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HE WHAKAWHANAUNGATANGA TIKANGA RUA: ESTABLISHING FAMILY LINKS; A BICULTURAL EXPERIENCE

A. RUSSELL BISHOP.

A Thesis submitted for the degree of Master of Arts in Education by thesis at the University of Otago.

This study focusses on the inexorable process of Europeanisation that affected my Grandfather's bicultural family in the Lower Waikato, New Zealand, during the period of the 'crucial decades', 1840-1865. In this thesis the study is introduced, the theory and methodology for the research are outlined, then the children of Irihapeti Hahau are introduced as are the life choices most of them made and the resultant locational and cultural diaspora of the family. Then consideration is given to the impact of Robert Maunsell, the missionary and his schools upon the life choices of family members.

The study relies heavily upon the knowledge and interest of numerous 'third generation' descendants of this family, including the author. Therefore this study is the result of the combined efforts of numerous family members to seek answers to common questions related to the loss of the family's bicultural identity. The study attempts to understand the reasons why these ancestors of ours would have made certain cultural determinations, 'life choices', that created a cultural and locational diaspora of the family.

Gramsci's concept of hegemony is used in this thesis to highlight the centrality of the notion of persuasiveness of ideas as an analytical tool. This concept was useful in enabling an understanding of the interactions between the social/political context and the individuals located in Lower Waikato in the crucial decades of the middle nineteenth century. Gramsci's notion of hegemony is also potentially emancipatory because it subsumes and incorporates the dynamic concept of resistance. Potentially, this concept can offer family members means whereby they can engage in critical reconstruction of suppressed possibilities, and also critical appraisal of those ideologies that maintain the dominance of a Eurocentric worldview in New Zealand.

The methodology offered uses a variety of oral, visual and written sources to 'reconstruct' the life histories of the family members involved and
of the other significant characters who influenced their life choices. This methodology is orientated at mediating that tension that exists between those who promote analyses of structures and those who promote analyses of purely cultural accounts. In other words, the 'reconstructed life history' methodology is designed to avoid reduction of individuals to passive bearers of roles, norms, discourses and ideologies, and also to avoid the exaggeration of the power of social actors to construct meanings of their existence that underemphasises the power relations of the wider society and the limitations that this places upon personal choice. Because of the complexity of the power struggles taking place during this period it was necessary to concentrate upon the interaction of the individuals within a detailed study of the context of the time.

The thesis introduces details of the complexity of the period, then focusses upon one of the elements that it is considered would have affected my Grandfather's family. This element was the specific targeting of this family by the Reverend Robert Maunsell for special incorporation into his own world view through the institutional medium of his boarding school, initially at Waikato Heads, and from 1853 to 1863, upriver at Kohanga. The study then considers how the struggles between the hegemonic designs of the Missionary and the hegemony of the Settler Assembly eventually eliminated many of the options open to this 'bicultural' family, essentially making these children 'irrelevant' to their Maori whanaunga, and left them with little choice but to join the emerging Pakeha world.
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CHAPTER 1: A: INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH PROJECT.

B: INTRODUCTION TO THE INEXORABLE PROCESS OF EUROPEANISATION OF MY FAMILY

INTRODUCTION.

This thesis is part of a much wider research project that I am currently engaged upon about my mother's family. I have been engaged in this project for the last ten years, and I intend pursuing this research over the next few years, following which I will produce an even more substantial report to the family. This thesis is therefore an interim report of progress that has been made into some of the questions raised by family members.

In this section the wider research project is introduced, and the location of this thesis within this wider scenario is detailed. The focus of the wider research project is my mother's family; the descendents of Irihapeti Hahau. The thesis focuses on the reasons for their Europeanisation, and the perpetuation of this phenomenon in the context of other possible alternatives.

The family knowledge about this woman has been suppressed. The process of searching for this information, and for the descendents of Irihapeti, and of the causes of this suppression is introduced. Also introduced is the notion guiding this study, that this family was subject to an inexorable process of Europeanisation. The concepts of 'life choices', 'cultural determination' and 'diaspora' are introduced, as key concepts to the understanding of the process of Europeanisation.

THE WIDER FOCUS

What follows is the story of a family. This family consists of the descendents of a Maori woman from Waikato and her two Scottish husbands. Her
name was Irihapeti (Peti) Hahau (See photo 1.1). Her heritage was of Ngati Pukeko of Poroporo, near Whakatane and of Ngati Mahuta of Waikato. She lived from about 1825 to about 1900. She and her first husband, John Horton MacKay, originally from the town of Paisley in Renfrewshire, Scotland, lived at Putataka bay, Port Waikato, for about twenty years. John MacKay drowned in 1859, soon after the birth of their eleventh child, Mere. Irihapeti remarried and she and her second husband, Sam Joy, lived at Raglan, and had three children. Irihapeti left Sam Joy soon after the birth of her last child and moved to Taupiri, where she lived with one of her daughters, Clara, on land she was able to claim as part of her birthright. One of the children of Irihapeti and John MacKay was my Grandfather; my mother's father, Benjamin Charles MacKay.

This information is not generally known among our family, the descendants of Irihapeti. Reconstruction of this story has involved a long search, gathering pieces from a wide number of sources. Details of the ancestry of my mother's family were never passed on to our generation, and many of us considered them to be lost. We thought that this was an accidental loss, but it proved to be a deliberate turning away from, and a selecting of a new cultural preference by many of our ancestors. This process was to be hidden from the later family members, by the children of Irihapeti and their children. Subsequently, there has been a great deal of research into the ancestry of this family, by a number of family genealogists. In many ways then this research is a collaborative effort by the interested descendents of this family. The interest shown has in fact generated the questions that have guided the study as well as providing much of the information on which I have been able to 'reconstruct' the past.

These 'family historians' are detailed in Diagram 5.1. I am writing this thesis for them, with their help and information. Therefore it is preferable that the plural is acknowledged when referring to the orientation of the study.
Photo No 1.1

Irihapeti (Peti) Hahau

(source Paula Legal)
INITIAL IMPRESSIONS

The impression those of us raised in the South Island had of the cultural development of our family, was that, given the bi-cultural ancestry of the children of Irihapeti, and the process of marriage, the 'life choices' made by our ancestors would have been fairly haphazard. It would suggest that proximity would have been significant in selecting marriage partners. In other words, in an area where there were large numbers of Pakeha, it was likely the children would marry Pakeha, where as if more Maori were present then more marriages to Maori would seem likely. In areas of Maori dominance, most marriages would seem likely to be with Maori. The predominance of Pakehadom in the South Island was taken as sufficient explanation of why our family was raised as Pakeha. We expected that most of the family who had remained in the North Island would have remained Maori or to have married into Maori families. This impression was reinforced by commonly held views, such as in Ward (1973);

Whether the product of informal or formal marriages between settlers and Maori, mixed-race offspring usually identified more strongly with the Maori side of their parentage.

(p. 310).

Given these expectations, the reality of the family in the North Island was somewhat of a surprise. Most of the children of Irihapeti had chosen to live a Pakeha lifestyle and raise their children as Pakeha. A series of visits and interviews established that the majority of the family members today are also living a Pakeha life-style, although there are a number who are living as Maori. Those members of the family who were raised as Maori, had really been put in this situation by accident more than design. Generally it was the result of shifts of location while the child was young, brought on by extraordinary circumstances, that opted the child to the Maori world. Those children brought up by their parents, tended to opt for a Pakeha way of life and their children tended to opt not to tell their own children about this cultural determination. So we find large numbers of third generation family members bewildered about their heritage.
It has been this bewilderment by these descendants of Irihapeti that has provided the stimulus for this search.

This search has become a search for identity, a reassertion of mana and it has revealed that an inexorable process of Europeanisation overtook my family. This process has proven to be so insidious in its progress, that now, approximately 150 years after the birth of the first children of Irihapeti, the overwhelming dominance of the Pakeha lifestyle among the numerous sub-branches of the family testifies to its pervasiveness. Irihapeti appears to have been encouraged to make a *cultural choice*, and certainly her children were encouraged to make such a *cultural determination*, that is, a firm resolve to choose one cultural lifestyle above another. The wider study then, is the story of how that determination was made and how it was perpetuated.

It would also appear that to a significant degree the history of the family is also New Zealand’s history. This process of Europeanisation began at the time when Irihapeti was raising her children. This was during the ‘crucial decades’ for race relations in New Zealand, that period from the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 to the wars of Sovereignty in the 1860s when the pattern of Race Relations in New Zealand was established for the time to follow. In this sense then, this story is relevant to a wider audience.

This family’s search for identity has also revealed a *diaspora*; a locational and a cultural dispersal. This search has revealed close cousins living within miles of each other, sometimes mixing in public institutions, yet ignorant of the very existence of any familial relationship. This story is very much a vignette of New Zealand’s history. Perhaps by close examination of this picture we will be able to critically reinterpret events and happenings to benefit our mutual understanding.
THE FOCUS FOR THIS THESIS

The focus is upon understanding the possible reasons for the 'life choices' made by the members of this family. In order to do this it has been necessary to 'reconstruct' the 'life histories' of the children of Irihapeti. This 'reconstructed' data necessarily forms much of the body of this thesis, designed to reintroduce members of the family to one another. While not necessarily explanatory, it is material requested by members of the family, and it helps to illustrate and validate the processes explained above.

The primary question to be addressed at this stage is what initiated this process of Europeanisation. The persuasiveness of the missionary, Robert Maunsell, appears pivotal in this respect. The small nuclear family of Irihapeti, John MacKay and their first daughter Marian, moved to Waikato Heads approximately at the time when Reverend Maunsell was establishing his mission station and school there. As their eleven children were born, they were baptised and educated by Reverend Maunsell and his family or their assistants. Therefore, this thesis, focusses on the importance of the attitudes of Reverend Robert Maunsell and of the institutions developed by him, upon the Europeanisation of my family. Many of the children of Irihapeti were educated at the industrial boarding school, run as part of the Mission station, by Reverend Robert Maunsell. These institutions targeted the children of Irihapeti for Europeanisation. This thesis is an examination of that process of targeting, its rationale and its outcome.

There are many other factors that will be alluded to, but need to be dealt with outside of this thesis. These include the effect of the support given to the 'world view' of Maunsell by the 'loyalist' chief of Ngati Tipa, Waata Kukutai, the reasons for Kukutai's conversion, Maunsell's role as a substitute 'Tohunga', the relationship of the missionary to the Maori social structure and systems of social control and the series of petit hegemonic struggles that were taking place within the Pakeha world at this time. This present thesis will introduce the effects of the political conflicts of the 'crucial decades' upon both the Maori and Pakeha groups involved.
INTRODUCTION TO THE SEARCH FOR A FAMILY

MY FIRST LANGUAGE WAS GREEK

The first language I was ever very fluent at was Greek. This was because, until I was five, we lived in a small town called Kingston on the southern shore of lake Wakatipu. Next door lived a Greek family with ten children. I used to spend my days playing with these children. As I was immersed in the language, naturally I picked it up. I then learnt English as a second language but I was not to commence learning the other language of my heritage until much later in my life. Thus I was raised on the shores of a South Island lake, learning to speak Greek, the descendent of English settlers in Otago on my fathers side and of Scottish and Maori Tupuna from Waikato on my Mother's side. These disparate threads were to raise questions in me that in time generated the quest which has led to the present study.

I was fortunate enough to receive a family history of my father's side from Ian Farquher of 'Barton Hill' farm at Highcliff, on the Otago Peninsula. This detailed history was researched and written by Ian, who is still farming the land purchased by George and Annie Bishop in 1868. This made very interesting reading, and fitted well into the context of the time; the arrival of settlers and the subsequent events of Otago's History, enabling me to understand that side of my family's heritage.

My mother's family proved more difficult to trace. Our family's knowledge of its heritage was very sketchy, almost non-existent, essentially consisting of a few stories passed on through my mother. We had been told of our Maori heritage, of the family's 'Maori princess', of how Granddad had been a runner in the 'Maori Wars' and a few other stories. It was hardly sufficient to base an identity upon. It was very difficult to find out much in the way of family details
for there appeared to be a conspiracy of silence. It was all very mysterious. It was not my imagination however, for this conspiracy about our Maori heritage did exist and it would appear that it derived from the social prohibition placed upon us by the 'times,' by the other members of the society and by family members themselves. This suppression of the family history was a consistent feature of the recollections of the family members that I interviewed.

My search for the story of my mother's family has become the focus of this study; it has determined the main questions of the wider study, and the process of rediscovery has enabled me to see this family as a vignette of New Zealand's history. It is a story of an essentially Europeanised family ignorant of its heritage and is part of a larger process that has affected us all.

My Grandfather (photo 1.2) was the second eldest surviving son of Irihapeti Hahau of Waikato, and a Scotsman, John Horton McKay from Renfrewshire in Scotland. He was one of eleven children of this marriage and half-brother to three other children born to Irihapeti and her second husband Sam Joy. One of his older sisters, Catherine, moved to Southland, in 1860. She and her husband lived near Fortrose until he was accidentally drowned in 1870. My grandfather was sent down by the family from the Waikato to help his sister Catherine following this tragic death. He lived a totally European life in Southland. He worked as a cook and station hand near the town of Mossburn in Central Southland. This is where he must have met my Grandmother, Margaret Ann Hughes, for she was also engaged in this type of work. He attempted to leave his Waikato background behind but he was not able to escape his past entirely, for a family story tells of his wife's sister breaking off all communication with her sibling when she married this man from the Waikato.

Irihapeti has become the real focus of my search. It is the overwhelming of her heritage by that of her two husbands, and her compliance in this process that has created the pattern of the wider family today. It is not that I wish to prove a case that it was a cultural struggle between husband and wife but more that these symbolise what was to happen to New Zealand as the influence of the
Photo No 1.2

Benjamin Charles Mackay. Aged 21 years

(source Doris Bishop)
Missionaries grew and later as the number of Settlers increased, with the large scale migrations to this country in the 1840's and the 1850's. Nor do I believe it is for me to say what should have happened but rather to attempt to explain as to how and why such a cultural struggle took place.

Our Grandfather brought up his six children as European and made no reference to things Maori unless he was talking to his sister, Catherine Patterson at Fortrose, (photo 1.3) when they conversed in Maori. We were never even told where he came from, just "up North somewhere" and that he was a goldminer in his latter life at Mossburn. He drove a cart and horse before that. We were certainly never told anything about his early life or his heritage. It was something that the family didn't speak of.

My mother was born in 1913, the youngest of a family of five children who had been born over a period of some twenty years (Photo no 1.4). I used to question my mothers older sisters as to the details of our family, but I got the clear impression that this was knowledge that they had some understanding of, but it was not to be passed on. What made it stranger was that these women must have known of the history being gathered by Kit Davis (a 'third generation genealogist'- see diagram 5.1) about my Grandfather's sister, Granny Patterson/Aunty Kate of Fortrose, yet they never referred to her either.

It would appear that the second generation hung onto the secret, even though I have since found evidence that my grandfather's oldest daughter, (my mother's elder sister) must have known some of the details of the family's story, for she applied to the land court in Hamilton in 1945 to succeed to Granddad's share in a block of family land at Taupiri. This block of land was Maori customary land returned as individual title after the confiscations.¹

¹ This aspect of our heritage is beyond the scope of this thesis and will be covered in the wider study about the perpetuation of the process of Europeanisation.
Photo 1.3

Catherine (Granny) Patterson nee Carran nee MacKay and Benjamin Charles MacKay at Fortrose, Southland.

(Source Doris Bishop)
The Family of Benjamin Charles MacKay and Margaret Ann Hughes. The author's mother, Doris is the young girl in the front row.

(Source Doris Bishop)

The people are (in clockwise order from the top left), May, Jack, Kate, Ben, Doris, Barbara and Margaret.
There has been a lot of interest shown in the heritage of this family by third generation members. There have been nearly ten family genealogists trying to track down the story. Diagram 5.1 illustrates this pattern. The "first generation" i.e. those who were dispersed is the generation of my Grandfather and his siblings. They were all born at or near Maraetai\Putataka Bay at the Waikato Heads, their baptisms were recorded by Robert Maunsell in his Baptism book (Maunsell, n.d.). Many of them would have attended the Mission Schools established by Rev. Robert Maunsell, and they ended up living widely dispersed throughout New Zealand. They also became culturally dispersed. The second generation must have learned of some of the events and circumstances surrounding the family's bi-cultural history, but they nearly all chose to suppress this information.

I have contacted numerous descendents of the 14 children (primarily concentrating on the third generation- the level of second cousins) and as yet have not found anyone who has any detailed knowledge of the lifestyles of the children or more particularly of their parents. To me it is very strange that so little has been passed down through the generations, especially when one considers that there have been a large number of 'family histories' written about the sub-branches of the family, numerous family gatherings and a great deal of interest shown by many people, especially in who John MacKay and Irihapeti were and what they must have been like.

This persistent suppression of the family history provides the catalyst for this thesis. My Grandfather had taken part in this process, allowing the Pakeha lifestyle to be dominant for his children. However upon the birth of his youngest daughter (my mother) when he was 65 years old, he relented. He gave her 'the names'. My mother often told the story about how he had given her 'all the names'. The fact she told it so often signifies the importance that he must have ascribed to them, for is it the single most important memory that I have of my mother's stories about her heritage. My mother's name was Doris Hinepau Elizabeth MacKay, (see diagram 1.1). These middle names were those of his
My Grandfather was the youngest child of Ben and Margaret Mackay. My Grandfather gave her "all the names" as a last reminder of his heritage, to be used as clues to a bicultural past by future generations. The names were Hinepau, his Grandmother and Irihapeti, his mother. The name Irihapeti was to lead us to the Waikato, Hinepau led us to Whakatane.
Much of what I have learnt appears to have happened by chance, but when one views the whole process there is a pattern of inevitability. One example became clear to us as my brother, Gavin, and I travelled into the depths of our northern family's world in May of 1990. There seemed to be an 'invisible hand' guiding us. We could hardly keep up with the revelations that came to us. However, as we travelled deeper into our bi-cultural past this began to feel less and less strange.
CHAPTER 2: THEORY

INTRODUCTION: THE NEED FOR THEORY

To explain the process of Europeanisation of my family, a theory was needed that could enable us to understand the 'life choices' made by Irihapeti and her children as they grew up in the lower Waikato. This theory was also needed to enable us to understand the actions and persuasiveness of those significant leaders of the area, the Reverend Robert Maunsell and Ngati Tipa Chief, Waata Kukutai, and their influences upon the family. Further this theory needed to explain the actions of other significant individuals, those leaders in the wider context of New Zealand politics of the time. Above all, what was needed was a theory that could allow members of the family to gain an understanding of the events and of the overall process of mono-cultural Europeanisation and to empower them to decide whether to perpetuate or to halt this process. A theory might also suggest social action to promote a model of Biculturalism that will help to counter the effects of Europeanisation.

The theory I propose to use is loosely called 'critical theory' by Giroux (1981a) and Carr and Kemmis (1986). In this context it is based upon the ideas of Gramsci (1977), Friere (1972, 1985), Friere and Shor (1987), Giroux (1981a,1981b,1983,1984,) Aronowitz and Giroux (1985), among others. It is primarily oriented towards enabling those who have suffered oppression of one form or another, and whose lives have been channelled by the hegemony of the ideas of others, to confront this situation and to work towards emancipatory solutions.

The emphasis in this thesis will be on Lower Waikato society in the 'crucial decades'. It will focus on some of the techniques used by those who became dominant through persuading others that their particular world view was preferable, and the resistance offered by the 'dominated'.
INTRODUCTION TO GRAMSCI AND TO THE NOTION OF HEGEMONY.

Gramsci is hailed as the most important Marxist thinker to emerge in the West since Marx. Convinced by the social inequalities in his Sardinian homeland of the need for change, he joined the Italian Communist party in 1921. Following Mussolini's seizure of power in 1922, he was imprisoned. During his period of imprisonment, he was able to write much of what has been collected about his theory of hegemony in the 'Prison Notebooks' (Reid, 1988). However, due to his health, and incarceration he was unable to elaborate this theory in a systematic way.

The theory lies fragmented and dispersed throughout his *Quaderni del carcere* (Reid 1988). There have been many attempts to piece together his theory in a systematic manner. Notable among these are those of Bates (1975), Entwhistle (1978) and Giroux (1981a). Critics, for example Smart (1986), of these attempts to systematise Gramsci's theory, maintain that Gramsci was inconsistent in his employment of the term hegemony, and the related concepts of the state and civil society. Indeed as Smart (1986) claims the terms undergo 'slippage' in Gramsci's work. Smart turning to Foucault's definitions of hegemony that are informed by the French Structuralist school, and states that hegemony is not necessarily gained "through consent:" but is gained most effectively through:

- practices, techniques, and methods which infiltrate minds and bodies, cultural practices
- which cultivate behaviors and beliefs, tastes, desires and needs as seemingly naturally
- occurring qualities and properties embodied in the psychic and physical reality of the human subject. (p.159).

