrative voices, events, indeed the overall textual narrative itself (the fiction) is itself both composed of and is in the form of conclusions. The problem arises when one is confronted with not the ending of the narrative of narratives, the fiction of fictions, but with an expectation that some final summary will be attempted and presented. For this summary creates a new fiction, a
new narrative and so the never-ending story continues. Yet accepting the underlying provisionality of all historical endeavour is no reason to fail to present a resolution and a conclusion, as there are certain core ideas that require reiteration if this rereading of the past is to successfully provide an alternative history of a suppressed narrative of the New Zealand Wars.

Before turning to the conclusions derived from this historical investigation it is important to state a point that may seem overly obvious yet is crucial to understanding what follows: this is a thesis on colonial church history written from the location of a post-colonial, post-Christian and postmodern society. These three factors have informed and underwritten all that has been attempted in this thesis to the same degree, I would argue, that being a colonial, secularizing Christian and modernizing society informed and underwrote the issues and conflicts of the 1860s. Both clergy and settler were aware that they were in a new and changing environment to that which they had willingly left behind. The issue was not a conflict over their past, but rather one concerning the direction and control of their present and desired future. The concerns over issues of secularization might have been transplanted to the new colony, but once there they took on a distinctly contextual nature that encompassed not only secularization but also issues of sovereignty and identity.

There are four main conclusions that lie at the heart of this thesis and which are crucial for any rereading of the period. The first is the need to recognize that the prevailing ‘Maori-Pakcha’ dualism of the majority of historiographical works concerning the New Zealand Wars of 1860 - 1865 is an approach and reading of

history that excludes and denies the existence of a crucial third narrative - that of the
'Church Party'. The exclusion and denial of the importance of this narrative is a result
not only of the prevailing dualism but also reflects two other areas of historiographical
neglect. The first is that of an overwhelming secularist approach in New Zealand
historiography. The result of this is to marginalize and ghettoize religious issues and
personages from the mainstream narrative accounts. This is of concern for figures and
issues of considerable importance and influence in nineteenth century New Zealand are
reduced to a few passing mentions in the vast majority of texts available with the result
that the past has been secularized from a twentieth century rewriting. This is partially a
result of the second area of neglect. The historiography of New Zealand is one that
appears indifferent to the issues and repositories of public opinion, the colonial
newspapers. For if they are consulted then the neglected issues and personages assume
a nation-wide breadth and level of importance in popular discourse that is not reflected
in the historiography of the period.

The second conclusion is that if this narrative of the 'Church party' opposition to the
New Zealand Wars has been mentioned then it is primarily from a partisan position
which commends such action to the effect that it ignores the existence and level of
opposition from the settlers. In other words, those who were opposed to this 'Church
Party' narrative (predominantly the settlers) have had their voices and narratives
concerning this issue denied and excluded. The result is that in these narratives the
settler has been relegated to the position of other and their critiques and concerns
denied not only validity, but also historical existence.
The third conclusion arises out of this situation. This is that there has been the denial of the existence of a secondary religious conflict that was being fought within Pakeha society. Although its contributing factors can be traced back to the pre-colonial issues of the churches and British society, it became a colonial issue as a result of, and in response to, the primary secular war being undertaken - and narrated. This 'religious war' was one that attracted and created public debate and response in the settler communities (as evidenced within their communal articulations of the newspapers) to a level and nation-wide degree that has hitherto been ignored in the historiography of the period. This conflict concerned issues not only of 'Church and State' but also those of colonial sovereignty and self-identity. It is a crucial narrative of nation that both later secularist and church historians have overlooked. There are two reasons for this; firstly, the debates were primarily conducted in the pages of the nation’s newspapers, which are an extremely underutilized resource in New Zealand historiography. These do not fit in the dominant historiographical focus and concern with either official or conversely, private sources. For newspapers are both a secondary and a public source of opinion, yet one that provides an unrivalled insight into colonial concerns, issues and perceptions. The second reason is that secular historians have seemed unwilling to grant religious issues any real degree of influence in New Zealand historiography, while church historians have seemed unwilling to engage with colonial criticism of the public and private actions of the churches and clergy. The result is a twofold neglect of the issues and debates of religion and colonial society. For secular historians seem to wish to ignore their importance, while church historians seem unwilling to acknowledge and engage with their criticisms.
The fourth conclusion is that a new theoretical understanding and methodology must be engaged with if these new readings are not only to be retrieved but critiqued in a manner that allows a new perspective upon the issues and debates of Pakeha colonial society. Firstly the postmodern critique of the Grand Narrative must be engaged with. This allows the recognition and articulation of suppressed and marginalized voices and narratives. It also stresses the provisionality of any narrative, which allows the critique of the dominant discourse to occur. Secondly it promotes the articulation of competing narratives that allow the discourses of discontent to be heard within their own framework. This is important for it prevents the dissolution into a hegemonic presentation that often undercuts attempts to allow dissent to be articulated.