Foucault, it is claimed has been able to escape from the strictures of the ambiguous concept of ideology and its effects to a consideration of the relationship of 'truth' and 'power' because of his distance from the limits and limitations of the Marxist problematic. However Femia (1975, p. 30) referring to Gramsci's famous letter to his sister that summarises Gramsci's attitudes and understanding of the concept of hegemony, provides a retort to Smart's type of analysis by
claiming that this 'slippage' is not as serious as one may think if the meaning of the concepts is considered in the wider context of Gramsci's notebooks.

THE HEGEMONIC POWER OF PERSUASIVENESS.

Gramsci opposed the Classic Marxist belief that ideas are the product of the 'base' workings of the society. He subscribed to the notion that hegemony contributes to or constitutes a form of social cohesion not through force or coercion, but through consent. Foucault (in Smart, 1986) provides a psychoanalytical perspective to the concept by arguing that the social cohesion is not necessarily attained through the consent of the 'ruled' to the 'rulers' world view. Foucault proposed the process as one of a more insidious 'infiltration' which cultivates new behaviors and beliefs as if they were 'naturally occurring' in the minds of the human subjects. Both of these approaches of Gramsci and Foucault have at their core the idea that some form of persuasiveness is the main means of spreading social control. The centrality of the notion of the persuasiveness of ideas is the tool used in this thesis to analyse the relationship between the context and the individuals in the 'crucial decades' of the middle 19th century in the Waikato, because it subsumes and incorporates the dynamic concept of resistance. Therefore it is suggested that this notion caters for the perspectives of Gramsci, Foucault and as will be shown later of Friere and Giroux also.

THE POWER OF IDEAS

Gramsci's concept of 'hegemony' remains a very useful explanatory tool. On the surface, it is a very simple concept, and is often used incorrectly. Yet its very simplicity makes it extraordinarily powerful. The basic premise of the concept of hegemony is that 'man is not ruled by force alone, but also by ideas' (Bates, 1975, p. 351). As Femia (1975) states "ideas had consequences that could not be dismissed' or 'reduced' to a more 'real' world of social and economic phenomena" (p.29).
Gramsci built upon and developed Classic 'Marxist' analysis which noted the phenomenon and the power of ideas more in passing, more as an adjunct to economic theory. His ideas have been used more recently for answering the problem that greatly concerns many critical theorists such as Aronowitz and Giroux (1985), and Anderson (1989). These writers were critical of those theorists still wedded to the Classic Marxists ideas about structural inequalities and the need for systemic structural change to remove oppression. Gramsci offers alternative solutions to those who perceive the necessity to work within a system, changing it from within, rather than being forced by structural necessity to change from without. Gramsci is often referred to as the father of Euro-Communism and Social Democratic movements for this reason. To Gramsci, it was ideas that allowed social contradictions to exist, allowed inequality to persist and dominance to be maintained. Similarly it is ideas that become the major forces of emancipatory action. For Marx, the internal contradictions, the inequalities, the dominations must inevitably lead to the overthrow of the existing political structures, but for Gramsci ideas are powerful enough to allow situations of inequality to continue to exist, long after the point where Marx determined the society would cease to function.

The fundamental premise of the Gramscian concept of hegemony is how ideas mute the internal contradictions of the society. In other words the central issue is how a powerful group convinces a less powerful group that the powerful group's world view is the only acceptable world view. From this, follows the analysis of how the powerful group dominates and perpetuates the inequality.

It could be argued that the 'new order' in New Zealand (1840-1865) had not developed to a significant enough degree to test the historical determinism of Marx or the contention of Gramsci about the muting effect of 'ideas'. However the focus in this study is on how such inequalities came about. How monocultural domination arose despite the potential of the Treaty of Waitangi can be answered only by considering the total context of New Zealand at the time.
The determinism of classic Marxism has not produced solutions because waiting for the internal contradictions themselves to generate solutions has proven futile. Gramscian theory, along with that of Friere (1985) Aronowitz in Giroux (1984) and Giroux (1981a, 1984) is in the forefront of a movement of critical theory oriented toward enabling those whose lives have been channelled by the hegemony of the ideas of others to analyse and to confront this situation and to work toward solutions.

THE CIVIL SOCIETY: THE ROLE OF COERCION.

Hegemony means that "political leadership (is) based on the consent of those led, a consent which is secured by the diffusion and popularisation of the world view of the ruling class" (Bates, 1975, p. 352). Hegemony is attained by the myriad of operations of civil society; the educational, religious and associated institutions (Femia 1975, p. 30), as opposed to the domination that is produced by the coercive organs of the state.

For Gramsci the role of ideology was crucial, being the means by which consciousness is mediated within Capitalist society and the means by which the dominant group's values are universalised and become acceptable as the definitive values of society. Gramsci used this notion to illustrate the role of 'intellectuals' who are the experts in mediating the ideological and political unity of the existing hegemonic structure, thereby universalising its dominance. He also argued that if the ruling group were unable to establish intellectual and political hegemony, the coercive function of the state would then be required.

Gramsci's concept of state has a wider organic sense than those of more limited definitions of this institution, in that Gramsci saw it as the equilibrium between political society and the civil society. In other words hegemony could be bolstered by the armour of coercion.

The wider social context of the political struggles leading up to the use of the coercive function of the state in the Waikato wars, will not be addressed in
this thesis. However the thesis does focus on the persuasive approach of Maunsell as an educator and his subsequent resort to 'coercion'. For Gramsci, a resort to force was a sign of great weakness. The resort to force in the lower Waikato was an outcome of hegemonic struggles between conflicting groups. Most of these groups were attempting to promote their own hegemony over others, accepting the hegemony of other groups or resisting the hegemony of others. This conflict created the opportunity for coercion, because of the strength of the resistance that opposed the hegemony of the final victors. Further, the resort to coercion itself weakened the hegemonic pervasiveness of the final victors.

To Gramsci, if force became necessary, it needed to appear to be based upon the consent of the majority. This necessitated the use of the mass media, and associated measures of myth creation, to attempt to reassert the balance of consent over force. In this way the new order might be legitimised as one of hegemony. Belich (1987) has admirably exposed the function of the 'civil society' in creating and legitimising myths about the New Zealand Wars. This thesis will try to show how the hegemony of one particular world view, and its conflicts within a matrix of interest groups, affected the decision making and life chances of the children of Irihapeti.

Ideology to Marx was a reflexive consciousness which obscures an understanding of the true social processes underlying the ideational level. Gramsci offers an alternative view of the concept. Instead of ideology being seen as a false consciousness, where people are duped by, and eventually fall victim to the distortions of ideology. Ideology is seen as having a dynamic of its own, acting as mediation between social and political power. Ideology is thus a continual process of conflict and negotiation between ruling and subordinate groups. Ideological control instead of being at the mercy of the economic substructure is seen as the organising principle, fundamental to the hegemony of the ruling groups. The importance of this 'active' view of ideology as opposed to the passive connotations of classic Marxism and modern authors like Larrain
(1979 in Simon, 1990a) is that groups of people and individuals within these groups, can shape and define the nature of historical processes. Gramsci places cultural activity, and especially ideology at the very centre of the social fabric. This is the key to understanding the notion of emancipatory research as founded in Gramscian theory.

**ANTI ECONOMIC DETERMINISM: ANTI REDUCTIONIST**

Gramsci challenged the crude reductionist 'economism' of class analysis to emphasise that ideas can have an impact upon history as does individual human will.

This emphasis on intellectual and cultural influences rather than a purely economic ones enabled Gramsci to develop his doctrine of 'hegemony'. (Joll, 1977, p. 101.)

Unlike traditional Marxist analysis, Gramsci believed that;

- the rule of one class over another does not depend on economic or physical power alone, but rather of persuading the ruled to accept the system of beliefs of the ruling class and to share their social, cultural and moral values (p. 8)

This stance whilst grounded in 'classic' Marxism, differs in that Gramsci denied that one element of the whole interacting context could be isolated, as Marx isolated the economic element, in order to explain the interaction between the context and the individuals.

Marx used the concept of ideology to explain that the ideational level was changed as the economic sub-structure changed. To Marxists, economic forces and the relations of productions determined the forms that consciousness would take. This economic determinism was essentially a reaction to earlier idealist forms of German philosophy (especially Hegelian) that to Marx, were anti-emancipatory because of their metaphysically based idealism. (Thus the foundation for his classic critique of religion as the 'opium of the masses'). In this type of analysis, spiritual sources of ideas are seen as conservatising, and are not grounded in the real human struggle. This conception of spirituality is of limited use when considering a Maori context, this has serious implications for
developing a methodology for study. Thus in this sense a Marxist approach is ethnocentric for it does not allow for an essential element of a Maori worldview, that inextricable linkage of the secular and spiritual world. If the object of the analysis of hegemony is to develop emancipatory theory, then it must be up to the oppressed to define what is emancipatory. Emancipation for Maori means self determination. Self determination for Maori means being able to express one's humanity in a way that is culturally acceptable, and not in a way that is prescribed or proscribed by outsiders.

Gramsci rejects the traditional 'economicist' interpretation of social evolution. This idea is explored and expanded by more recent writers, including Apple (1986) who contends that;

"Not everything is explained by economic power. Capitalism is not only an economic system, but a form of life, 'a structured totality.' It is not reducible to the bare bones of economic relations...we need to see our kind of social formation as built up out of a constantly changing and contradictory set of interconnections among the economic, political and cultural spheres. (p. 16)."

Apple's stance is further expanded by Reid, (1988) another writer following this school.

"Economism reduced all types of struggle to simple economic and class-based conflict, and as such 'does not take into account the ideological force of Capitalism.' (p. 34).

Apple (1986) considers this "type of argument" falls into the broad category of "anti-reductionist" He implies that to 'reduce' an argument to constituent elements is often to 'lose sight of the forest for the trees'. This type of Gestalt, anti-reductionist approach is constantly being emphasised by Maori Kaumatua on Marae. It also has a commonality with Zen, Christian and Bahaí teachings. It is a very appropriate and challenging approach for the analysis of hegemony in a bicultural society.

Giroux (1983, p. 4) also critiques the 'reductionist' approach and suggests his type of analysis is necessary in order to break from those 'radical' theorists who cling to notions of overbearing structural domination while ignoring the
role of human's in the creation of history. Such crude determinism appears to have been inherited by many espousing the 'New Sociology of Education' who argue that history is made independent of human beings. Some also argue that within the context of dominion the mediating effect of human agency virtually disappears. The methodological implications of this stance are explicated in chapter four. One significant implication being that the reductionist approach to 'biography' which lifts characters out of their human context will lead to an incomplete analysis of situations of hegemony also.

THE ROLE OF INTELLECTUALS.

Gramsci's study of the role played in Italian society by intellectuals led him to break the orthodox Marxist picture of the 'superstructure' into two floors; 'civil society' and 'political society'. Civil society is the groups; schools, churches, clubs, journals and parties, that “fashion the formation of social and political consciousness” (Bates, 1975, p. 353). Political society, is the 'state' which is composed of those public institutions; the government, courts, police and army that exercise direct control. Civil society is the marketplace of ideas "where intellectuals enter as salesmen of contending cultures" (p. 353). The intellectuals are the 'officers' of the ruling groups. They exercise the subordinate functions of social hegemony and political government. In the case of social hegemony, intellectuals provide the spontaneous support and consent given to the direction imprinted upon social life, that is, the creation of new cultural forms through the prestige of the group that the intellectual represents. In the case of political, the apparatus of state coercion ensures the discipline of those who do not consent, and is ready in anticipation of the moments when spontaneous consent diminishes.
The intellectuals succeed in creating hegemony to the extent that they extend the world view of the nucleus to the ruled, and thereby secure the 'free' consent of the masses to the law and order of the land. To the extent that the intellectuals fail to create hegemony, the ruling class falls back on the state's coercive apparatus which disciplines those who do not 'consent' and which is constructed for all society in anticipation of moments of crisis of command...when spontaneous consensus declines. (p. 353).

This thesis considers the importance of Reverend Robert Maunsell as 'an agent of the civil society'. In the wider study, the struggles for power between the intellectual leaders of the conflicting Pakeha groups will be detailed. The wider study will document how the spontaneous support that the new order had gained with the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi had diminished and how this diminution led to the need to resort to coercion. Because of the loss of direction from the group that had assumed leadership (the British Government's representatives and eventually the Settler's Assembly) following the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, Maori groups began to develop their own means of incorporating the new order in the old. The majority of Maori people would have been quite content to follow the lead that had been offered by the original signing, despite the misunderstandings of the implications of the treaty if only they had been given a chance to take part in the development of the new order. The misunderstandings could have been resolved if there had been a desire to include Maori in the problem solving process (Ward, 1973). However, it was because of the conflicting struggles for power among the Pakeha that the views of the Maori were neglected. Then the state apparatus had to be used. This thesis will demonstrate how the relationship of Maunsell to the Maori people of Lower Waikato closely parallels the wider political picture. Maunsell was initially very successful in attracting 'converts' to his own school, but he soon noticed a "dropping off in interest" and a decline in the "quality of adherents" (Nathan 1973). His response to this counter hegemonic movement was initially bewilderment, which has been noted and reported by later commentators (Nathan, 1973; Garrett, 1991). However, Maunsell was quick to resort to a counter
hegemonic action of his own, the development of the boarding schools. The thesis will describe how supportive of Maori aspirations Maunsell actually was until the point when he felt too blatantly challenged by the Maori church. He then aligned himself with the 'forces of coercion' and joined the army as chaplain and supported their Wars of Sovereignty in the Waikato.

THE CONTEXT.

The analysis of the effect of Robert Maunsell's mission and schooling upon the family is seen in the context of the wider events of this period which can be identified as a struggle for ascendency. Detailed explication of this situation is beyond the immediate scope of this thesis, but some acknowledgement of this situation is necessary. At one level there was conflict between the leaders of Lower Waikato, the Governor and the Settler's. There was also a series of conflicts between the various Maori Hapu of the Waikato river. Thirdly there was an overriding struggle for ascendency between Pakeha and Maori interests. A classic Marxist analysis would see this conflict in terms of the impact of the underlying economic forces that drove the system and the conflicts that would determine the relationship with the superstructure of society. Indeed, this type of Marxist analysis, where the emphasis is placed upon the struggle for land as the primary economic resource of the country is currently popular. The period of the crucial decades of the 1840's through to the 1860's is typified as the primary period of that struggle. The nomenclature of the 'land wars' as a replacement of the biased terminology 'Maori wars' reflects this 'reductionist' approach to revisionist history. The wars were about much more than land and this is supported by the work of Ward (1973), Belich (1987) and Orange (1987). Orange refers to these wars as the 'Wars of Sovereignty'. Detailed historical analyses exhibited in these works contributes to furthering a wider 'anti-reductionist' approach to New Zealand history.

The context of this period needs to be detailed. Kwen, (1987, p. 445) cites Cleave (1983) as distinguishing between three Maori responses to European
colonisation as 'resistance, neutralist and loyalist'. This idea of a dynamic continuum along which individuals and groups were located and moved as their attitudes changed and their options narrowed, is of great assistance in understanding the dynamic of this period as one of a conflict of interests. The dynamic of the continuum raises the need to consider those forces that were existing in the contemporary context, that both located the people upon this continuum and that necessitated their moving. However a continuum of response is not sufficient for it does not allow for the dialectical nature of hegemonic struggle. Rather, an approach which focuses upon the interactions and interrelationships between the Maori groups and those forces attempting to promote the European worldview upon the Maori, has a greater chance of explanatory success. This is in the nature of a matrix of interactions and reveals more about the period than does an orientation which studies responses as Cleave (1983) suggests.

The complexity of this context of the 'crucial decades' indicates a possible need for refinement of the concept of hegemony to recognise there can be levels of hegemonic struggle within a bicultural situation. Gramsci developed his analytic tool from studies within one society, essentially a monocultural one. Caution is needed when applying this across to the context of colonialism, although the organising concept of internal colonialism could be used here. In the New Zealand context there is a situation of intercultural conflict. While there were hegemonic designs between the two cultures, (and this can be categorised as the orientation to Europeanisation), there was also conflict within the groups attempting to promote the wider hegemony. Further, there were counter hegemonic struggles taking place. Gramsci has described such situations arising in his classic study of the Risorgimento, but there the situation was not complicated by the level of conflict between the colonised groups. In the Italian situation there was conflict between the groups asserting their right to rule, as well as there being a corresponding conflict between those who were to be ruled. In this example in New Zealand, I suggest that at one level we can identify the conflict as described by
Gramsci as the hegemonic struggles between the aspiring rulers, and we can also identify a conflict between the potential ruled (however much they were unaware of this status). There is also another level, and that is the underlying struggle between Maori and Pakeha cultures that became a dominant feature of the New Zealand scene at the same time as the other struggles were continuing. Therefore, I am suggesting that the struggles between the various groups of Maori and between the Pakeha groups be seen as 'petit' hegemonic struggles, struggles for the right to forward the particular world view of the group and its leaders. The larger struggle between Maori and Pakeha is to be seen as a 'gross' hegemonic struggle, that was predicated upon a different ideology than that of the petit hegemonic struggle level.

The petit hegemonic struggle between the Pakeha was predicated upon the desire to rule and was manifest in the racist attitudes toward Maori characterised by the ideologies of single and multiple genesis of humankind, (see chapter three for details). This was to be a major cause of the conflict between the Pakeha groups in New Zealand, while the overall hegemonic struggle was predicated upon the fundamental belief in cultural superiority of the European system over any other. At this level the ideas underneath the petit-hegemonic level becomes a lesser level justification, rather than an organising ideology. The organising ideology became one of white supremacy.

This analysis would suggest that the colonial relationship is better analysed by the notion of conflict of interests, at a number of levels, within an understanding of the overriding dynamic of hegemony, complicated by the ideologies of cultural superiority.
DISCUSSION OF THEORY: METHODOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS.

CLASS STRUCTURE, THE ULTIMATE IRONY AND THE CONCEPT OF RESISTANCE

As stated above, a major problem of traditional Marxist analysis and indeed the Marxist problematic as a whole, is its very ethnocentricity. The argument that Marx developed was based upon case studies of 'modern' and 'emerging' capitalist societies, where he disclosed the class structures. Gramsci also developed his theory as the result of a study of 'the nature and mechanisms of bourgeois class rule in a stable capitalist societies' (Smart 1975).

There is a fundamental assumption upon which a 'class' analysis is based that needs questioning and careful consideration. Developing a theory which uses the concept of class in one context and then applying this to another context, creates the illusion that theories are universal. There is considerable risk in developing a theory of a 'stable capitalist society' and then applying this to a bi-cultural context of colonialism. However useful such a concept as class may be to isolate and identify contradictions within a wider society, the concept of class becomes ethnocentric when applied to a situation of colonialism. The use of the concept of class to analyse colonialism assumes that a society has one fundamental underlying organising set of principles.

Maori-Pakeha relations were struggles between two groups predicated upon different world views (Anderson, 1988). The argument is that this relationship is not adequately analysed by the notion of class, and to use class as the primary analytical foundation precludes or inhibits the development of a methodology of bi-cultural research.

Urry (1981) as explained by Simon (1990a) argues that the notion of class can be expanded to cover groups that are based upon such criteria as 'race' and 'gender'. He attempts to extend the nature of the concept of 'class' to that of a generic factor. He contends that it is wrong to view "class relations as purely or essentially economic" (p. 25). Classes exist only at the level of 'civil society' in
terms of various forms of structuralism. Urry believes it is totally wrong to conceive of classes simply as "abstractly or purely related to the mode of production." He extends the terminology and conceptual framework of 'class' to include those traditional 'classic Marxian' concerns of the struggle between the capitalists and the workers, and offers the notion of "classes-in-struggle," which involves groups "based on other criteria."

Simon (1990a), alerts us to the contradiction hidden within this idea. She identifies the limitations of this type of analysis for the emancipation of oppressed groups. Initially the 'class' or a 'class-in-struggle' engaged in the forefront of the 'revolutionary' struggle "represents the interests of all the non-ruling classes." However, in time, as it develops its own specific interests, contradictions with other groups appear, notable among them is the appearance of a 'hidden hierarchy' of oppression. There follows a ranking of needs of the different groups as determined by, what becomes yet another outside group. "Ideology then serves to conceal these contradictions and perpetuates the idea that the 'new' dominant class represents the whole society." In short, assuming that all oppressed groups suffer the same form of oppression is another form of hegemony, denying the need for self-determination of each group. The attempt that is then made by the leadership of the new 'leading' group to define the oppression of the others they themselves classify into this category, is evidence of this new hegemony. This in effect serves the purpose of the new dominant group, for they attempt to define the underlying cultural principles and needs of the other groups as the same as theirs but, significantly as having less pressing needs than their own.

This dilemma is the root problem that limits the usefulness of the concept of Multicultural Education (Parker-Jenkins, 1991), as espoused by the dominant group, in that it develops a hierarchical set of concepts that no two groups can agree upon. This dilemma also makes Maori people withdraw from equal employment opportunity and special education negotiations. The production of this type of dilemma by the dominant culture results in a series of petit hegemonic struggles among the groups that oppose its dominance. These
struggles dissipating the energies of the groups before the victorious can emerge to negotiate with the dominant culture. The concept of bi-culturalism in the New Zealand context is different. It avoids the lack of conceptual clarity that plagues Multicultural Education by focussing upon the power relations between the original signatories of the Treaty of Waitangi. It pre-supposes that the Treaty of Waitangi is to be used as the fundamental model of the relationship between two cultural groups. Biculturalism focuses upon the power inequalities in the relationship between the two Treaty partners, between what is now the dominant culture and the Maori.

Thus the major criticism of Urry's argument is that it is really trying to stretch a useful concept from a situation where it may be an effective explanatory tool to a situation where it is not. This approach appears to fall within the domain of 'Grand Theories'. Banks (1988) among others, critiques revisionist analyses by saying that theorists who use 'Grand Theories' (which are all embracing, unified explanations of events and phenomena), "usually feel obliged to interpret their findings in ways that support their theories." Banks claims that 'Grand Theories' are "useful for they help social scientists to order the universe and to explain and interpret relationships" but he remains unconvinced that a depiction of extremes is necessary in order to make "observations and theoretical frameworks consistent" (p. 150).

The basic flaw of this attempt at a universal theory is that there is an underlying assumption that all forms of domination are similar and therefore can be analysed by a similar theory and solved by using similar methodology.

Friere (1985) has argued that domination cannot be reduced exclusively to a form of class domination. Fundamental to Friere's idea is the "unclaimed heritage" of emancipatory thought fundamental to both secular and religious philosophy "located within the corpus of bourgeois thought" (Giroux in Friere 1985, pxii). Friere's 'unclaimed heritage' is guided by the notion of diversity that inevitably rejects the idea that there is a universal kind of oppression. Friere and Giroux are critical of these analyses of social and cultural reproduction as
exemplified by the work of Bordieu (1977a, 1977b) and Bernstein (1977). They claim these reproduction theories see relationships purely in terms of power relations and domination that "surrenders to a version of hegemony in which the cycle of reproduction appears unbreakable" (Giroux 1981a, p. 11). The major problem lies in this type of reproduction theory ignoring the notions of resistance. This concept is fundamental to the Gramscian notion of hegemony and has important methodological implications for studying counter-hegemonic struggle. Aronowitz and Giroux argue that Bordieu and Bernstein, while differing in specifics, have a view of class domination as the central element underlying the mechanisms of social and cultural reproduction.

Yet rather than viewing class domination as only one mode of oppression they have fallen into the reductive position as seeing it as the only mode. Consequently there is little or no treatment of patriarchy (or racism) as a related but distinct and powerful moment in the process of social domination. (Giroux, 1981a, p. 11).

Giroux suggests that the fundamental difference between the new sociologists and that of Friere is their respective starting places. The new sociologists commencing with the;

logic of political, economic and cultural reproduction, whereas, Friere's analysis begins with the process of production, that is, with the various ways in which human beings construct their own voices and validate their contradictory experiences within specific historical settings and constraints. (Giroux in Friere1985, p xvi).

Belich (1987) and Owens (1981) offer a useful model to evaluate the situation within New Zealand during the period under study. Belich states that this period can usefully be seen as a period characterised by complementary 'Zones of Influence'. The zones of influence were each characterised by different cultural perspectives and in particular by the different types of social control within them. Owens (1981) considers that the fundamental differences in social control between the two zones could be illustrated by reference to the Europeans who were living among the Maori as traders. These Europeans had been incorporated into the Maori tribal structure of whanau, hapu and iwi. They were
respectful and cognisant of Maori kawa and tikanga as contrasted with the European divisions of race, class and sect. Complexities and differences within these interacting zones are obscured if we concentrate upon an analysis of class as if New Zealand was indeed one society.

One example is obscuring the ability of Maori people to exist in a market economy while living in a culture different from that which Classic Marxism or Capitalism would prescribe as necessary for the successful management and arrangement of 'emerging' Capitalism. Temm (1990) details the success of the Maori people in adapting the new methods of marketing and agriculture to their own way of life. Indeed the emerging details about the success of the adaptations of Maori groups to the economic opportunities of these decades is seriously challenging much of New Zealand's stereotypes and mythology about Maori people.

Friere (1985) also steps outside standard Marxist analyses by arguing that "society contains a multiplicity of social relations, which contain contradictions and can serve as a basis from which social groups can struggle and organise themselves." Arncowitz (1981), in Giroux (1984) argues that the persistent use of the Marxist perspective and reliance upon the analytical power of the concept of class as the exclusive referent for the understanding of history and the dynamics of domination and struggle, has limited usefulness. He argues that there is little benefit beyond an insistence upon the depressing inevitability of domination, and the creation of a 'feeling of hopelessness. He argues that the development of a critical theory of emancipation;

demands that the Marxist theory of class and history be discarded and the theoretical terrain of culture and ideology be given primary importance as a constitutive force in the shaping of consciousness and historical agency. (p. 115).

Gramsci's notion of hegemony, is important in this context, for here emancipatory action is not reduced to historical inevitability, but to an historical potentiality. This notion added to the critique of classic Marxism that Gramsci began, and as extended by Arnowitz, Giroux and Friere is that of recognition that
"class is not the only terrain where contradictions are rooted and struggles emerge." Contradictions and forms of oppression are also rooted in "sexual, ethnic, and racial social practices and hierarchies". The principal assumption underlying this argument is that the analytical usefulness of the concept of hegemony is much broader than class. Therefore, the attempt to attain political ascendancy and self determination cannot be understood entirely through the category or interests of class analysis.

Another limitation of this 'class' perspective is the reduction of the Maori culture to a sub-set of European culture. This reductionism contains concomitant denial that Maori culture is a fully functioning culture on its own and does not need to be defined in reference to another culture. This is a persistent myth in New Zealand educational circles and its powerful impact has been the channelling of analyses and appreciation of Maori culture through the medium of Pakehadom.

Maori and Pakeha societies had and still have demonstrably different underlying structural formative principles (Anderson,1988). Both Maori and non-Maori have clearly spelt out for a wide audience some of these principles, see for example the wide range of ideas covered in King (1976). Anthropologists, such as Metge, (1976) and Salmond, (1975, 1976, 1985) have also clearly identified some of these principles. Further refinement work by Metge (1986) illustrates that Maori society has fundamentally different organising principles from those of the cultures of a majority of the theorists who try to analyse Maori society.

The cornerstone principles of Maori culture do still exist today, despite an enormous attempt by the education system to assimilate Maori into the European world view. Resistance to this assimilation and marginalisation (Walker, 1990) has centred upon the central institutions of the Marae, the central ceremony of the Hui, and the conservatism (in its non-pejorative, positive sense) of the wisdom and respect for the power of knowledge and of the role of kawa held by the older Kaumatua. That Maoridom has maintained its conception of the world
illustrates the strength and the successfulness of the Maori resistance to
annihilation, through assimilation. Another element of resistance has been
Maori reaction to the denial of a place for Maori in the modern society. The
marginalisation that took place served a conservationist function, for Maori were
forced to live outside of the mainstream of the Pakeha dominated world. Belich
(1987) claims that it was the isolation in the King country for such a long period of
time that significantly helped Maori culture to survive. Those who did enter the
world of the Pakeha were forced to identify and assimilate with the dominant
culture. One very clear message from this study of my family is that those who
did enter the Pakeha world, leaving behind those essential institutions of
resistance; the marae, the language; were to be absorbed by a 'culture' that would
not tolerate differences.

RACISM

Belich (1987) and Simon (1990a) offer an analysis of racism that has a
usefulness and applicability to the situation in which my family were growing up.
This analysis goes far beyond the limitations of class as a tool for understanding.
This analysis will be detailed in chapter three, but it is outlined here. Essentially
those Europeans who arrived here in New Zealand from the 1800's to the 1860's
subscribed to some form of racist ideology that had one common root in a belief
that white people were inherently superior to 'people of colour'. In Gramscian
terms, a successful ruling group must be able to establish its intellectual and
moral leadership and attract support from other groups. In New Zealand, in the
1830's to the 1860's, the Missionaries and the Governor were relatively successful
in this aim. The missionaries persuaded many converts to subscribe to their
model of the world and its development. However, the missionaries became
frustrated as many of these converts began to reject the world view as presented by
the missionary and to develop a syncretic amalgam of their own. One early
example was the Papahurichia religion which developed in the Bay of Islands in
1833. There were to be many other syncretic responses develop in the nineteenth
and early twentieth centuries (Elsmore, 1985, 1989). This syncretisation is readily understandable in Gramscian terms, for it was really the result of the process of counter-struggle that is a feature of every hegemonic relationship.

The Governor attracted Maori in the early part of the 'crucial decades' through a system of 'patronage'. However, subsequent Governors and Settler Governments created suspicion among Maori and prompted the development among some Maori groups of a very strong counter hegemonic alternatives, such as the King Movement. In the latter period of these decades, the Settler Assembly attempted or supported attempts by others to attract the non-loyalist Maori to its cause by both persuasion and bribes of grain, cash grants, and finally salaries as 'hundred' magistrates (Gorst, 1864).

To understand this failure to attain hegemony over the non-loyalist Maori, by the Settler Assembly who were eventually victorious in their petit hegemonic struggles over other Pakeha groups, it is necessary to understand both the degree and nature of the petit hegemonic struggle between conflicting Pakeha groups, and the ideology that underlay the actions and attitudes of these conflicting groups. As will be developed in chapter three, these ideologies fall into two broad categories. Firstly, an ideology of racial categorisation that acknowledged that Maori were capable of being incorporated into the new order. This was opposed by a racial categorisation that asserted that Maori were people who were inherently incapable of taking part in the new order. Both categorisations were racist, and therefore denied self determination for Maori, but their effects were to be different. The former was an inclusive category, the latter exclusive. The former was a form of paternalistic humanitarianism fundamental to the notion of Assimilation, that became the apparent heart of New Zealand's education policy for over a century from 1867. More crucial, however, to New Zealand's education system was the second category, that was aimed at removing Maori from any position of influence and power, and effectively became the real heart of education policy. The full effect of these racist categorisations is examined by Simon (1990a).
The 'exclusive' ideology, ironically, partially saved Maori culture from annihilation and suffocation through assimilation. The successfulness of the missionaries in their incorporative ideologies is well illustrated in the Pacific, in the Cook Islands (Scott, 1991) and in Hawaii, (Kameʻeleieva, 1991). In contrast, in New Zealand, where the secular Settler Assembly and their 'exclusive' racist ideology soon became dominant, these policies resulted in Maori continuing to develop their own adaptations of Christianity (Elsmore, 1985, 1989). Maori were excluded from the mainstream of political decision making for over a century, experienced the near total destruction of their language, and became a rural 'peasantry', which forced them to fall back upon their own resources. This situation perpetrated poverty among Maori, but also contributed to the retention of their language and culture. The ultimate irony is that if the settlers had really wanted to exclude and eliminate Maori thought and practice from the political, social and economic mainstream, then the best way to have done so would have been to have adhered to the Missionary model from the beginning.

The period following the wars can best be seen as a period of marginalisation of Maori, rather than of class formation. During this time through the workings of the land courts (Ward, 1973; Sorrenson, 1981), and the education system, (Simon, 1990a, chapter 4) most Maori were ruralised, forced into a subsistence existence on insufficient and agriculturally unproductive lands, limited in attainment in their native schools through restrictive curricula and low expectations from teachers. Maori were offered marginal, part time employment within the commercial rural sector that was essentially controlled by Pakeha. A more appropriate portrayal of this picture is similar to that of Peasantry as offered by Franklin (1973). Pakeha institutional racism through the courts and the schools was to marginalise the Maori during the latter nineteenth century to a peasant existence, but outside of the 'class' structure. Maori were called upon to enter the commercial sector only when needed and were discarded when they became a drain upon the commercial sector that supported the Pakeha 'class' structure. Maori provided seasonal labour for the commercial sector when
needed, and when not needed they were to return to their own resources. This was not a class system, but a variation on a much more ancient system of domination implemented by the Settler representatives.

**TAPU VERSUS TAPU.**

Now that hegemony has been identified as a broader analytical tool than the notion of class, the 'overriding dynamics' of the concept of hegemony need further explanation. Femia (1975) argues that Gramscian theory is often taken at its crudest level and therefore "the concept's nuances, along with its theoretical potentialities, have been obscured if not completely disregarded" (p. 29).

Any situation of ideological predominance of a particular group or class seems to have been deemed hegemonic. Femia challenges this use as lacking in intellectual rigor. A somewhat neglected, yet crucial aspect of hegemony that Gramsci highlighted, was that alternative ideologies are always present, exerting their counter-hegemonic influences. These alternative views are not acknowledged as valid by the agencies of civil society as they present a challenge to the existing order and serve to undermine its legitimacy (Reid, 1988, p. 56).

However, if hegemony is conceived as a relationship entered into by the dominators and the dominated, it could be argued that the dominated must in some way contribute to their own oppression. This does not create a very favorable impression of the oppressed, nor does really mirror reality. It lends support to the classic Marxist's negativistic analysis of ideology as that which dupes the oppressed into accepting the ways of the oppressors. To analyse the relationship between Reverend Maunsell and the Maori people of Lower Waikato in this light would do them both a serious injustice. There was a great deal of interest taken by the Maori in the benefits that the European world could offer to the Maori of that time. These 'benefits' ranged from technological skills to literacy skills, methods of marketing and communication and spiritual beliefs. Acceptance by the Maori of many such elements from the Pakeha world, was on their own terms, and interpreted in terms of their own world view, so much so that
Maunsell had to create a separate institution to reestablish the dominance of his worldview. The counter-hegemonic struggle of the Maori was very strong, both to the relatively benign missionary and to the more rapacious Settlers. Therefore to Gramsci:

In none of its forms does hegemony represent a cohesive force; instead it is riddled with contradictions and tensions that open up the possibility for counter hegemonic struggle as well as reinforcing the distinction between hegemony and ideology. (Giroux, 1981, p. 17).

Thus a theory that can only account for this interaction in terms of a one-way domination by ideology is inadequate. To adopt such a theory would also contribute to the hegemonic ideal of Pakehadom, by implying that Maori could not cope with struggles. Maori had coped with struggles for generations. Even a cursory knowledge of Pre-European Maori culture would establish this, see Kelly (1949) for example. What was happening during these 'crucial decades' in Maori terms was nothing new. It was the struggle of one tapu against another tapu (Shires, in Duming, 1987). This struggle is fundamental to understanding the 'rituals of encounter', and indeed was fundamental to the very existence of Maori (Salmond, 1975). This concept of struggle is understandable in both Maori and Pakeha terms, and should contribute to a bi-cultural methodology and analysis. A bi-cultural theory of struggle is needed which is understandable in terms of the world views of both cultures, otherwise, it will simply perpetuate the dominance of one cultural world view over the other.

Friere (1985) also has made this idea of counter hegemonic struggles a central part of his theory; the insight that domination represents a combination of:

- contemporary and historical ideological and material practices that are never completely successful, always embody contradictions and are constantly being fought over within asymmetrical relations of power. (Giroux, in Friere, 1985, p. xii).

Friere provides the key to understanding the notion of emancipatory research. Interactions are never passive, they are ongoing and active. If they are to be productive then there needs to be an educative function to the interaction, to
raise the consciousness (the Frierean notion of conscientisation) of the 'oppressed' to understand their 'oppression'. Smith (1990) believes that to accomplish this, Maori and Pakeha will have to confront the unpleasant aspects of our colonial past.

Friere has suggested that the maintenance of power and oppression by dominant groups is closely aligned to control over knowledge and learning. In his terms 'the control over what is deposited as valid knowledge is employed to avoid conscientising the oppressed'...Thus, the full schooling endorsement of Maori knowledge, language and culture would not only mean accepting the unsavoury aspects of colonial history, it would also lead to an increased conscientising of Maori people of their social, cultural, economic and political oppression. (p. 188).

One means of maintaining power and oppression by dominant groups, has been their control over research into the plight of the oppressed. Giroux has identified the need for research to be emancipatory. Giroux (1983) describes the challenge that presently confronts radical pedagogy as that, while being rooted in a hatred of any form of domination, there is a need to develop modes of critique within a theoretical framework that allows for the possibility of social action and 'emancipatory discourse'. Underlying the premise that this research should be emancipatory is the need for it to be 'critical' of the underlying assumptions of the prevailing powerful groups, their rationalisations and the myths created to justify the continuance of their positions. The research position taken in this study will attempt to be emancipatory and critical in this sense.

Many attempts have been made by theorists to understand the process of domination by powerful groups and how to alleviate it. Very few, however, have attempted to offer a theory that will cope with the complexities of a bi-cultural situation. The Frierean analysis is pertinent to this consideration and can be seen to be an important and logical extension of the subtlety of the Gramscian principles of hegemony as an analytical tool. It will be seen that a Frierean approach allows for specific cultural world views to be expressed, and not to be
It is to the liberation of the 'oppressors', the oppressed themselves and those of the family who unwittingly support this oppression, that much of this thesis is focussed, with its attempt at a bi-cultural theory and methodology. Perhaps Walker's ideas could be taken further to consider the loss of the ontological base of the Maori side. The integrity of another world view than that of the powerful group needs to be asserted, as a means of establishing what is true, and of challenging the hegemonic assumptions and the myths of superiority.

THE ROLE OF THE SCHOOL.

To evaluate critically the function of the mission school at Maraetai and later at Kohanga, we need an analytical tool more sophisticated than that offered by positivism, that is an examination of the school as a instructional site. Positivist discourse is inadequate and indeed faulty for it takes as its most important concern "the mastery of pedagogic techniques and the transmission of knowledge instrumental to the existing society" (Giroux in Friere, 1985, p. xiv). Restructuring the analysis of day to day instructional content and aspirations of the education proponents ignores the role of the school as a political and a cultural site. A critical perspective is one that considers that the school needs to be examined as an area of contention among differently empowered cultural and economic groups. This implies analysing the school as a locus for the questions related to knowledge, power, indoctrination and domination. Whose knowledge, whose power and which group was to be dominant are questions guided by this theory. The answers to these questions hopefully will explain the role of the school in the choices made by my family.

The 'new sociology of education' ( after Bordieu, 1977, and Bernstein, 1977) posits that schools are agencies of social, economic and cultural reproduction; essentially powerful instruments for the reproduction of the 'dominant' culture and for legitimising the ideologies of the time (Giroux, 1981). While this analysis is sufficient to understand part of the relationship of reproduction, this analysis
does not go far enough for it ignores the resistance of the 'initiates'. This resistance is a necessary condition for analysis.

There is a further need to consider institutional attempts to counter resistance. This study shows that when Maori 'bought into the system' for the benefits of literacy, they bought into the whole cultural package that Maunsell was offering. It became impossible for the participants in the schooling to continue to participate only in the aspect of the new culture that they wanted, for when Maunsell realised what was happening, he changed the structure and the function of the schools to bring about the total absorption of the new culture by the participants. He established a boarding facility. This was a major shift from the partial absorption that was enabled by the earlier day schools. It was the 'counter hegemony' of the Maori that made Maunsell create the new boarding schools. This was an act of resistance and struggle on the part of the Missionary. In those years Maori were tending to make the Pakeha irrelevant to their world once they had been persuaded to pass on those skills Maori people perceived as useful. That Maori do not actually need Pakeha people to survive in a modern world is not often considered by Pakeha researchers. This is a rather 'uncomfortable' perspective to confront the now dominant with, and as such it has been well ignored by traditional and radical Pakeha researchers alike.

A 'critical perspective' allows an examination of both the 'hidden curriculum' of the institution and the underlying ideology fundamental to the specific type of education and the forms of knowledge transmitted. As will be shown in chapter six about the school, the knowledge transmitted was critical to the new culture that Maunsell was trying to impart. What was included in, and what was excluded from the curriculum was specifically intended to promote the manual, the industrial and the mental, those factors that would promote the development of the Missionaries new world order. "In this view, culture is linked to power, and to the imposition of a specific set of ruling class codes and experiences" (Giroux, in Friere, 1985, p. xv). The new culture is promoted through the process of hegemony, through the process of convincing the
'subordinate' group that their culture is no longer suitable for meeting the demands of the new day. As explained earlier, fundamental to the concept of hegemony is the continual process of struggle between the 'dominant' and the 'subordinate' group. It will be demonstrated that this was a constant source of conflict between Maunsell and the local Maori. The culture that Maunsell introduced emphasised the positive elements of his theocratic model, and affirmed those who were subscribers to this particular world view. The corollary to the positive affirmation of the missionary culture in the school was the concommitent denigration of the "histories, experiences and dreams of the subordinate groups" (p. xv).

The particular modes of incorporation are of significance in this theorising. The educational institutions are usually the main agencies of the transmission of an effective dominant activity, the new order. The specific educational institution developed by Maunsell and the other Missionaries will be examined to establish how they developed and modified to ensure the transition of the dominant world view of the Missionary. The study will examine also the reaction to these institutions from the new Government. Governor Grey was initially happy to incorporate Missionary schools into his wider plan, for he thought that he would be able to modify them to suit his own purposes (Barrington and Beaglehole, 1974). However, he underestimated the resistance offered by the Missionaries, as they engaged in their own rejection of his hegemonic overtures. Finally the exasperated members of the Settler Assembly were to demand curricular changes and eventually changes in control of the institutions as they realised that the Missionaries were resisting settler attempts at hegemony as well. The demise of the mission schools resulted from the institution of the Education Acts of 1867 and 1877, which promoted secular education. These acts were to be the means by which the Settler Government began to control the modes of incorporation. The Settler Assembly's educational hegemonic structure began to assert itself with their establishment of the Native Schools. Simon (1990a, 1990b) graphically details
how these schools were actually to marginalise Maori people due to the 'exclusive' racist ideology.