Also arising out of the postmodern insight are critiques arising from postcolonial theory. The first is the Saidian-derived debate of ‘Culture and Imperialism’ which, in the colonial context needs, I argue, to be broken down into an investigation of the existence and articulations of sub-cultures and competing imperialisms. It is from such an understanding that I provide two competing discourses of church and settler opinion. The second critique arises out of the theoretical notion of otherness. This I argue provides a method of and for reading the colonial situation and competing discourses in a manner that enables new narratives to be told - and new perspectives to be offered. It also allows the transcendence of the predominant Maori-Pakeha historiographical dualism that is perpetuated in works on this period, and provides a way of understanding the debates of ‘Church and State’ that were fought within colonial Pakeha society at this time.
Therefore the underlying conclusion is that the history of this period has been too clear-cut, dualistic, simplistic, secular and also, (though not paradoxically) too clerical in its narratives and conclusions. It has been a history that has failed to encompass plurality, nor included narratives that provide a dissenting voice to the prevailing dualistic orthodoxy. So this thesis is a counter-narrative, an act of historiographical subversion in that it uncovers a narrative of settler distrust in the involvement of ‘the Church’ in issues of politics when ‘the Church’ does not underwrite the ‘settler narrative’. But it is also a counter-narrative in that the degree of opposition that this involvement aroused has been written out of New Zealand historiography up to this point. The reason posited for this is that the narrative of this secondary conflict is one that not only shows a level of religious debate and influence amongst secular settlers that is anathema to the predominantly secular mind-frame of New Zealand historians, but is one that also displays a level of opposition to clerical involvement that is disturbing to church historians. In other words, both sides of the academic community preferred to act as if this situation and conflict did not occur. The secondary reason for its ‘non-existence’ until this thesis, is that it was a conflict which was primarily fought amidst the pages of the popular press - a historical source still sorely undervalued amongst the academic community. So, in many ways, this was an issue and a conflict that did not exist because it occurred outside of the prevailing historiographical mind-frame and predominantly within sources that, it appears, can only be described as being considered unimportant.

---

2 By history I refer to the dominant historiography (histories) that encompass, narrate and underwrite my complaints of the preceding sentence.
It is thus a hidden narrative that has now been exposed, a repressed narrative that has been articulated, and a dissenting narrative that has been granted legitimacy. For to ignore the debates of 'Church and State' is to ignore a crucial component of the colonial self-articulation of self and nation. Likewise, to exclude and marginalize the debates and personages of importance in the nineteenth century within the pages of twentieth century texts is to perpetuate the colonial and imperialist misadventure. While to deny the legitimacy of the voices and opinions found within the mass media of the colonial newspaper is to promote either the elite discourse of the official source or the personal discourse of the private document. Yet communities operate in a public sphere and their discourse is primarily articulated within the secondary sources of popular opinion and mass media. So to ignore and deny the validity of these sources is to ignore and deny the concerns and issues of that community. The past may come to us in fragments, but we must ensure that we do not further fragment it to the possibility of exclusion by suppressing discourses that do not fit with present day sensibilities. For such has been the fate of the issues of 'Church and State' in nineteenth century Pakeha New Zealand – a situation this thesis has sought to rectify.
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