**MANA**

One question remains paramount as one studies the successfulness of Maunsell's achievements compared with those of Ashwell and Morgan, Church Missionary Society missionaries who ran similar institutions further up-river. It would appear that the successfulness of Maunsell can be ascribed to the 'unwavering loyalty' offered to him and to his vision by the local chief, Waata Kukutai. The successfulness of Maunsell can be measured by the degree to which he was able to convince Kukutai to subscribe to the new culture. This response will be contrasted to those other Christian leaders upriver, who eschewed the assimilationist role of Kukutai. After attempting unsuccessfully to pursue their own model of integration, they eventually joined the forces of opposition to the 'coercive hegemony' of the new state. These responses will be analysed in terms of the success of the persuasiveness of the various hegemonic agents active in the area.

**DISCUSSION OF THEORY**

Jim Ritchie, at Turangawaewae Marae in May of 1990, offered an explanation for the phenomena of our search for our Tupuna as a "typical third generation search" (Ritchie, 1990) that followed an unpleasant emigration, or the escape from horrific circumstances. Ritchie explained that the first generation did not want to talk about the events surrounding their departure. The second generation were so busy consolidating their new situation that they too didn't want to talk about it. It was the third generation who strove to seek out the dispersed family structure, all the time hoping to understand the reasons behind the dispersals of the first generation. Although Ritchie's explanation assisted me in my establishment of my interviewee group, I believe there were deeper forces
at work in New Zealand during the last 150 years that made the family 'amnesia'
inevitable.

Adorno introduces the interesting concept of 'historical memory' that;
all reification is forgetting...objects become thing-like at the moment when they are
seized without all their elements being contemporaneous, where some of them is
forgotten ( Friere and Giroux in Livingstone 1987, p. xi).

The picture we had passed down to us was spasmodic and selective. This picture
was also influenced by a very selective education system, and a very strongly
biased social climate. Adorno contends that it is the loss of this historical memory
that is a pre-condition for all sorts of domination. In order for the process of
domination to proceed, all traces of viable alternatives need to be annihilated.

The development in New Zealand of a bi-cultural world view during the
crucial decades, essentially Maori, yet incorporative of the material advances
offered by the Western world, and within the control of Maoridom, is a possibility
examined by Ward (1973) and Owens (1981). That an alternative to the commonly
accepted historical picture of New Zealand was being developed in the Lower
Waikato in the decades preceding the Land Wars, and that this alternative
development and its implications have been forgotten, is a clear example of the
loss of historical memory, that perpetuates attitudes of European superiority in
New Zealand. The particularistic, empiricist methodology employed by
generations of historians and educators from the dominant group to analyse the
holistic phenomenon of history, has perpetuated the status quo as established
with the arrival of the missionaries. Perpetuation of that status quo has continued
through the subsequent struggles for the hearts, minds and resources of New
Zealand, and is seen particularly clearly in the history of our educational
institutions.

The story of my family and their formative years in the Lower Waikato
during the years 1838 to 1865 is a case in point of the political struggle for control
between the assimilationist approach of Rev Robert Maunsell, his main local
supporter Waata Kukutai of Ngati Tipa, the assimilationist policies of Governor
Grey, and the annihilationist policies of the Settler governments. The potential for a bi-cultural future envisaged by Maori such as Wiremu Tamihana and Pakeha like William Colenso and Sir William Martin was lost in the maelstrom of hegemonic struggles. That the potentiality for a bicultural future has also been lost to history reveals much about the dominance of the successful antagonists. Giroux and Friere in Livingstone (1987) submit that the;

implication was that forgetting instances of human suffering and the dynamics of human struggle not only rendered existing forms of domination 'natural' and acceptable, but also made it more difficult for those who were victimised by such oppression to develop an ontological basis for challenging the ideological and political conditions that produced such suffering. (p. xvii).

The concept of historical memory is useful therefore, in order to develop a discourse that will break through the false harmony prescribed by of dominant ideology.

The first step in this process of reasserting and reclaiming the bicultural vision, must be a rediscovery of the details of that 'human struggle'. The major question arising from this is how could a bicultural family have become monocultural. Answering this question may help to answer the question of how a bicultural country became mono-cultural?

In this thesis I will introduce the family members, the brother and sisters of my Grandfather, describe their lifestyles and salient events. Then I will examine one of those elements, the schooling of the Reverend Maunsell, that made possible the hegemony of the dominant group, within the period leading to the land wars of the 1860s.
SUMMARY.

To promote the concept of biculturalism as emancipatory, we need an analytical tool that will suit this purpose. The concept of the persuasiveness of the various world views within the conflicting groups that typified this period, is suggested as an organising analytical concept for this purpose.

This conceptual framework is necessary to allow the actions and attitudes of individuals to be understood in terms of the actions and attitudes of others, while allowing those attempting to make sense of this complexity to a) acknowledge that their interest is in fact an integral part of the process b) that what is done is done and why we study history is for our purposes today, and c) the realisation that we can decide what our purposes can be; which means that we can establish an emancipatory goal for our work if we so desire.
CHAPTER THREE : RACIAL ATTITUDES.

INTRODUCTION

Belich (1987) notes "there is an extensive literature on the subject of the Victorian ideas of Race", but he does insist that in his book "no attempt at a full examination is possible ..." (p. 321). This situation also applies to this thesis, however, it is important to consider the implications of the racial attitudes of Victorian Europeans toward Maori potentiality in order to aid an understanding of the actions of the agents engaged in the hegemonic process.

The Europeans who came to Aotearoa in the 19th Century exhibited a variety of attitudes toward the indigenous New Zealanders. This range of differing attitudes, was based upon the notions of race that had developed in the 18th and 19th Centuries in Europe. Two broad forms of racism had emerged as a product of the political conflicts in Europe during this period; one inclusive, yet patronising, the other, exclusive and destructive. They were to be typed as Monogenesist and Polygenesist (Belich, 1987; Simon, 1990a).

Monogenesist Racism was based upon the belief that "Black equality was prospective, not actual, and it was a distant prospect" (Belich, 1987, p. 325) whereas polygenesist racism was based upon the belief in "multiple creations, in several Adams and Eves" (p. 323). In its extremist form, polygenesist racism took the view that human races were separate species of the genus homo. Basically this latter belief was predicated upon the 'inherent inferiority' of the non-white races in the world.

Despite their differences, Simon (1990a) contends that;

Both views... can be seen to be Eurocentric and ideological. Both serve the interests of European ruling classes by concealing social contradictions (p. 55).

Indeed it is fundamental to this study that both systems are predicated upon the notion of white superiority. This commonality negated any appreciation that Maori were able to maintain their own mana motuhake. The implications of this
were to be profound for the future development of Race relations in New Zealand. It is only now in the late twentieth century that this is being addressed in the New Zealand education system (Smith, 1990). It is important to analyse the commonality of these ideologies, for as was explained in the previous chapter this commonality underlaid the gross hegemonic process that all the European groups subscribed to. The petit hegemonic perspectives of the Pakeha groups were manifest of the differing racial attitudes described above as Monogenesist and Polygenesist.

The roots of the common European attitudes to race lay in their attempt to resolve those contradictions that were part of their emerging world view of the 18th and 19th centuries. There was the contradiction of needing to understand the 'obvious' differences that were perceived to exist between human beings following the expansion of European interests in the 'Age of Discovery'. That these 'differences' were in the minds of the Europeans, was at the root of the contradiction. Needless to say, the resolution was not in these terms, but rather in terms of supposing there was some problem inherent to the observed peoples. Physical characteristics formed a base for the explanation of the 'differences'. That many of the differences were indeed created by the 'Age of Discovery' itself escaped notice also. There was a pressing need to find a ready justification to rationalise the horrors of the slave trade and a need to resolve that Christian guilt created by the economic and political dominance the trade gave to Europe, and the English middle classes in particular. This justification took two forms, abolitionist and continuist. These two strands were to emerge as rationalisations and justifications in the racial categorisations described earlier as Monogenesist and Polygenesist.

Simon (1990a) explains how the emerging conflict within the late 18th and early 19th century about the abolition or continuance and justification for the slave trade tended to spawn these two racially based justifications. On one side developed the conservative religious contention, along with other reformists, that proposed that all races had "sprung from the monogenetic root of Adam," therefore all races were inherently similar and through a process of civilising
would be able to be raised to the standards established and attained by the white race. On the other side, the adherents to the continuance of the slave trade gradually began to justify their position through the idea that "God had created other species of man besides Adam." Thus the doctrine of *Polygenesis* began to gain credence. The latter doctrine was to achieve a 'distinguished' prominence in the academic world of physical anthropologists. However in New Zealand this ideology was used to justify marginalisation of Maori people, just as earlier it had been used to justify the economic and political benefits of the slave trade.

The evolutionary theories of Darwin and Wallace were later to be used to justify and further the Polygenesist doctrine and gave birth to the doctrine of 'Social Darwinism'. The central idea of Social Darwinism was that both the physical and mental superiority of the white races was 'proven' by scientific evidence from the likes of the 'craniologists' and other 'scientists' who contended that natural selection of mental and indeed moral characteristics proved the superiority of white people. The 'obvious' results of evolutionary selection, meant that the Black races were inferior by birth, and could in no way catch up.

In New Zealand this theory was used to account for the decline of the Maori race. Their decline was seen to have commenced even before the arrival of Europeans. This theory was used to justify the 'obvious' impoverishment and marginalisation of the Maori people that was actually created by deliberate policies of the Settlers Government.

Gascogine (1977) contends that the capital accumulation created by the Slave Trade allowed the 'Industrial Revolution' to commence. Debate over this contention is continual, but it does highlight the mythology perpetuated in the education system even today that the reason for the development of the Industrial Revolution in Britain was because of the intellectual superiority of the British. Belich (1987) writes, when considering the Victorian Interpretation of the New Zealand wars that;

> The European monopoly of the higher mental faculties was the innermost tabernacle of Victorian racial attitudes. To question it was to question a whole view. When events did
indeed cast doubts on it, as with evidence of Maori possession of the higher military
talents, Victorian commentators avoided, misinterpreted, or suppressed them. (p. 326).

The roots of the Humanitarian movement in Victorian Britain lay in the
need to find some sane way to counter the horrors of the slave trade, while being
careful not to destroy the economic and political superiority that had come with
that infamous trade. The solution was an embracing of the ideology of
humanitarianism. Humanitarianism, exhibited patronisingly as either a rationale
to 'protect' aboriginal races or as a need to 'civilise' those less fortunate, was an
outcome of the reform of the slave trade. It was a response which did not consider
the promotion of self determination for indigenous peoples. The movement was
designed to solve an internal contradiction within the European community by
maintaining the rationalisation that 'white' races were somehow superior to those
'not so white'. The mediation offered by Humanitarianism was to allow the non-
white the chance to 'catch up'.

By the end of the (18th) century 'civilisation was largely seen as the destined goal of all
mankind and used to account for the apparent 'racial' differences amongst human beings.
Typologies were drawn up classifying people as 'savage', 'barbarian' or civilised', and
while debates ensued as to the positions in the hierarchies occupied by particular
peoples, it was, nevertheless assumed that, given time, those in the lower order would
progress towards civilisation. (Simon, 1990a, p. 49).

'Civilisation' was seen as the perogative of those at the top of the order. Thus the
rationalisation for enslavement could be justified by some as a means of raising
the 'benighted' into the realm of Christian civilisation. Others opposed to
enslavement, used the same justification for their purposes, without this seeming
to provoke any contradiction within Victorian society. The compatibility of
Victorian perspectives on Christianity with enslavement helped to hide the
hideousness of the trade that reduced people to a pitiful state, totally dehumanised
them and rendered them powerless. The rationalisation that Christianising was
beneficial, even in a slave ship, permeated its way to Aotearoa, albeit modified by
a paternalistic humanitarianistic reaction, in the earliest period of the 19th century.
Samuel Marsden clearly stated his preference for the 'civilisation' that he knew, and he implied that the type of political organisation to which he adhered was superior, and justified the absence of these 'criteria of civilisation' as being caused by the dominance of Satan; he reported that the Maori he came into contact with in 1830 had "no laws, nor magistrates; so that Satan maintains his dominion without molestation" (Owens, 1981, p. 41).

This patronising humanitarianism is also apparent in the instructions by Lord Normanby to Hobson in 1840 and helps us to understand why there was so much confusion over the meaning of the Treaty (Orange, 1987). The English rationalised it in terms of their finally agreeing to take the troubles of this place onto their shoulders, that is, as a treaty of cession, whereas it is conceivable that they saw it as a military stratagem to ensure a peaceful solution to an exploding population in Britain (Steven, 1989). Maori saw it in a different light, as a Treaty confirming tino rangatiratanga, or self-determination. That Henry Williams saw fit to modify the Treaty with his translation is evidence of conflict between the two different aspirations and fundamental ideologies. The British would not have pursued the Maori language version and the Maori would not have signed the English language version, unless there had been a better attempt to persuade them of the benefits than that which passed for discussion at Waitangi. In contrast to other Maori leaders, the Maori leaders at Lower Waikato did in fact sign the English version of the Treaty. To understand how these Maori were convinced to sign the English language version, it is crucial to understand the role played by Robert Maunsell as an intellectual in the process of promoting the hegemony of the British system of justice.

Chapter four discusses the tendency for historians nowadays to write about the inability of the Maori to cope with the European contact period of the early 19th century. This contention is rooted in the belief in the 'fatal impact' that Maori were supposed to have suffered as a result of this contact. This is linked with the paternalistic 'noble savage' attitudes of the 18th and 19th century, which in turn helped to promote the protectionist attitudes of the period. These attitudes
are compatible with the notion that civilisation (as understood by Europeans of that time) was open to all, given certain circumstances. This is the monogenesist stance, in that in order to 'cope' with the new order, Maori people had to become part of it. There was no conception of the 'new order' changing in order to 'cope' with Maori society as had been the case with the earliest Pakeha arrivals, the Pakeha-Maori. This assimilationist stance is still at the root of many Educational reforms attempted today (Smith, 1990).

Care must be taken not to imply that during the 19th century there was an evolutionary progression from Monogenesist to Polygenesist beliefs. While it is true they shared a common belief in white supremacy, their effects were to be quite different. As the adherents of the Polygenisist belief became more numerous and politically more powerful following the establishment of the Settler Assembly by passage of the 1852 Constitution Act, their racist denial of a place in New Zealand for Maori and their justification of Maori's inherent inferiority gained prominence.

THE MONOGENESIS OF THE MISSIONARIES.

The evangelical missionaries who arrived in New Zealand tended to adhere to a monogenesist agenda, so that to them the Maori were perceived as having the inherent capacity eventually to reach 'civilisation'. In contrast to the Missionaries, the colonial representatives largely endorsed a polygenesist standpoint "claiming that Aboriginal peoples were inherently inferior to the 'civilised' Europeans" (Simon 1990a, p. 55).

Along with other Missionaries, Robert Maunsell exhibited a belief that Maori were worthy of 'civilising' but that what they believed in and the way they lived scarcely could be accepted as an alternative to English Culture, and therefore needed replacement, in their own best interests.

This benevolent attitude was also exhibited by Wade (1842), a missionary and lexicographer who had travelled to New Zealand in 1835 to assist William Colenso as the Mission Printer. Wade described his admiration for Maunsell and
Hamlin following his visit to the mission station at Moetoa at Manukau, immediately prior to Maunsell's shift to his later location at Waikato Heads. Wade stated they "appeared deeply sensitive of the importance of exercising the thinking facilities of their scholars" (p. 81). He illustrates the developmental belief fundamental to the monogenesist attitude clearly by claiming that:

whatever intellectual or moral rank we may regard them as holding among savages, the New Zealanders are... 'Matured as Savages'. (p. 81).

Wade also exhibits the contemporary bewilderment at the skills Maori people displayed for oracy and memorisation;

- discovered in that condition, wild and untutored, without a written language, having few sources of information and fewer occasions for that exercise of mind by which their faculties were to be developed...afford unquestionably a fair specimen of almost totally neglected mind, and may serve as a criterion of the power of undisciplined memory in adult age. (p. 81).

Wade then proceeded to give numerous examples of the 'extraordinary memories' of orators and genealogists, and he saw these abilities as supporting his contention that these savages were essentially empty vessels awaiting to be filled. Certainly their minds were 'uncluttered'. Simply, Wade was seeing what he wanted to see, not what was actually before him. He was interpreting cultural differences and cultural strengths as cultural deficits, from the perspective of his own world view.

Maunsell's attitudes are strongly evident in his actions and stated beliefs. In 1849 Maunsell praised the formation of a 'A Missionary Association' in New Zealand, and suggested that the primary purpose should be directed to the forming and maintainence of schools among the 'aborigines'.

The channel is now open through which may flow the liberality of those friends who admire this noble energetic race, and who desire them raised to a higher, a more noble, and a more useful position among their fellow men. (Maunsell 1849, p. 26).

In a letter to the Governor in 1856, on the subject of the withdrawal of England's protection, Maunsell was concerned that this withdrawal suited the Colonial Office and the vested interest of the British ruling class, more than it
suited the needs for 'civilising' the Maori. Maunsell reiterated that this withdrawal of crown protection would not allow sufficient time for Maori to reach "that degree of maturity in which they can join the superior race in administering the interests of the common country." (GBPP, 1860, 2719, p. 379).

Maunsell's attitude to the Maori is very clear in this letter;

> If we contemplate the native population, we find them also in a state of motion rising fast in wealth and intelligence. The next twenty years we must expect will see them very different from what they now are. Towards the Queen, as distinct from the New Zealand Parliament, we find them possessed of the highest feelings of loyalty—the result of the exalted and noble principles by which the measures of Her Majesty's ministers and governors have, from the very first foundation of the Colony, been directed towards them. (p. 379).

He believed that it was the duty of the British to indoctrinate the Maori into the uses and extent of the privileges bestowed by the Treaty.

> The great political want, I believe, of the country is some leavening principle to undermine the present system of clanship, and to mould society into those thoughts and actions, which, unless brought into action before the white man has consolidated his power, and before England has withdrawn her protection, must issue either in debasement and contempt to the native race, or in fierce struggles which will end in their extermination. (GBPP, 1860, 2719, p. 380).

Here, Maunsell displays the same ignorance and misperception of the importance for Maori of their tribal structures that persists to the present day, (Smith, 1990).

Maunsell was also critical of the central Waikato Maori when they later advanced the dissolution of this 'clanship' in favour of 'Kingitanga'. When Maori began to take Pakeha ideas and incorporate them into their own system of needs, using them to their own advantage, he sided with those whom he had correctly prophesised would create a conflagration in the country with their greed. Maunsell's desire for full assimilation by educated Maori overrode his concern for them as an independent people. His total conviction that Maori could not cope, except by following the path that he prescribed, caused him to join forces with
those settlers he had originally opposed. The petit hegemonic struggles illustrated in Maunsells letters gave way to the gross hegemonic ideology that the British way was superior, no matter what!

**THE POLYGENESIST BELIEFS OF THE SETTLER REPRESENTATIVES.**

The early settlers in New Zealand broadly subscribed to the Polygenesist belief of the inherent inability of Maori to be 'civilised' and therefore to be fully assimilated into the new order.

The New Zealand Company land purchasing methods were not based on a desire to maintain a place in New Zealand for Maori. The neglect to honour promises of 'tenths' in South Island land transactions illustrates this, (Evison, 1987). Evison, (p. 18) goes further to describe the racist justification for the development of the 'waste lands' doctrine by the New Zealand Company. In the words of Lord Durham, the Governor of the Company, those lands were the "rightful patrimony of the English people, which God and nature have set aside in the New World for those whose lot has assigned them but insufficient portions in the old." 'Waste lands' were conveniently defined by the settlers as those lands not actually cultivated. Food gathering was an idle means of existence and kept others, "more labourious and too much pent up" from occupation.

Ward (1973) recounts that as early as 1840, Maori in the Wairarapa district had discovered the benefits of renting land to pastoralists. However this practice was deeply resented by the settlers, for:

- most settlers had emigrated in the expectation of quickly acquiring their own freehold farms in the new Colony and wanted to rid themselves of a hated dependence on people they regarded as semi-barbarian and inferior. (p57).  

This attitude to Maori was also reported by Kelly (1949) as early as when:

- founding of the towns gave rise to a class of people who knew little of the Maori and cared less. Chiefs now found on visiting Auckland, that they were the objects of disgust and dislike. (p429).
Fox (a former Prime Minister of this Colony) was quoted by Governor Bowen in a despatch as stating that the;

gradual disappearance of the Maoris is not to be attributed in any large degree to their intercourse with Europeans, (for) that, for the most part, has led to the adoption of better food, better dwellings, better general habits of life. The one great cause has been, and is, their utter disregard of all those social and sanitary conditions which are essential to the continuing vitality of the human race; this cause was in existence long before there was an European in the islands, and there is little doubt that the race was on the decrease when Cook first landed there. (AJHR, 1868, Enq 1, p. 12).

Such justification was to become common currency in New Zealand and was still found in personal comments by a number of present day family numbers.
CHAPTER FOUR: METHODOLOGY

THE NEED FOR METHODOLOGY

The implication of the theoretical discussions in chapters two and three is that there is a need for a methodology that will focus not only upon the individuals involved, their aspirations, attitudes and ideologies, nor upon the structural and institutional elements involved, but upon the interactions between these two.

As the focus of this thesis is to move toward an understanding of the reasons for the cultural choices made by my mother's family, and the resultant diaspora, it is important firstly not only to identify the individual people involved, but also the wider context in which they were raised.

Walker (1979) offers a challenge to researchers and a guide to possible methodology when he highlights the need to study the actions of the family members within the context of the period, especially that part of the context that is the Pakeha side. Walker's concern arose from the enormous amount of research done on Maori people by non-Maori. He contended that it was these non-Maori who actually benefited from this research. Walker (1979) warned:

It is an axiom of Social Science that social phenomena have multiple causes, and if these causes are to found the whole field needs to be examined, in other words it is time that researchers examined Pakeha society itself. (p.91).

One decade later, it is timely to accept Walker's challenge, to develop this idea further and create research methodology that will examine both sides, and not just concentrate upon the Maori or the Pakeha side. Although it would appear that this thesis concentrates on an examination of the interactions of the Pakeha side in the form of a study of the petit hegemonic conflicts of the Pakeha groups, just to examine Pakeha society itself, in the case of the Lower Waikato 1840-1865 is insufficient to provide a complete answer to the question of life choice determination by my family. As will be made clear...
in chapter six it was a complex matrix of interactions that affected the institutions that Maunsell created.\(^1\) The multiplicity of causes would not be clarified if only the one side were examined. Therefore a bicultural family needs to be studied by means of a bi-cultural methodology.

Such bicultural imperatives are driving the emerging historiography of the period under study. These imperatives deny assumptions by authors such as Wright (1959) that Maori could not cope with the impact of the new order. Howe (1973, 1984), Owens (1981), Salmond (1983), Binney (1987), Belich (1987), Spoonley (1988), and Temm (1990) propose that Maori did cope with the rapidity of change during the early contact situation. Exponents of what has become the 'fatal impact' scenario (after Wright) tend to see history as a linear process of evolution, and judge the progress of Maori people upon this scale of 'civilisation'. Essentially they construct an ethnocentric, monocultural view with built in assumptions about the 'inadequacies' of the Maori. In contrast the emerging revisionists assume power and conflict between equals are central issues. In this revisionist analysis the significance of the different elements of the social structure, in terms of the interrelationships of the meanings they have within the total context, is examined. Revisionist historians seek an holistic analysis, to discover the relationship, for example "between educational structures and other parts of the social system"(Olssen, 1985, p. 36). Olssen contends that they are conscious of "historicity and social relativism of knowledge and of the dormant social, political and educational ideas of particular periods." Above all in Walker's terms they are questioning the foundations of the Pakeha system, while also investigating the foundations of the Maori system.

One of the potential pitfalls of this approach is that the role of individuals may possibly be played down in the context of understanding how

---

\(^1\) At a further level, it is also necessary in a further study to examine the interactions between Waata Kukutai, Wiremu Tamahana and Rewi Maniapoto, for these three represent the spectrum of response to the colonial impact, and their attitudes and responses would also have impacted on the family.
patterns, people and events fit together. The work of Giroux and Friere informs a wide range of disciplines that are engaging a 'critical perspective'. One example among these is the emerging of a 'critical ethnography'. Anderson (1989, p. 249) notes this was created by dissatisfaction with purely cultural accounts of human actors in which broad structural constraints like class, patriarchy and racism never appeared. However in more recent times this same critical ethnography is now concerned that the resultant over reaction against purely cultural accounts has created dissatisfaction with accounts of social structures in which real human actors never appear. This points to the need for a methodology that strikes a balance, remembering that to study individuals out of their wider cultural context is to ignore the fundamental traditions, beliefs, language, attitudes, and aspirations that influence their actions. These considerations point to the need for a bicultural methodology.

ELEMENTS OF A BICULTURAL METHODOLOGY.

This thesis attempts to develop a bicultural mode of analysis, and of data gathering and processing. The method therefore needs to incorporate Maori and Pakeha preferred ways of information transmission and verification.

According to Binney (1987) the central problem facing someone trained in the methodology of 'a western historian' is that;

Firstly, Maori oral history is not merely another source of information, nor even of perception. The purposes of the oral narrative tradition are to establish meanings for events, and to give a validation for the family's and the group's particular claims to mana and knowledge. ... Secondly, the transmitting of Maori perceptions allows the colonisers to see the perspective of the colonised: a necessary step so that the dominant culture changes its attitudes about the possession of the 'truth'. (p. 27).

This position challenges the purpose of monocultural research. In order for research to be bicultural it is important to consider the different purposes that
it will serve. Serious concerns about research involving Maori people have been raised by Walker (1979) Curtis (1983) Stokes (1985, 1987), Bishop and Glynn (1990) and Smith (1991). These authors caution that research into Maori people and issues associated with Maoridom should not perpetuate the monocultural research methodology and findings so common in the literature.

One of their major concerns is that much research in the past has concentrated on identifying characteristics that make 'sub-cultural' group members function unsuccessfully in the 'common culture'. This research orientation is essentially of a social pathology type (Banks, 1988) where the focus of research is on only one element of a very complex equation. Such research often highlights those elements (often out of context) that are believed responsible for 'deprivation' or functional inadequacy of minority groups.

A great deal of research into Maori people's affairs has had belittling or disadvantaging effects. Much of the research has been designed to answer research questions that have benefited the researchers and the non-Maori academic community rather than the Maori people themselves. Many research activities by non-Maori have disadvantaged and even belittled the mana of Maori knowledge and understanding of their own history. Researchers need to answer the question; What is the use of this research to the Maori people? Indeed they need to put that question to Maori as a validating methodology.

A third and related concern of Maori people is that much writing about the past has been done to advance the cause of others. The supposed inability of Maori people to cope with the culture contact situation has been the focus of much debate. Even today much is still being made of the supposed anarchy of the pre-1840 period and the supposed inability of the Maori to cope with the rapid changes. This is not only misleading but actually serves another agenda, namely to perpetuate the myth of white supremacy. Researchers and
educationalists in general need to develop a means for critically evaluating such harmful myths which have underpinned social and political actions.

Non-Maori research has frequently served to diminish the abilities of the Maori in order to enhance the abilities of non-Maori. Research of this type covers both traditional pre-European period and post-European periods. The classic example pertaining to the former period is the contention that Maori were not able to navigate themselves round the Pacific, and that they were just blown 'before the winds of chance'. In the face of evidence from recreation voyages, as recounted by Lewis, (1978), Siers, (1977) and Finney (1979), from the 'discovery' of Micronesian sailors still using traditional navigation techniques (Finney, 1979) and from contemporary documentary and archaeological evidence the claims by Cumberland, (1981) and Sharp, (1963) are in need of critical revision; so too does the place of this earlier material in school curricula.

Furthermore some researchers have actually removed taonga from Maori people, such as whakapapa, waiata, whakatauki and pakiwaitara. They have processed these taonga for their own research needs and ignored or violated associated tapu. They have done so in the face of advice as to the correct methodology from Kaumatua. The clear implication here is that if the research methodology is not collegial in its widest sense then this form of belittlement will be perpetuated.

The earliest educational institutions established in this country were built upon a very English model. This model held as its core an overvaluing of the literate and an undervaluing of the oral. Evidence will be presented to illustrate the negative attitude of Reverend Maunsell to the oracy and cosmology of the Maori. That such negative derogatory attitudes have persisted into this period are evidence of the successfulness of this act of hegemony. Emancipatory methodology is essential to rescue the value of oral taonga from under this cloud of ignorance. Furthermore if schools are to understand Maori preferred modes of transmission, then it is essential that
their own preferred modes of transmission are critically evaluated, from a bi-cultural perspective.

Maori people have become increasingly concerned over the past century about the 'capture' of their past by others, even to the extent of questioning who has the right to write as as indigene? (Fee, 1988). Fundamental to this question is that of Maori being perceived as a group that is studied 'out there'. Some researchers whose perspective has focussed on Maori as they lived in former times, have been unaware of Maori as a contemporary culture within New Zealand. Are they really a living cultural group in control of their own destiny?

Maori people resent being "dissected" with the same model as used by natural scientists. In this model all natural things can be seen as elements, as objects of study from some 'neutral' stance outside of the people themselves. A methodology of research that fits broadly into the approach typed by Carr and Kemmis (1986) as 'critical theory' shares a common belief that the;

all pervading influence of positivism has resulted in a widespread growth of instrumental rationality and a tendency to see all practical problems as technical issues. This has created the illusion of an 'objective reality' over which the individual has no control, and hence to a decline in the capacity of individuals to reflect upon their own situations and change them through their own actions. (p. 130)

This 'neutral stance' is being seriously questioned by Kaumatua (Tutangaite, 1990) and Maori people in general. This 'neutrality' is now seen as another myth, created by those in positions of authority to perpetuate their own interests.

The critical school has as its central task emancipating people through their own thoughts and actions, from the positivistic domination of thought. This domination it is argued, comes from the animate world being treated as methodologically similar to the inanimate world. The forms of reasoning associated with the inanimate world were becoming a "powerful element in twentieth century ideology" (Carr and Kemmis, 1986, p. 131). Just as Gramsci
THE ORIENTATION OF THE STUDY.

If research is to be emancipatory, consultation with members of the 'research group' as part of the total process is necessary. Allowing the researched to set the agenda, the parameters, the direction of study is an important initial step. Being one of the 'researched' group helps the researcher enormously, but may not be essential. Being on the inside and being part of the study as well as being inextricably tied into the outcomes and implications is likely to satisfy these considerations. Replicating a research study with researchers who are not 'of the group' may be a method whereby these conditions can also be met. To succeed at this the research needs to be collaborative and interactive, and the researcher needs to be guided by the desires and needs of the researched.

The fundamental focus of this research is whakawhanaungatanga, finding whakapapa links. The usefulness of this research has been established by the collective actions of the researched group (which includes this author) over a number of years.

Whakawhanaungatanga includes the rediscovery of links and of rights, but it is necessary to understand that with rights come obligations. I have used the names of my mother as the guide to the whakapapa of our family. At this point our Kaumatua, Tukawekai Kereama warned me not to "pollute" my whakapapa. He said that its use in this context was acceptable but "make sure that you don't throw it away just to anyone." Whakapapa is tapu. From a Maori perspective whakapapa is not just knowledge to be collected for oneself, but for the betterment of the group, for the knowledge belongs to the group.

Rediscovery of whanaungatanga is desired by the family members who see the tremendous benefits that such linkages have to offer. In Gramscian terms this rediscovery can be seen as a counter hegemonic activity. In Maori terms it is a reassertion of one tapu against another, dominating tapu. In a Maori sense to remove one's tapu is to make one noa. Noa is the state of being free from the restrictions of tapu. In certain circumstances the removal of tapu,
if done according to ritualised whakanoa procedures, for example kai following a powhiri, is an acceptable process of meeting and greeting. However, in other circumstances, noa can result from a foreign tapu overcoming your own tapu. This results in the destruction of your mana. Tapu is a restriction imposed upon one's actions by one's own Atua. The mana of your Atua is manifest in your tapu. Metaphorically it is an act of enslavement (whakataurekarekatanga) to have your tapu overcome. In earlier times capture meant removal of tapu, making prisoners noa, their tapu having been overcome by the tapu of an enemy (Shirres in Durning, 1987).

The implications of this perspective for the family is well understood by many of the researched group. For them to accept the knowledge is to accept the reassertion of the tapu. Stepping out of the taurekareka status within the Pakeha world into the Maori world involves commitment to the other Maori world view as explained by Binney (1987). This requires a commitment to the collective value of knowledge, the perspectives of truth, the ontological basis and the sanctity of the knowledge. It is much more than genealogy research purely for interest sake.

Within a bicultural methodology communication is fundamental to understanding of the different perspectives involved in the total picture. The development of this communication will involve a new means of acknowledging, but not attempting to dominate the tapu of each perspective. This is the meaning of biculturalism for influencing our family's future, when new 'rituals of encounter' can be developed to mediate between the tapu of the two peoples.

This thesis has been built upon the work and interest shown by the 'third generation' family historians and genealogists' (see diagram 5.1 for details of names and interests). Their interest and research has provided me with the platform on which to commence production of a comprehensive picture. It was through interviews with these family historians that some of the major questions of this study were suggested. Among the common
questions the family members wanted answered were "Who was Irihapeti? Who was John McKay? Who was Sam Joy? How did they live? Where did they live? How did they bring up their children? Where did the children of Irihapeti settle? Why are they so spread apart? When did this happen? How do the descendents live now, as Maori or as Pakeha? How did this separation occur?

Two examples illustrate this instigatory phase. Kit Davis suggested one orientation for the study, with her statement that although Granny Patterson had never spoken Maori to her "she spoke with a Maori tongue." This raised the question as to why Catherine Patterson suppressed this element of her upbringing? Why did she concentrate only on those things of her Pakeha upbringing and ignore those of her Maori heritage? She was taught in Maori, grew up speaking Maori, yet felt it necessary to suppress this aspect when living in the settler society of Fortrose. It later became clear that those members of the family who remained in the Waikato had also suppressed their Maori language, even though they were living as 'settlers' very close to their own whaunanga, with whom they must have spoken in Maori. Suppression of the language seems to have been an essential step in the process of Europeanisation as decreed by the dominant settler culture. In comparison, the process of Europeanisation as implemented by the Missionary, Maunsell included the retention of their language.

Ron Gordon alerted me to the social attitudes of the later nineteenth century and the early twentieth century, the period of his youth, when he alluded to the derogatory nature of the term "going back to the mat." This was a reference to those of the family who having lived a Pakeha lifestyle, then returned to live with Maori whanaunga. This indicated to me the need to question family members about those subtle as well as the overt controls that were and still are placed upon members of our family to conform to the 'norm'. This itself is such a powerful notion that it warrants further study in it's own right.
As well as being emancipatory in its orientation, and empowering in action, the research methodology needs to ensure a high degree of interaction among the participants of the study. It should not be seen as just the work of the researcher, but rather the product is the result of the work of the participants. Research of this type should also affirm the lifestyles of the community and improve the life chances of the community and its members (Banks, 1988, p. 158).

Essential to the process of power sharing is the need for researchers in this field to be working toward "cross-cultural competency" (Banks 1988, p. 37). Cross-cultural competency requires researchers to develop skills and experiences that will enable them to function cross-culturally by being able to communicate, interact positively and comfortably within one or more cultures.

As Stokes (1987) states:

Ideally, the researcher needs to be a bicultural person, able to weigh up sometimes complex cross-cultural situations and perceive very clearly his or her own role, obligations, liabilities and responsibilities. (p. 11).

and also

A researcher who is not only comfortable in both cultures, but who can also stand back and put both sets of cultural values (and the real and potential conflicts) in perspective, will come closest to evaluating Maori research needs. (p. 10).

I believe this 'cross-cultural competency' may not be a sufficient condition in itself, for much 'belittling' research has been done by some very cross-culturally competent researchers. The key to success is for researchers to have a very clear idea of their own preconceptions, assumptions and prejudices before engaging in cross-cultural research, and to be able to understand the preferred ways of approach that are fundamental to the different cultures.
THE 'RECONSTRUCTED LIFE HISTORY' METHODOLOGY.

In this section the reconstructed life history methodology will be examined. First the method will be identified and explained in the concept of the broad spectrum of research methodologies. Comment will be made as to its suitability for reaching the goals of emancipatory and empowering research. Secondly, the process of selecting the study participants will be detailed. Thirdly, I will outline the techniques of interpretation and analysis and raise some of the theoretical, methodological and ethical issues and problems engendered and encountered. Finally, I will discuss the problems of 'reconstruction' and of analysing and interpreting 'reconstructed' life histories.

The methodology of 'life histories' as outlined by Middleton (1985, 1988 1990) considers many of the methodological concerns outlined above. Middleton contends that the methodology of "Life Histories" is one that concentrates both on social structure and the individual agency. This answers the need for a methodology to locate the decision making of my ancestors within the context of their own lives;

The life history technique has been described as 'particularly suitable to discovering the confusions, ambiguities and contradictions that are played in everyday experiences.' (Plummer 1983, p. 68. cited in Middleton 1988, p. 4).

Middleton (1985) states that:

- People are seen, not as mere victims of their conditioning, but as creative strategists who devise means of dealing with, or resolving, contradictions. (p. 3).

- It is important that this type of methodology is differentiated from that of 'biography'. Biography can easily fall into the dangers of taking the experiences of individuals out of the context which gives them sense.

Middleton (1985) uses the life history methodology to allow for an account of the radicalisation of a group of feminists to emerge. Middleton concentrated on the socialisation of the family, schooling and higher education, career paths, personal relationships and political involvements to allow the stories to emerge. Her methodology answers the concern that Maori
people and others have about the need for collaboration and negotiation, for she developed a complex system of cross referral and consultation to evaluate the progress of her study and the development of the understandings of the researched group. The distances involved and the shortened time frame available precluded my use of such a complex collaborative design as developed by Middleton. However, I believe that the very method of conducting the interviews as information sharing and joint problem solving sessions will to a large degree cover this concern. The four visits to the North Island in 1990 were in the nature of consultation sessions. As new documents and oral material was unearthed it was subjected to the scrutiny of many of the 'researched' group. The third generation participants were also asked to take part in the editing of chapter four and this has proven to be a valuable method of ongoing evaluation of the whole study. So too has been the continual communication I have maintained with my primary informants.

Middleton observes that the life history approach has been curiously neglected in the sociology of education, and probably will continue to be neglected given the increasing popularity of 'biography' at this time. Unless researchers consider the wider implications of their work there will be few researchers asking 'people to describe and evaluate their own schooling or the process of their politicisation" (p.3).

RECONSTRUCTING LIFE HISTORIES.

I was unable to ask my ancestors to 'evaluate their own schooling' or the actual process of their cultural determinations. In this thesis the "Life History" methodology has been modified to enable a study of numerous family members, and others who were seminal in their association with the family, for example Reverend Maunsell and Waata Kukutai. It has been necessary to try to 'reconstruct' these life histories. These 'reconstructed life histories' are different from biographies in that rather than focusing on the
central features of the person's life, the focus is on the interrelationship and interaction of individuals with the context of their lives.

In reference to the family members there was a paucity of surviving empirical information, indeed there had often been a suppression of oral recollections about the 'diaspora effect' and a great deal of 'opacity' of reality had occurred since last century. The only viable research method seemed to be a 'critical reconstruction' of possible answers. The critical reconstruction employed the notion of a critique of ideology. This is fundamental to an emancipatory methodology (Carr and Kemmis, 1986) that ascertains likely reasons for decisions. This critical appraisal focussed upon the persuasiveness of the various world views within the matrix of conflicting hegemonies that typified the period under discussion.

By carefully focussing upon the 'life history', the life of the individual plus a detailed study of the context within which they lived the reconstructions were considered be less tenuous than an attempt at biographical reconstruction. Also that this approach will likely be of greater use to family members (and other interested parties) than biography, because of their need to 'make sense' of their suppressed history.

The concern about those 'revisionists' who focus on 'structure' alone, and therefore undervalue the role that individuals have to play, (Friere, 1985; Giroux and McLaren, 1986; Anderson, 1989) is addressed by the life history conceptualisation. This methodology would appear to offer a resolution to the tension that exists between those who have been accused of reducing the individual to a passive bearer of roles, norms, discourses and ideologies, and those whom Olssen (1985) and others critique as having exaggerated the powers of social actors to construct meanings of their existence that under-emphasises the power relations of the wider society and the limitations that this places on personal choice (Middleton 1985, p. 4).

Gramsci's concept of the intellectual counters the often crude determinism of some structuralist authors. Joll (1977) describes the Gramscian
emphasis on the initial phase of hegemonic domination where the role of the intellectual is paramount, since the achievement and maintainence of hegemony is largely a matter of education.

Reverend Robert Maunsell, was just such an 'organic intellectual' who promoted the early phase of hegemonic domination. He is a major focus of this present study. Through his educational institutions, his messages and attitudes, the family, and of the people of Lower Waikato in general, were subject to a very persuasive argument about the efficacy of Maunsell's world view.

THE TECHNIQUE OF RECONSTRUCTING LIFE HISTORIES.

This methodology allows for and necessitates a wide range of information gathering techniques. These techniques include interviews and problem solving sessions with family members, interviews with other interested parties, photograph analysis, family documentary material analysis, archival manuscript analysis, referring to secondary sources, land court records, newspaper archives, and visits to numerous hui.

This type of thesis fits into the broad rubric of Qualitative Research for the actual type of information gathering technique varied from person to person, according to the most likely source of information. For example, for John MacKay, interviews with descendents was not the most fruitful source, but research done by Elva Kelly unearthed his possible convict passage to Australia. It was archival material from the collection of the Anglican Church where Reverend Maunsell's original records of baptisms was held plus a secondary source that actually located him at Putatakta bay/ Waikato Heads. Much of the material about the siblings of my grandfather has come from family members and their often extensive research collections, but often it was still necessary to consult wider sources to cross check information or to add significantly to the understandings.
The 'reconstructed life history' approach relies upon combining some or all of the above research sources and techniques. Each life history may rely upon differing emphases of the various techniques. Tukawekai Kereama affirmed this part of the methodology by his understanding that the material that I had uncovered in the land court archives was confirmation of family stories that had been in the Joy family for years. This type of cross referencing between oral and written sources was a constant feature of the interviews, and provided confirmation and answers to many questions.

Thus this method employs a dynamic and as such is ever changing as contact and family wide research continues. Therefore, the data presented in this study is a statement of finding up to the present day. Hopefully this methodology and rationale for reconstructed family history research will allow continual addition and reappraisal.

SELECTION OF THE PARTICIPANTS.

The focus of this thesis is on my Grandfather's parents, his siblings, and their missionary, Robert Maunsell. They were raised during the 'crucial decades' for race relations in New Zealand when the range of choices open to Maori was perhaps the widest that it had been for a very long time. The choices ranged from complete absorption into Pakeha institutions and ways through to the development of new Maori models based on adaptation from and to some western ideas and material goods through to a complete rejection of Pakeha ways. Of course, 'few Maori responses to the 'new order' were at either end of this spectrum, but it is significant that there was a choice. The decades preceding the 1860's were to see this choice polarise under pressure from external forces. As these crucial decades drew to a close the cultural options open to New Zealanders of all races became more and more limited.

Ritchie's (1990) analysis of the 'generational effect' of the diaspora, alerted me to the fact that there was an informant group available to me and that they had already selected themselves by their interest in the history and the
cultural diaspora of the family. These were the third generation genealogists who were already "experts" on their perspectives of the family. Without exception they were enthusiastically collaborative in this project.

Similarly it was important to reconstruct the life history of Reverend Robert Maunsell. Another seminal character was the Ngati Tipa chief, Waata Kukutai. Much of the 'success' of Maunsell was due to the support he received from Kukutai and to the mana of Kukutai himself. Therefore it has been important to try to reconstruct, as carefully as possible, the life histories of these two pivotal characters. Chapter six of this thesis will concentrate mainly upon the reconstructed life history of Robert Maunsell. Much of the attitudes and aspirations of Robert Maunsell was available from contemporary written sources. Details of the family members' lives has primarily concentrated upon extensive interviews, as described above, with supplementation and confirmation from other sources.

The interviews were generally conducted as a series and involved a cooperative search for answers, drawing on the expertise of the interviewees. The interviews often took the form of an information sharing session with each of us filling in the missing gaps in the others' perspective. I did have specific questions that I asked of each person once we had shared information pertaining to the family connection. These questions generally were orientated to the life experiences of the interviewee, their schooling and upbringing. This information was useful for us in gauging the degree of Maori or European influences in their own childhoods, as well as serving as a useful guide to the overall context of this thesis. Generally I initiated a discussion about the ancestors of our family. Discussions ranged from their occupations, to whom they married, to where they lived and their attitudes to others.

I focussed on interviewing at least one 'geneologist or family historian' from each sub-branch of the family (see diagram 5.1). ²A sub-branch being

²The process of finding these individuals was a major task in itself, albeit a very pleasant one, and one worthy of its own publication.
defined as those descendants from a particular child of Irirapeti Hahau. It is
the children of Irirapeti who define the sub-branches, and it is her extensive
whakapapa that links her uri together.

One limitation of this present work is the very constrained reconstructed
life history of Irirapeti herself. Irirapeti's life history was very difficult to
reconstruct, for she appears to have accepted the persuasiveness of
Europeanisation early in her life. However, the answer as to why she did this is
really not for me to speculate. A detailed reconstructed life history of Irirapeti
would add greatly to the understandings of this study. The production of this
study itself will hopefully be a step toward justifying the importance of
disclosing Irirapeti's background, upbringing and aspirations by those who
hold this information in trust. There is a need here for cultural understanding
about who has been entrusted with certain information. A future study may
address this omission but the scope of the present study does not allow it.

A second limitation of the present study is that I have been unable to
interview all of the 'target group'. I still have to interview the grandchildren of
Albert MacKay, and Henry MacKay. I also have uncovered an enormous
number of family leads that need to be followed up. However each necessitates
time and the commitment to respond. I believe my priority was to produce
something in response to the enormous help that I had received during the
major research year of 1990, and to summarise and analyse the information
that I had so far. Meanwhile the publication of this information may enlighten
some of the many questions from the family and may indeed act as a wero to
the fourth generation to rediscover that part of their heritage that was denied to
them for so long.
ETHICAL STATEMENT

As a social process, research can bring about changes in peoples lives. This raises ethical questions. To what extent should I pursue the implications of this thesis. Consider the reaction of those members of the family who do not 'want to get involved'. Social process researchers need to be aware of the consequences of their research; they need to be accountable for their actions. This type of research intervenes strongly in people's lives. I was at pains to explain to my informants that I was planning to use the information for a subsequent publication. I also explained to them that they had the right to withdraw personally at any time as indeed they had the right to withdraw their family's story from my collection, although possibly this would need to be referred to the wider sub-family for verification. A related question was the right of veto of subsequent usage. I made it very clear to all my informants that they have the right of veto over the use of material they provided at this stage or at any stage in the future. However, many of my informants stated that I was free to do whatever was necessary to get this information back to the family now and in the future. I returned the chapters on the family to eight of my informants for their editing and any further use will also be subject to this process. When there was an infrequent request for anonymity it has been scrupulously observed. The stories about the family belong to the family. The theoretical framework, methodology and the conclusions are mine. However I have employed them for the benefit of my family. I accept responsibility for any errors and omissions.

I was sometimes apprehensive about what I was about to embark upon. There were some members of the family who did not want the past investigated, also there were others who may have found some of the investigating emotionally painful. Kit Davis (grand-daughter of Catherine MacKay) and the single most important person in initiating my search, had this to say. She was 89 at the time.

Granny Patterson, she was a wonderful old lady. I had a peculiarness about why
I was interested in finding out about Granny Patterson and her people and I used to be that interested and wondered why I should be, but I just found out by talking to you Russell that I know now that I think it is deep in me, you say you are learning Maori, speak Maori and everything. You see that to me I feel is something I missed, I missed that, I would have liked that.

R. But you did the other thing.

K. I did everything I could, everything I thought was interesting. I don't think there was anyone who knew more about Granny Patterson then I did because I was the eldest of my Dadas family and I used to go down there a lot and learnt such a lot from her.

I felt sad causing Kit to think back on her life, and possibly causing her grief, to uncover some things that she didn't feel she had been able to do, I wondered if this was really worth the pain of exposure?

I spoke to Ted Gynn about my concerns. He said;

> it is a perfectly natural process to go through at the end of your life, to grieve for some parts of your life you couldn't cope with or make sense of and it is a way of her coming to terms with her own grief, especially if the person who is the catalyst for grief is in fact someone who may help resolve some of these contradictions.

I took careful note of this idea, hoping that this type of research, essentially picking up on the many questions that many family members want answered will be of significant enough use to outweigh any anguish caused. I was also greatly reassured when recently I returned to Invercargill to take Kit a copy of the chapter on the family from this thesis. She was elated, and said that she would treasure this document. It was a very significant moment for this process of whakawhanaungatanga.

I have a great empathy with Kits' deep yearning to find out more of our Maori ancestry. I myself have always had this feeling. I learned Maori at school in 1968 when it was very unpopular. I did Maori Studies and Maori Reading

---

3Ted is a colleague and a friend.
knowledge at Victoria University, not knowing how important this language was to be for me and not knowing anyone to talk to in Maori.

The only response I had to my learning Maori was when I was applying for my first teaching job following my Secondary Training year at Christchurch Teacher's College in 1973. At an interview for a position at a local high school I was asked, regarding my inclusion of Maori Studies and Maori Reading Knowledge in my Curriculum Vitae as part of my BA degree; "What associations or sympathies do you have with Nga Tamatoa?" (then a 'radical' Maori group) and "are you a follower of radical movements like this?" Needless to say I did not get the job. Nor did I really sustain my interest in learning te reo Maori.

Perhaps I had to wait for the time Grandad suggested may come, when searching for culturally diverse 'roots' was acceptable in the wider society. Since my first fitful attempts to engage in this research in the 1960's, there has been an explosion of interest in Maoridom, led primarily by Maori groups themselves reaching out for a share of the power that would enable them to achieve their own self-determination. This reaching out' by 'radical' Maori groups has also reached people like me and enabled us to acknowledge our heritage. Perhaps this process will enable other bicultural families to respect the centrality of their whakapapa. This phenomenon of 'reaching out' has been described as 'the Maori renaissance', but this term hides the fundamental ideological change that is behind the movement. What has happened has been a linking of common experiences across national boundaries, between colonised groups within Western countries. In some sense the term '4th world' captures this idea. Yet in another sense, the term itself is a term designed by the colonisers to define the relationship they have with other groups. The term fits the Western defined 'First' and 'Third' world nomenclature, which is a hierachical division to further accentuate the superiority of the 'First'. The movement to link common experiences between
it's colonised groups is a revitalisation movement (Banks, 1988). In the New Zealand context the movement is aimed at reaching beyond single causal explanations for exploitation situations and is orientated toward the sharing of power and resources equitably. For Maori, it is an attempt to come to terms with the marginalisation of their cultural world view. It is a movement that is orientated to removing the monocultural viewing of the world that has been forced upon them and non-Maori alike. It is a movement which attempts to allow another cultural system to flourish in New Zealand. This movement is based upon humanitarian beliefs that it will be beneficial for both Maori and Pakeha peoples.

The family story in this study is pursued in the spirit of this revitalisation movement. However the pursuit may not always be a comfortable one. It contains tragedies and denials. It may prove to be painful for some people. I apologise for this but suggest that new learning is often preceded by periods of extreme discomfort. If we are to reconstruct some of the lost past, and if we are to move toward a healthier society, then possibly we may experience some discomfort in the process.
CHAPTER FIVE: THE FAMILY.

INTRODUCTION

So far in this thesis the focus of the study has been introduced, and the theory and methodology that were used to find the answers to the questions generated by the family members have been explained. In this chapter the results of the research about the family is detailed. Included in this chapter are the details about Irihapeti Hahau, her two husbands and their children, that I have been able to find to date. Diagram 5.1 shows the relationship between these parents and children as well as showing the 'third generation' informant group and their relationship to their ancestors. In the diagram each of the descendents of Irihapeti has been allocated a letter within their respective generation level for clarity for the reader. For example Marian MacKay is allocated the reference '1a'. This means that she was the first born of the first generation from Irihapeti. Whereas Benjamin MacKay is '1e', the fifth born child of Irihapeti. Kit Davis with a reference of '3c' is a third generation descendendent of Irihapeti's third child Catherine MacKay.

Irihapeti Hahau, nee Joy nee MacKay.¹ (photo no.1.1)

Very little is known of Irihapeti, yet this is very much her story. There is much speculation and conjecture among the family about her parentage. It is clear at this time that she was of Ngati Mahuta of Taupiri. One significant piece of evidence to verify this was that she was able to gain a crown grant for two blocks of land in 1874. She then had this land vested in her children's names (see map 5.1). This land had been owned as Maori customary land before the confiscations. It was confiscated under the New Zealand Settlement Act 1863 because its owners had been involved in 'rebellion' against the crown during the wars of the 1860's.

¹The spelling of MacKay varies as does the pronunciation. I have chosen to use the MacKay form for this is that used by my Mother and my first cousin, Benjamin Charles MacKay, another grandson of the original Benjamin Charles MacKay. He explained that he had fought a lifelong battle against officialdom who insisted upon spelling his surname as McKay.
Map 5.1.

Parish of Taupiri Lots 469 and 470.

Vested in the names of the Children of Irihapeti, a Crown Grant made under the New Zealand Settlement Acts, 1863 and 1865, dated 22-10-1874. The land is adjacent to the Mangawara stream.
Following the wars, some of the confiscated land was to be returned to its owners, but the Assembly legislated that the land was to be returned as Maori freehold title in individual blocks. The land was not returned to communal ownership. Maori had to vie for individual ownership on the basis of whakapapa rights. Maori people who could present a suitable case did so to a board of Commissioners. A crown grant was then made, except if these applicants were still classified as rebels (Innes, 1990). One example is from the map adjacent to the MacKay family land, (Map 10528 Rangiriri) which includes the notation;

Huihana (sic) Rangitaunga and Rangitamanga's lots to be granted. Takerei Te Rau's to stand over as he has returned to rebellion. signed J. Mackay. 16 6 68.

The other block to the east of the MacKay block was granted to Heta Tarawhiti, the first ordained local minister. He had been the assistant of Reverend Ashwell's at Taupiri. Heta was of Ngati Mahuta descent as were all the others named on the documents. This was Ngati Mahuta land before the wars of 1863-65. Because Raupatu land was returned only to local Maori who were not 'rebels' and who could verify their claim by whakapapa (genealogy), Irihapeti must have been of Ngati Mahuta birth. Numerous oral recollections from many family sources verify this but details of her father's identity are not clear enough at this time to publish. Further investigation is necessary to verify the family recollections.

In 1984 I contracted Robin Ray, an ex-official of the Land Court, to research the land file for me. He found a large file of material pertaining to this land that had been vested in the name of our great-grandmother. Robin Ray referred to the Crown Grant, Volume 10, Folio 184, (see map no 5.1) and explained that;

This is the certificate of Title drawn in the form of a Crown Grant because the present system of land titles was just coming into use at that time and the Maori Land Court was still using the old methods. At that time the prescribed method was to receive a grant from the Crown. It appears to have been the only method provided for by the Statute up to that time. However this was not a grant of the common variety, ie; a grant of Crown Land.
to a settler. This Grant was made under the New Zealand Settlements Act 1863 and its amendments which means that the land was Maori freehold land investigated by the Maori Land Court (or possibly Maori Customary Land) and found to belong to the Stewarts and MacKays. In accordance with the aforesaid statute the Governor issued a Grant to them dated back to 31/1/1874.

This was Maori Land, returned to a Maori, Irihapeti Joy, nee MacKay and specifically named for her children. Lot 470 was vested in the names of her 'MacKay' children. Lot 469B and the smaller Lot 472 were granted to the three other children she bore to her second husband, Sam Joy.

Irihapeti's mother was Hinepau. Hinepau was a sister of Kihi, a fighting chief of Ngati Pukeko. Best (1925, p. 1206) tells stories of Kihi and his exploits in the Bay of Plenty. He was much travelled doing battle with neighbouring peoples in this area. MacKay family stories tell of Hinepau living with her family at Poroporo in the Whakatane area. Ngati Pukeko were a voracious bunch of fighters, and it is told that while raiding a Waikato taua, who were fighting Ngati Maru of Thames, Hinepau was taken by the Waikato party (Stewart Family records). Another story and whakapapa has Hinepau married to a member of Tuhoe, before being taken by the Waikato taua (Stewart family records). Yet another story according to Ina Chamberlain tells of her being captured on White island, again being taken to Waikato where she became the first wife to a significant Rangatira. Tukawekai Kereama, a third generation descendent from the Joy side of the family tells a slightly different story. Kereama said that a war party had gone through the Mataatua area, and two chiefs had found this Puhi.1 When a certain Rangatira heard of this he said that she should be his wife. Hinepau became his first wife.

Joe Mason, of the Ngati Awa trust completed the picture of Hinepau's ancestry by giving us two whakapapa, one showing where he is descended from Pukeko; and another showing us where we are descended from Pukeko through a

---

1 Puhi; girl of noble family kept for the right match. Ryans Dictionary (1989)
man called Poroaki, to a woman called Hahau, the sister of Kihi. Hahau was Hinepau's mother.

The stories about her removal to Waikato all have the same common thread. Hinepau of Ngati Pukeko was taken back to Waikato as a somewhat unwilling captive. There she married a person of 'high birth' and had at least one daughter, Irihapeti. Many members of the family believed that she was returned to Poroporo to be buried. However, it is very difficult to verify such details. It was also thought that her daughter was returned to Poroporo to be buried but searches for their graves have proven futile, yet the location of their graves has been generally indicated to family members by Kaumatua. Tukawekai Kereama, however reveals another picture. He told me that in 1938 he had gone for a holiday at Rotoiti to stay with his uncle Sam Emery.

He had a great big house, we went round to the front parlour. He said to me 'I want you to know a few things'. He told me about the passing away of his Dad at Ngaruawahia.

He thought that he had better come to Ngaruawahia to get his father, Sam Joy. Te Puea was there to meet him when he arrived and she cursed him. 'There is no way you will take him away' Te Puea said 'If you take away your father, there is his mother.' and she gestured toward Taupiri.

Therefore, according to Kereama's knowledge of Princess Te Puea, Irihapeti is buried up near the top of the urupa on Taupiri mountain. Sam Emery was Sam Joy's (the second's) son. Sam Joy's mother was Irihapeti.

John Horton MacKay

The life history that I can reconstruct for John Horton MacKay is an example of the type of 'critical reconstruction' made necessary by the paucity of empirical information. In this example the reconstruction has focussed on the likely reasons John MacKay would have had for certain 'life choices' that he made, given the persuasiveness of the various world views that he was in intimate contact with. By focussing on the context within which he lived, and the
people with whom he would have dealt, it is possible to make some reasonable deductions.

John MacKay was born in lowland Scotland, at Paisley in Renfrewshire, the son of Johnson MacKay and Paisley Horton. It would appear that he left there to head for New Zealand as one of the increasing number of settlers travelling here prior to the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi (Owens, 1981). It would seem likely that John MacKay had not been in New Zealand any earlier, for there is no mention of him in any of the earliest accounts of life in the Waikato (Marshall, 1873; Kelly, 1949) or in the records about the Manukau, or Awhitu peninsula (Muir, 1957), or in the Waiuku and Pukekohe Museum records. Nor does John MacKay appear as a Tipuna in any oral Whakapapa, as do other Pakeha-Maori like Charles Wade (Weti) (Rua Cooper, 1990). In all the secondary references that I have consulted, I found only one to John MacKay and that is in a Centennial History of Raglan County, where it states that "just inside Waikato Heads, at Putataka, John MacKay had settled" (Vennell and Williams, 1976, p. 71). His name does appear in Reverend Maunsell's baptism record book from Maraetai, as the baptism of his children was recorded by Maunsell (n.d.). Apart from these few mentions he was a very invisible man. This led Elva Kelly (3k) to speculate whether he had been a convict to Australia and she did recently find a reference to a John MacKay being transported to Australia in 1832. This would have put him in the right place for migration to New Zealand. Whether MacKay was a free migrant or escaped to New Zealand is not known but that he may have been a convict seems likely given the lack of information about this man.

John MacKay appears to have moved to the Waikato Heads about the same time as Robert Maunsell was establishing his mission station, around 1838. It would appear that this was a common pattern at this time for "a mission station often formed the nucleus around which white settlement began to grow" (Vennell & Williams, 1976, p. 39).

However this was not the first location John MacKay had lived at in New Zealand for the MacKay's first daughter was born on the Manukau in 1838.
(Stewart family bible). Interestingly enough this was where Maunsell's first mission station was, Maunsell having established his station at Moetoa on the Awhiti peninsula in 1836. Therefore John MacKay and his new wife Irihapeti must have been among the first couples to experience the dilemma of which world view to follow. That of the Maori or that of the Missionary. Garrett (1991) states that Maunsell and his assistant, Hamlin were quite isolated from their fellow missionaries, and from any other Europeans. At this time John MacKay was living elsewhere in conjunction with other people. These other people, of course were Maori. Awhiti peninsula was the home of Te Wherowhero and a considerable number of Ngati Mahuta at this time. Kelly (1949, p. 425) describes this as the home of Te Wherowhero when Maunsell approached him to sign the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840. MacKay must have met and married Irihapeti here, and then was persuaded by Maunsell or the economic opportunities to move to the new mission station site at Waikato Heads.

Robert Maunsell established a Church Missionary Society station towards the end of 1838 at Maraetai (named after the nearby stream). "On 3rd August 1839, the C.M.S. bought the site of the mission station - about 80 acres - for trade goods valued at about 60 pounds" (Moore, 1966). "Before long a few Europeans not connected with the mission were living in the vicinity of Maraetai" (Vennell and Williams, 1976 p. 39).

It is likely that John MacKay was one of these Europeans 'not connected with the mission for Reverend Maunsell makes no mention of him in his letters or records yet he mentions all others who are connected with the station. The possibility of taking advantage of the increasing number of travellers, both official and private who were passing through Waikato Heads, combined with the potential for trade with the numerous Maori who moved to this area for the seasonally abundant seafood, would have made the move to Waikato Heads attractive. Maunsell records (Garrett, 1991) that he moved from the Manukau
because of the decreasing population in this area. It is probable that this decline in population would also have affected the prospects for trade and John MacKay may also have found this to be an opportune time to shift. Waikato Heads is located at the mouth of the river and near the 'portage' to Waiuku and the gateway to Auckland - both as a source of imports and exports.

By 1833, when the mission station was moved upstream to Kohanga, Maraetai had grown into a substantial settlement with a dozen dwellings, a church 56 feet by 24 and other buildings both of wood and the ubiquitous raupo.

(Vennell and Williams, 1976, p. 39).

PAKEHA-MAORI

Another major consideration apart from the possibility of economic advancement must have been the conflicting persuasiveness of the lifestyles and world views open to such a bicultural couple. The opportunities open to such a couple were changing rapidly during this period of rapid change. It would appear that John MacKay had commenced one type of lifestyle upon his arrival in New Zealand, and that this changed with the move to Maraetai/Waikato Heads. In order to understand the change it is necessary to understand the lifestyle he would have entered upon his arrival and the persuasion that would have been used for him to abandon this for an alternative.

There are many romanticised notions about the Pakeha people who lived in New Zealand at the time. Very little is known of these ordinary folk, but much is made of them, often to suit the perspective of the various authors rather than to portray the life style of the people themselves.

Vennell and Williams (1976) report that Europeans who were pork traders were termed by the "natives as Pakeha-Maoris - White men of no consequence" (p. 40). Vennell and Williams give an impression that nobody was really enamored of the Pakeha-Maori who lived along the Waikato. They described Pakeha-Maori as those who;
generally possess some private income which enables them to command the luxuries
necessary to a European, they can live comfortably enough in a country where the mere
necessities of life are so abundant or so cheap. (Vennell & Williams, 1976 p.42, quoting
the Colonial Surgeon Dr Johnson in 1846.)

They identify the locations of a number of Pakeha-Maori but can only identify
one as Randall - "a runaway sailor who lived there with his half-caste family" (p. 41). These authors accept the reported social hierarchy of the period with Pakeha-
Maori at the bottom as Adventurers and Runaways then interior traders, with
permanent settlers above that. Missionaries and Colonial Officials were at the top.

This distinction between 'Pakeha-Maori' and 'interior traders' would
appear to conform to a Pakeha world view, more than to a Maori world view, and
demonstrates these authors uncritical acceptance of the opinions of their sources.
Vennell and Williams are not very critical of this scholarship, for it depicts
usefulness of Europeans to the Maori as seen by the Europeans, rather than as
seen by the Maori. To the Maori these early 'traders' were of much use. So much
so that in 1836 Waikato travelled to Hokiangatobring back a white man. Some
white men were to become an integral part of the tribe to fulfill the desire of the
tribe for access to Western goods (Kelly, 1949, p. 238).

This somewhat derogatory picture of the earliest Europeans to arrive in
New Zealand is similar to that portrayed by Maude (1968, p. 134-169) in reference
to the Europeans who lived with the Indigenous peoples of the Pacific Islands. He
offers a definition of the early arrivals in that area as;

What really differentiated the beachcomber from other immigrants was that fact that
they were essentially integrated into, and dependent for their livelihood on, the
indigenous communities...to all intents and purposes they had voluntarily or perforce
contracted out of the European monetary economy.

One wonders if this is not a fanciful ethnocentric reinterpretation of the past
rather than a reflection of reality.

This picture did not apply to the majority of Pakeha-Maori in New Zealand.
There were transients in New Zealand, for example those who occupied the first
European village of Kororareka. These more accurately fitted the derogatory conception of the beachcombers of the Pacific. Many of the inhabitants of Kororareka were convicts, runaways, deserters, and other 'no-hopers'. It is not helpful to type these people with those who chose to live with the Maori communities. Those Pakeha who went to live with the Maori people did so on Maori terms. To portray them in derogatory terms is to belittle the people with whom they lived as though the Maori were not able to control their community of interest. The Pakeha-Maori were very much subject to the social controls of the hapu or iwi (Manning, 1973). Sherrin and Wallace (1890) offer a succinct definition of the Pakeha-Maori.

After the Europeans had become familiar with New Zealand most villages had, at least, one European Resident, called a Pakeha-Maori, purchasing provisions and flax. Such a person was generally under the protection of the chief of the village, and married, either by native custom or legally, to a relative of his rank and influence. (p. 216).

There were therefore, individual Europeans who were attracted to live among the Maori people, who formed a 'bridge' between the two worlds. They more often than not were married to a person of significant rank to ensure their loyalty to the hapu, and most significantly, they lived according to the social controls of the Maori.

Charles Marshall (1873; Marshall family records) was one such Pakeha-Maori. He arrived in Lower Waikato in 1830, married into Ngati Pou, and acted as a trader for this tribe for many decades. John MacKay, arrived later than Marshall, but was probably about to follow this pattern in the Awhiti/Manukau area before he transferred to Waikato Heads.

Nearly all Europeans in New Zealand before 1840 were in Maude's terms 'essentially integrated into, and dependent for their livelihood on, the indigenous communities...' whether they were whalers, traders, or even Missionaries, they were only present by the good will of the Maori. It was the Maori who controlled the economic and social milieu under which these Europeans lived. The differences between the Pakeha during this period was essentially between those
who were prepared to live within the social boundaries of the Maori and those who challenged this control. At this time the group who first challenged this social control was the missionaries. These missionary men and women were to persuade others that their way was preferable to that of the Maori. The Missionaries began the process of instilling *self-doubt* in the minds of the Maori and of the Pakeha-Maori as to the efficacy of the Maori world view. The material superiority of the European was exploited by the earliest Missionaries to indicate to the Maori that the Maori system was inadequate since it was not capable of producing such goods. This process was to become a greater element in the conversion to Christianity and in fostering the support local Maori gave to the Missionaries than those more dramatic causes of disease and approaching anarchy forwarded by Wright, (1959). This subtle persuasion of the Missionaries was probably part of the reason why John MacKay moved closer to a European enclave than he had been in the Manukau. This insidious 'self-doubt' is also at the root of much of the current problems facing contemporary Maori people, and it can be traced back to the earliest hegemonic overtures of the missionaries.

The description in Wily and Maunsell (1935), of the life style developed by the Maunsells when they reached Maraetai, is typical of those who attempted to replicate England where they settled. This replication almost always required a European wife, and a preference for one's own particular world view over that of the alternatives close at hand, and it was this group who were to stop the development of the Pakeha-Maori. Robert and Susan Maunsell were to establish their own piece of England at Maraetai. They were to indicate to the 'natives' that their way was demonstrably superior, and that the way to a higher standard of living was by joining this enclave, to the exclusion of that which had been common before. John MacKay was persuaded to return to a way of life, essentially familiar to him, yet offering wealth, unlike his previous experiences with the European way of life. Similarly the Missionary explanation that the way to the
better life was by the acceptance of the total world view they offered, would have been no real problem to Irihapeti, for Maori had never consciously segmented social elements, religious and the secular distinctions did not exist for her. For her husband, to combine these religious and the secular must have appeared to have made remarkably good sense as well. There is no evidence that these people were coerced into accepting the new way of life, persuasion by far being the stronger tool.

The timing of John MacKay's arrival in New Zealand was critical. If he had arrived earlier he would have developed into a Pakeha-Maori, as he was doing when he lived with Ngati Mahuta at Awhiti. His development into a Pakeha-Maori was thwarted by the strength of the persuasiveness of the option offered by Maunsell. The very forcefulness of Maunsell would probably have stopped MacKay from being inextricably entwined in the affairs of the Maori family into whom he had married. Maunsell's schools were then used to maintain and extend the new status quo among the children of John and Irihapeti MacKay, for these children were among those specifically targeted for 'civilization' by Maunsell (Maunsell 1849).

The family stories and other sources place Irihapeti Hahau, John MacKay, and Reverend Maunsell on the Manukau before the signing of the Treaty. As earlier explained, he was probably not in the Manukau area very long before his shift to Waikato Heads, here to come under the full sway of Reverend Maunsell's persuasiveness. John MacKay arrived in the Manukau just soon enough to marry a high ranking Maori woman as previous Pakeha traders had done, but not soon enough to enable him to be incorporated into the life of the Maori family, before the arrival of Maunsell who then persuaded him to join the 'civilizing mission'.
THE CHILDREN OF IRIHAPETI HAHAYU.

Marian (Maryanne) MacKay, (1a)

Marian was born on the 21st of June, 1838, at Kahawai, Manukau. She married Robert Oliphant Stewart twenty years later on 2nd February, 1858 at Kohanga, Waikato. Robert Oliphant Stewart was born at Rothesay, Scotland, on the 5th August, 1828. They were married by Reverend Maunsell at the new Mission station which had been shifted upriver in 1853. Marion died on 10th January, 1882 aged 44 years.

Initially they lived at Raglan, for it was at their house at Raglan that Catherine MacKay (18 years) (Marion's younger sister) married William Carran on October 29th, 1860. The Stewarts must have shifted house to Port Waikato soon after this for Mr and Mrs Stewart are mentioned by Rev. V. Lush;

10th June, 1866. - there Mr. and Mrs. Stewart and I went, by invitation to the mess
where besides the usual officers we met Mr. and Mrs. Draper. (n.d.).

R.O. Stewart was an official at Waikato Heads;

In August, 1853, he was appointed interpreter to the Magistrate at Lower Waikato and, in 1864, was made Resident Magistrate, Native Department, Port Waikato, at a salary of 300 pounds. He was also given 100 pounds towards the cost of a house and, in addition, he received a salary of 210 pounds per annum as Postmaster from the 3 February 1864. (Wilson, 1967).

Robert and Marion Stewart had seven children whose birth places mirror the locations of Marian Stewart's siblings, as well as indicating the changing location of the Stewart Family.

Randolph 15/2/59 at Raglan - The Stewart family home at Waitetuna, Raglan

Charles 11/1/63 at Raglan -

Walter 16/4/64 at Taupiri - On the Waikato River,

Flora 24/5/65 at Port Waikato

Mary 23/7/66 at Port Waikato
Clara  10/10/68 at Port Waikato - the home of Marian's sister Annie Marshall

Alfred  20/6/71 at Taupiri - the home of her younger sister, Clara and that of her mother Irihapeti. (Stewart Family Bible).

The Bible was presented to Robert Oliphant Stewart Esquire "by the undermentioned settlers and other friends as a mark of their respect for him" (frontispiece) at Port Waikato, August, 1866. It is an interesting collection of notable names, including, among others,

W.P. Kukutai [ ]
Wiki Kukuta [ ] Ngati Tipa
Nini Kukuta [ ]
Hori Kukutai [ ]
Aihepene Kaihau - Ngatiteata
The Bishop of New Zealand [ ] CMS Mission
The Reverend Dr. Maunsell [ ]

(John MacKay was dead by the time of this presentation.)

This list indicates very clearly the commonality of exchange between Maori and Pakeha in this region at the time, given the date of the presentation was just after the conclusion of the War.

Lush confirms their residence in his journal entry of 11th September 1866.

Dined with the mess at the barracks, and spent the evening with Doctor Codrington at the Stewarts, went on to Raglan. (n.d.).

Again on 16th October, 1866.

Mr. Stewart took me to the site of the new cemetery...

Stewart is mentioned in the New Zealand Herald.

The rising ground overlooking the sea and the river is in command of Captain Antrobus, with some 120 officers and men of the 2nd Waikato Regiment, Messrs Stewart and Simpson are busy on the flat beneath...rushing up Government stores and Commissariat buildings. (N.Z. H. 19/1/1864).
The Stewarts were located at Port Waikato during the Wars of 1863/1864 because of the growth experienced by this place during that period.

During the war in the Waikato the Government constructed a dockyard and stores along this shore, and stationed troops on the hill opposite. The dockyard outfitted and repaired river steamers which carried up river supplies discharged here by sea going vessels for the army and Military Settlements. After hostilities ceased the soldiers left, the Government sold its steamers and in 1868 the dockyard closed. (Moore, 1966).

The Stewarts may have returned to Raglan after the war, as R. Stewart had his judicial area extended to cover Raglan county, for in 1868 he is reported as the stipendiary magistrate of Raglan.

The Stewarts moved to Whakatane in 1868/1869.

Mr. R.O. Stewart, formerly Raglan's first stipendiary Magistrate, was Whakatane's first schoolmaster - he built the school himself - and he was the founder of the present library. This was in 1876. Mr. Stewart (Grandson A.O. Stewart) was very proud of the fact that his grandmother was the first licensed interpreter in New Zealand, holding a position in the House of Representatives, where she interpreted for a Maori Member who would speak no English. (Whakatane Beacon, 1957).

Robert and Marian Stewart were strongly convinced of the benefits of education. The Stewart's attitudes toward education are revealed in a report he made in 1867 from Raglan.

There are at present three Maori schools in this neighbourhood, two of which, Aotea and Karakariki, the third at Kawhia. It is conducted by a Maori, imparting very refined notions to his scholars, as the school, owing to the state of the country, is not visited by any European. It would be a pity, however, to reduce such an establishment, forming as it does an oasis to some extent amid surrounding heathenism, and a rallying point in the midst of disaffection for Christian and loyal Natives.

It is best for all in authority at Maori schools to be Europeans, so far do tribal jealousies
and distinctions interfere with the exercise of Christian and social duties. The school at Karakariki is taught by a young Maori woman. The children read with fluency both in English and in Maori, and the house and the whole settlement are conducted in a most orderly and exemplary way. (AJHR, 1868, A, no.6, p. 8).

Europeanisation is evident in these attitudes, but it is very much in accord with those attitudes associated with the Missionaries more than with the Settler Assembly. The Stewarts’ school in Whakatane appears to have been closer to the model offered by Maunsell than that offered by the central Government in the 1867 education Act, yet it was a ‘native school’ they established in 1873. Robert Stewarts sympathies lay with the indigenous people in contrast to those attitudes recorded as common among the settlers (Barrington and Beaglehole, 1974).

The Stewarts felt strongly about the actions of the settler Government toward their whanaunga of Ngati Awa. Marion Stewart died young as the result of pneumonia that she contracted when standing in the rain on Parliament steps, protesting about the confiscation of land in the Bay of Plenty (Stewart Family Story, Don Stewart, May, 1990). The Stewarts were said to be a truly bi-cultural couple promoting the benefits of both cultures.

In 1876, the first school opened in Whakatane. A native school organised by Mr. Robert Oliphant Stewart, catering mainly for Ngati Awa and Ngati Pukeko, and a small number of European settlers arriving in the district. It was a small tin roofed shack near the present Wairaka Marae and pupils came from as far as Poroporo by canoe. They ranged from the age of four to forty. Early records are incomplete and consist mainly of correspondence between Mr. Stewart and the Department. (Mason and Brown, 1983).

The second eldest son of the Stewart’s, Charles, married a Maori woman called Awhiahua Hetaraka and they had 7 children, the third eldest of these was Albert Oliphant Stewart. He married Adeline Celia MacKay who was the daughter of his Grandmother’s younger brother Albert. Charles was a truly
bic peacecal person. His obituary is headed with;

Helped link Maori and Pakeha. A man who did much to foster Pakeha-Maori
relationships was Mr. Albert Oliphant Stewart... His funeral was attended by many
Europeans as well as Maoris. (Obituary, n.d. 1958, Whakatane Beacon).

Born in Whakatane on June 7th, 1884, Charles Stewart was a pupil of the
Poroporo school when he won a scholarship to St Stephens College in Auckland.
He also studied law at Te Aute. He worked in a Gisborne law firm (as did Albert
MacKay - his Great Uncle) and this may have been where he met Albert's
daughter, his future wife. He was an active community member, a Whakatane
Borough Councillor from 1917 to 1919, and a member of the Whakatane Harbour
Board 1923-1932. In Maori Affairs he was the founder of the Mataatua District
Council, a licensed Maori interpreter, a Court interpreter, a native land agent, and
from 1940 to 1955 he was appointed as a Collector of Maori Votes. He was
president and secretary of the local Rugby Union Club, patron of United Football
Club, captain of Mokorua Golf Club, founder and President of Mataatua Maori
Lawn Tennis Association, and a life member of Whakatane Rowing Club.

Mrs. Stewart however has always been, "too busy rocking the cradle" to have any real
interests outside her family. 'She went to Gisborne Girls for one year, Hukarere Girls'
School, Napier for one year, St. Joseph's College, Napier for four years and at Gisborne
High School for two years." (Whakatane Beacon, Sept. 18, 1957).

Charles and Adeline had four sons and four daughters. Don Stewart is the
oldest living descendant. He is a cousin of ours from both Marian MacKay and
Albert MacKay. I spoke with Don in May 1990 and he explained how the
Europeanisation had not really become totally dominant until his father's
generation - indeed his father had been both an important member of Pakeha
institutions and an able and important member of Maori institutions. He was
regarded as an expert in Marae kawa and whaikorero.
Don Stewart's father Albert did not teach his children to speak Maori. He insisted they learn English only and although he was fluent in Maori, as was his wife, and they conversed in Maori, they only spoke in English to their children.

Thus the inexorable tide of Europeanisation finally won in the Stewart family. Although they had escaped the extremely European dominated Waikato, and had their own 'vision' of Maoridom, that was definitely 'Maunsell inspired', they married back into Ngati Awa Maori families, and succeeded as a bicultural family. Indeed they had resisted the early waves of hegemonic displacement of Maoridom in mid-nineteenth Century. However the early twentieth Century saw an upsurge of the educational authorities insisting on learning only one language, that being English. Don said that his father wanted him and his siblings to take on the ways of the Pakeha - that was the road to success.

Don spoke with some sadness at his lack of ability to whaikorero for as he explained,

I am descendant from three Rangatira lines and if I go to the marae, the place is made for me at the top of the bench. (May, 1990).

**Annie MacKay. (1b)**

Annie MacKay, was born on the 25th of July 1840, and she died on the 20th of July 1920 at Opuatia near Glenn Murray in the hills south of Pukekawa. She married William Hitchin Marshall at Kohanga. He was born on the 25th of July 1840 and died on the 7th of July 1914. He was the son of Charles Marshall and Rangiweu of Ngatipou. William Marshall died at Taupiri and was also buried at Opuatia. All their children were educated as Europeans (Marshall family records).

They had 12 children; some married Maori and other married Pakeha. William Hitchin Marshall and Annie MacKay moved to Opuatia to farm soon after the Waikato wars concluded. They were among the first Mormon converts in the Waikato and at least nine of their children were baptised and brought up their families as Mormons.
Emma Tonga is a third generation genealogist of the Marshall family and she talked to me about the family's life and relationships to Maori and Pakeha lifestyles.

E: Henry Marshall used to go and help Te Puea at Ngaruawahia - he would help at the Coronation, 8th October or something - he would help, all the followers would bring something, we had land here, stock, cows and that - we would supply the meat. Maybe two or three cows from our farm - the next farm along and so many sheep or a couple of cows or something like that and he helped that way and he also organised church people up there in Pukekohe, Mormons in Pukekohe, to get cracking on the potato patches, truck loads of spuds would come.

R: Even though the family were Mormons, they were still part of Kingitanga?

E: The Mormon teaching was to be loving and to help people so it's only natural the Mormons would help Te Puea and the Movement.

R: He was related to Te Puea?

E: Yeah, we used to peel potatoes, all the gossip was shared and all the matchmaking - the old dears - they looked forward to that every year - the regatta.

Te Puea would say when it was all over, "Come on girls, you get paid today". Oh boy, we thought - we are going to get paid. Here comes Te Puea walking along the road with a big bag of apples - "Come on girls, I am paying you now. Come and get your apple!"

You just sit now and laugh don't you?

R: Do you take part in King Movement?

E: I chose where I am. It's how you find out information. It's a matter of feeling - what you feel - its blood related - you want to find out - enjoy each other - its family. It doesn't matter where you get. Anyway, most Maoris have a tie in somewhere.

R: What people would come from here?

E: Ngati Tara Tikitiki, my brother was Richard Taratikitiki Marshall.

R: Annie MacKay - what people would she be from?

E: That's a good question now...

R: I liked your comment about why you didn't want to track down the relationship to Te Puea.
E: My gang would walk round with their noses in the air - I'm the greatest, they would be too proud - they wouldn't be humble.

It does appear that the Mormon religion tends to add a new dimension to the bicultural picture of this family, but it beyond the scope of this thesis to examine such phenomena.

Catherine MacKay also known as Catherine Carran and Catherine (Granny) Patterson. (1c)

The numbers of migrants to New Zealand were steadily increasing, before the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi.

Owens (1981) says,

As the decade of the 1830's drew to a close, the flow of immigrants from New South Wales, through areas such as the Bay of Islands, the Hokianga, and the Coromandel, grew rapidly. In 1830-31, there were between 300 and 330 European in New Zealand, by the end of the decade there were thought to be some 2000. The biggest increase came in 1839 when it was known the country was shortly to be annexed. (p.50).

In New South Wales, a series of droughts, labour shortages, a fall in the price of wool and the raising of the minimum price of Crown Land to 125 pounds from 55 pounds an acre, turned the tide of migration toward New Zealand.

One family of settlers was the Carrans.

Daniel and Elizabeth Jane Carran arrived at Kororareka in 1840 in the ship 'Glydersee'.

They had 4 sons, John, William, (born 12th Nov. 1833,) Daniel and Henry. (Kathleen Braune, Auckland. Personal letter to Kit Davis. Patterson Family Records.)

Catherine MacKay was married to William Carran at Waitetuna, Raglan, on October 29, 1860, "in the house of R.D.(sic) Stewart, Waitehuna (sic), Raglan" (Macintosh, 1975). Her husband left the area soon after to travel to the very southernmost tip of New Zealand, to join the search for gold at the recently discovered Tapuka field in Southland.
Granny Patterson was interviewed by a newspaper reporter when she was elderly, and she recounted her travels to Southland, and her trials and tribulations. The newspaper report commenced with a general survey of the early period that Catherine had lived through, clarifying the reason for and the location of her husband's arrival point in Southland.

It was between 1860 and 1861 that the quest for gold began in Southland and Otago, and when lucky finds of this precious ore at Tapuka, Waikawa and Six-mile Beach were reported the rush started at these districts.

In her own words Catherine recounted her story.

William Carran was unsuccessful in obtaining any gold but he did get a job at the Waimahaka Estate. From there Mr Carran wrote and told me that he was ready for us (Catherine had one baby by this time) to join him. I started out when I received my husband's letter and also came down by boat on the Waikato River, and sailed in a ship bound from Onehunga to Dunedin.

We experienced many delays and much rougher weather. We called at all the coastal ports, and at length the weather was so wild that when we reached Akaroa we were bound to put in at that very picturesque harbour for over a week. At length we reached Dunedin and from there, keeping to my original agreement, I wrote to my husband and told him that I was leaving by the "Star of Dunedin" for Bluff. When I arrived at the Bluff, there was no one to meet me, and after staying at the hotel for a week waiting for Mr Carran to come or receive a letter, I started out to walk along the Beach road from the Bluff to Fortrose carrying my baby. I was accompanied by a young married couple from Melbourne who were going to take up work for the Bruntons at Rocklands. We made an early start, for it was a good 25 miles round and we arrived late at night at the Sandhills where we slept out in the open until next morning when we were put across the river by the Wybrows. Captain and Mrs Wybrow were most kind and hospitable to me and my child, and I stayed with them until they were able to take me up to Waimahaka Estate where my husband was most surprised to see me, for, owing to mails being delayed, he had not received my letter from Dunedin.
We all stayed on at Waimahaka for a year. Then we left and came down to the Ferry House at Fortrose, a small two-roomed cottage. My husband acted as a ferryman, and we started an accommodation-house where we were licensed to sell liquor and would also supply food and meals for the public. Our customers were mostly miners who were working on the beach between Fortrose and the Bluff, and all along the coast. Here we lived for six long years, and then my husband decided to take on farming and purchased a place at Seaward Bush. After we settled in he sailed over to the Bluff to get provisions for the winter, and after he had completed his purchases going out of the Bluff Harbour his boat upset and my husband lost his life by drowning. It was a great shock to me for I had six young children at the time—three boys and three girls. Mr Carran's body was not found for five months, and then searchers discovered it washed up on the beach. I had to give up the Seaward Bush farm and I brought my young family down to Fortrose and there I would go out nursing among the settlers' wives. Three years afterwards I met and married Mr Patterson who was an American. He also died many years ago and I am quite happy in my little cottage living with my grand daughter and her husband and small son—my great grandchild. I have had a very busy life and reared 13 children in all, six sons and seven daughters. They are all away and married with homes of their own. I have a great number of grandchildren and great-grandchildren who are over the district and beyond.

After my first husband was drowned I carried my little youngest baby right up to Invercargill and back to be christened—people used to walk long distances then. I have always belonged to the Church of England, and the Wybrows used to have a service held in their hospitable home every few months when all the settlers for miles around would go.

(Newspaper report—possibly the Otago Witness—Patterson Family Records.)

The story she recounts of her journey from Bluff to Fortrose is one of the few surviving family stories; of her heroic journey on foot from the Bluff, along the water line of Southern N.Z. to Fortrose. Battling hardships was to be a constant feature of her long life. She became a very popular figure. She was the local midwife who helped to bring many Fortrose people into the world. Her funeral was attended by many people and was described to me by Joan MacIntosh, a local historian as the largest funeral that district had ever seen. Joan also
mentioned that there was so much information about Granny Patterson that when she was writing her history of Fortrose there was a danger of her taking over and it being a history of Granny Patterson.

Joan won an essay competition in the past using Granny Patterson as the focus. It was entitled "Portrait of a Pioneer Women". The imagery this conjures up and the tone of the personal communication that I had with Joan about the essay, as with the book, 'Fortrose' and the whole tone of the newspaper report about the early life of Catherine Patterson, is of a Pakeha settler women, recently arrived from another part of New Zealand or overseas, who fitted very well into the life styles of pioneer New Zealand. In fact the tone of the local histories is of this focus on 'pioneer culture'.

These stories all indicate a very prominent woman. However a significant feature of her life was missing. That she was the daughter of a Maori woman was ignored.

I asked Kit Davis and her daughter Phyllis Ford

R - "Did Granny Patterson speak Maori?"
K - "No, no, no Maori, no she couldn't speak Maori.
R - "Is that right?"
K. - "No, I never heard her speak Maori once, but she had a Maori tongue. You know how they lisp a bit or something. She had a Maori tongue, but I never heard her speaking Maori."
R. - "Would she have had anyone to speak Maori to?"
K. - "I don't think so." (June 1990)

Neither of them had ever heard her speak Maori. Kit is her granddaughter and spent a lot of time with her grandmother and Phyllis was one of many raised

---

4Kit is 90 years old herself now, and she is a prominent third generation family genealogist. It was her who really put me onto much of the initial information and the pathway for searching. Kit confirmed that the names of my mother were family names. I first contacted Kit in about 1982 when I finally decided to find out for my own self more about our family's heritage. I was put onto her by an aunty of mine in Lower Hutt. I travelled to Invercargill to meet Kit, and when I reached her house, she just opened the door and greeted me as though we had known each other for ever. She just said welcome, now let us continue. This was initially strange to me until it was explained by another Maori cousin that only certain people are whakapapa people. I will always be grateful for Kit recognising this in me.

---
by Granny Patterson when her mother was in the Sanitorium, and she never heard her speak Maori. Yet my mother recalled and recounted to my brother and I that whenever she visited 'Aunty Kate at Fortrose' (we had another Aunty Kate - my mother's sister, hence the clear recollection of the locational nomenclature) with her father, Ben MacKay, they always spoke in Maori together. She recalled them sitting on the verandah of her house - see photograph No 1.3 - speaking together in Maori.

Catherine MacKay (Granny Patterson) had been baptised by Reverend Maunsell at Putataka, Waikato Heads. She probably attended the mission school at Maraetai before the mission station shifted upriver to Te Kohanga. She played the piano and read and wrote well (Reverend Purchas, one of Maunsell's assistants, was a pianist and taught many children). Her upbringing would have been in the Maori language for there were very few Pakeha in Waikato in that period and the language of instruction and of catechism was Maori.

The almost total suppression of her Maoriness in the later 'frontier culture' is very significant yet Granny Patterson fulfilled many roles of a kuia, albeit in another culture. This 'strong woman type' who raised many of her own children, was a local nanny to many children, was a local midwife, who fostered many whangai, was tolerant and supportive member of the community is found in many other branches of the family.

It is interesting to look at a series of photographs of 'pioneer women of Southland' in Natusch (1976). Catherine Carran and her husband William Carran are among the selection. From the photographs it would appear that she had been totally assimilated into the mores and norms of the settler society. However, her background was not forgotten. In the Anglican church records of the period, it was felt necessary to record in Bishop Nevill's list of the "people resident in the Fortrose and neighbourhood" with affiliation to the Anglican church, those people who were 'half-caste'. Significant in this list were "Mr and Mrs Patterson and family (half-caste)" (MacIntosh, 1975, p. 178).
This is the only mention made in the literature and in many of the stories about Granny Patterson about her ethnic background. It seems that this can only be seen in a perjorative sense in this context, for why else would it be mentioned but to remind people of her past. The message is clear; no matter how much you attempt to assimilate, your past will always be with you.

An idea of the type of 'mind set' Catherine Patterson was moving into in 1860 is given in a newspaper account in 1847.

The following account of the population around Fouveaux Strait has been kindly furnished us by our Southern Correspondent. A considerable number of half-caste children are growing up to maturity, and we trust some effort will be made to furnish them with the blessing of education. (Wellington Independent, 19 May, 1847. Quoted in Natusch, 1976).

The 'Southern Correspondent' then gave an account of the population of the various settlements round the shores of Fouveaux Straits in 1846.

He concludes,

It is rather difficult to make an accurate census, as the settlements are so scattered, and people are often shifting. It must also be remembered, that in the settlements which are termed European, the wives of the settlers are almost all New Zealanders.

They deserve, however, to be put upon the level with European women, for they are much above their countrywomen; their minds having been much enlarged by new views.

Their religion is not deep, however it has altered them a good deal. All the old native customs and superstitions are abolished, except amongst a few aged persons who still believe in them, and when they are made a pretext for a private quarrel, but they are never entertained by the community. They are also gradually making a little progress in knowledge. (Wellington Independent, 19 May, 1847. Quoted in Natusch, 1976).

The lifestyle options that Catherine Patterson faced were limited, as was the opportunities for local people of Maori descent. However, recently there has developed a resistance to the dominance of a monocultural world view among local Kai Tahu people. Evelyn Thompson voiced this very clearly at a recent Hui at Whare Awhina, Invercargill on Saturday, 30th June, 1990, when she said,
What history has been taught here is that of the 'settlers'. Kai Tahu have been ignored or if recorded, only as and where they married into settlers families. We want history teaching to reflect more than this. (June, 1990).

John Horton MacKay (Jnr) (1d)

John was born on 22/11/1843, and is believed to have died 'young' leaving no children. On formal oath to Judge R.P Dykes on 4th June, 1946, Henare Marshall recorded the following.

Deceased was a maternal uncle. Died 5th November, 1896 at Auckland Hospital. No will. No children. Parents dead. (Auckland Minute Book 18, P. 93).

Charles MacKay (1e)

Charles must have died young, for he appears in Maunsell's Baptism book, (Maunsell, n.d.) but does not appear in any of the family records.

Benjamin Charles MacKay (1f)

Benjamin was my grandfather. He was introduced in chapter one.

Henry MacKay (1g)

Henry married Margaret Evans, a European woman, and they brought up their family as European. I have only limited information about this sub-family as yet, although I do have an extensive family tree, prepared by Ken Corbett, a third generation family genealogist. (Patterson Family Records).

Clara MacKay (1h)

Clara married Robert Campbell, a European bricklayer. They lived on the family land by the Mangawara Stream, near Taupiri. This land will be the focus of a more detailed future study when I will consider the perpetuation of the dispersal of the family, but it is significant that it was Clara Campbell who settled
on the family land at Taupiri, left to the children of John MacKay by Irihapeti, for Irihapeti spent her last days here also. Dawn Sutherland, a granddaughter of Clara Campbell, was able to furnish details of history lost to the rest of the wider family. In an interview Dawn recounted the details.

R: Where did Clara Campbell (nee MacKay) live?
D: On the farm at Taupiri. The farm’s right there at Mangawara by Laura Henry’s place on the Orini Road.
R: Who was her husband?
D: Robert Henry Campbell from the place where they wear skirts ye ken?
R: So they farmed the land?
D: My Grandfather was a bricklayer and half of his work is in the Waikato, especially at Huntly. He went out and did all this bricking and Clara ran the hundred acres and brought up her family there. She grew strawberries for the market and I said to my mother at the time, before I knew my Grandfather was a brickie, “how many cows did you own?” did you have a town supply? Mum said, “No, we only had one for the house”, she told me the boys used to go up into the hills and dig coal to put in the fire in the farmhouse,(there was) petrified wood up there. They only had one cow, and Gran grew strawberries on the banks of the Mangawara River for the market here in Auckland. And at the end of the season, she would invite the whole of Taupiri across the river to the farm and they would have the last of the strawberries on the trestle tables with cream.

Albert MacKay (ii)

Albert was born 14/2/52 at Port Waikato, and died 9/2/1928. He was buried at Whakatane. He attended Kohanga Mission School. In 1877 he moved to Napier where he worked till 1874 as compositor on the Maori Newspaper, "Te Wananga." Till 1882, he worked as a licensed Interpreter and Law Clerk for W.L. Rees. Form 1882 till 1886 he was a law clerk in Gisborne but then entered the Native Land Court as Government Interpreter and Clerk of the Court. Then he became managing Law Clerk for Mr. C.A. de Lautour. In 1890 Albert married
Katherine Cecelia Greening, their son Paumea Horton MacKay was a Mormon. This is another branch of the family I have yet to study in detail, although I do have detailed genealogical charts from their third generation genealogist, Paumea MacKay. (Cyclopedia of N.Z., Auckland Section, 1902, p. 803).

Harriet MacKay (1j)

Harriet married Thomas Waterford Wade, a European son of Charles Waterford Wade. They lived a Pakeha lifestyle, running the hotel at Rangiriri. This family has a very interesting story to tell and I intend focussing upon them in a further study. Some of their children married into Pakeha families and some into Maori families. This family represents the diaspora factor very clearly for today there are many Wade descendents living as Maori or as Pakeha, both sides being aware of each other, but having very little contact.

Maria MacKay (1k)

Maria married Benjamin Stubbing in 1872, a Road Overseer. He was the eldest son of Mr B. Stubbing who became a Waikato farmer, and was born in Middlesex, England in 1844. He arrived in Auckland in 1859. On the outbreak of war, he joined the 2nd Waikato regiment, served throughout the war and gained the N.Z. Medal. He joined the armed Constabulary and took part in one of the last expeditions against Te Kooti. They had four daughters and eight sons (Cyclopedia of NZ, Auckland Section, 1902, P. 803). He and Maria settled at Ngaruawahia where they farmed and raised their large family.

Mere MacKay (1l)

The youngest daughter was Mere and she born about 1856. She was sent to be brought up by her grandmother's (Hinepau) family of Ngati Pukeko at Poroporo, Whakatane, and lost contact with her Waikato family. She married into a Maori family, Hohepa, descendents of whom still live on family land at Poroporo, Whakatane.
When my brother and I went to Whakatane we had little to go on regarding finding this youngest daughter's descendents. We knew of the Stewart family and that they lived in Whakatane, but as to Mere, she was a mystery. The key was in the name Hinepau.

We spoke to Joe Mason, chairman of the Ngati Awa Research trust, who knew someone called Hinepau, although to everyone in the district her name is Ina Chamberlain. This name was the one we had been looking for for so long. Ngahuia Rowson, a Senior Research Officer with the Ngati Awa Trust was helping us in our search and she sped us out to Poroporo. We held our breath all the way, lest this prove another dead end. We approached the house with trepidation, for we had been unable to find anyone who had known the name Hinepau. We introduced ourselves to a mystified person, who said "Yes, My name is Hinepau. My grandmother's name was Hinepau also. Mere Hinepau MacKay!" At last our grandfather's youngest sister's granddaughter, our second cousin.

We were all very excited and spent the afternoon sharing stories and photographs. Mere was the youngest of the children born to Irihapeti and John MacKay. She was only two when her father drowned in Lake Whangape. Irihapeti moved to Raglan where she married Sam Joy. Mere was sent back to the people of Irihapeti's mother at Poroporo.

Ina took us to the two Marae of Ngati Pukeko. Pukeko at Poroporo and Rongotaua, and we departed with the request to return the results of our searching to the people at a formal Hui.

THE DIASPORA.

Four of the sisters remained in the Waikato and lived as settlers, close by one another and kept in contact with each other. They were Annie Marshall at Opoutia, near Glenn Murray, Harriet Wade lived at Rangiriri, Maria Stubbing at Ngaruawahia and Clara Campbell at Taupiri. There are no family stories of their keeping in contact with Maori relations, indeed there are family stories to the
contrary, therefore it would appear that these families chose a cultural diaspora. The rest of the family were to be locationally dispersed as well.

Marian Stewart went to Whakatane in 1868. Catherine Carran (Granny Patterson) to Southland in 1860. Her brother Benjamin was sent down to help her on the death of her first husband in 1870, and he stayed on. John went to Auckland, Albert to Mahia and Henry to Thames. The youngest Mackay, Mere, went to Whakatane in 1859. The three Joy boys appear to have remained about the Waikato as settler farmers (Maori land court records- file lot 469b Parish of Taupiri).

Elva Kelly is a granddaughter of Maria Stubbing and is the family genealogist of the Stubbing family. The Stubbing family have always lived at Ngaruawahia. Elva told me of Regatta day at Ngaruawahia when the families of those MacKay sisters living in the Waikato and indeed sometimes of those families as far away as Auckland getting together by the bridge at Ngaruawahia for a big family picnic. Elva recounted a family story told by her Uncle Edward Stubbing (Nobby) about the only time he ever saw his mother acting like a Maori, and that was one regatta day when she met up with her youngest sister, Mere. They had not seen each other since Mere had been sent back to Poroporo. Elva recounted her grandmother wailing and hongiing "just like a Maori" when she met her young sister again.

The suppression of a life style that is poignantly told in this story, is but a vignette of the suppression which was necessary for these women to succeed in the 'colonial settler' culture of the time.

**Samuel Joy (1m)**

Irihapeti's second husband was also a Scotsman. He was a builder at Raglan. They had three sons. Sam Joy (the one buried on Taupiri) Daniel and David. I have very little information about the descendants of the two younger brothers but the oldest, Sam Joy, had two children, Sam Emery and Hera Emery.
Hera had fourteen children, one son being Tukawekai (Darcy) Kereama, my third generation informant from this family.

Hera was fostered at age 2, to her whanau in Foxton. She halted the Europeanising process by growing up speaking Maori, and living as Maori. Her father, Sam Joy, preferred to speak English. Te Puea is said to have said of Sam Joy that he had a Maori heart but his tikangas (ways) were Pakeha. There is much more research to be done on the Joy family, but findings tend to parallel those of the MacKay family, in that those of the Joys who broke the pattern of Europeanisation, had to move away from the European dominated areas and into Maori dominated areas, and to be brought up with Maori families.

At about the same time that Hera was fostered her older brother, Sam Emery (aged about 4 years old) was also taken from his father, Sam Joy by the family of his wife, Waimarama Emery from Te Kopua near Te Awamutu. Sam Joy had committed a crime against the family in having an affair with another woman, and the brothers of Waimarama would not accept the disgrace to their sister. So they took the children away. Sam Joy (the third Sam Joy) became Sam Emery, and he and his mother were 'sent' up north to the gumfields area, and when he returned he went to live with other family near Rotoiti. He lived here for most of his life.

When Sam Emery died, in 1967, Waikato came to his Tangi in strength. The Queen came to the Tangi. Kepa Ehau of Te Arawa asked if they had come to get him back. Waikato said "they had nothing to say for this is the place where he made something of himself."

Those of the MacKay family who remained in the Waikato also kept ties with their Joy relations but by now the links are fading, and only the oldest of my informant group knew of the relationship. One example was this comment by Tukawekai Kereama "I used to meet these MacKays and they didn't look like Maori, but they had a Maori heart."
THE PROCESS OF TURNING AWAY FROM THE MAORI SIDE.

In the introduction I mentioned how many of the second generation must have known about the heritage of our family, yet they were unwilling to pass this information on. During the course of meetings with my relatives I came across many stories of attitudes that illustrated the degree and kind of the turning away from the Maori side that had occurred in this family.

I was reminded of the context that John Pilger (1986) had described about his recollections of his growing up in the post World War two Australia of the 1950's;

We knew little about any of this because dissenting views had no powerful and persuasive public voice, and the self-image our society as a second hand England, a gathering place of 'exiles' was so engrained on all of us that obsequiousness to another's people's past and myths was a way of life...At school we sang imperial hymns, celebrated 'Empire Day' on May 24 and were taught a history whose focus was a small cluster of islands on the other side of the planet,...Australia's own story, especially what was done to the Aborigines, a story in contemporary terms even more rapacious than that of the United States, was frequently dismissed as a joke. Certainly, it was not to be studied for serious purposes such as elevation to higher education. (p, 28).

This situation appears to have much in common with ours here in New Zealand. This type of experience was to be recounted to me often in my interviews with family members. Dawn Sutherland, the granddaughter of Clara Campbell, revealed a typical story about the loss of cultural knowledge of our family. These experiences were to be repeated and recounted to me in a number of ways.

Dawn Sutherland recalled;

"I said to her, "You've got a big family, (I am an only child,) what did Grandpa do?" and I'd get a clip over the ear...We were dark; I coloured up very quickly in the summertime and my girlfriends used to say to me, "Gee, you've got a great tan, you don't burn or anything", and I would say to my mother, "There must be a nigger in the wood pile", and I'd get another clip over the ear.
"The only time I saw Grandma Campbell was when she was brought up from the farm by my Aunt Marion, (my mother's second eldest sister, she was a Mrs Hawkins,) to the hospital in Auckland. My mother brought me here up to see her and in those days, they had very much the hospital, white counterpane, quilts and what have you. Here was this dark lady lying in bed in the hospital, with her hair parted down the centre, it was black and white, salt and pepper and these great big long plaits over the white bed clothes and I stood in awe at the end of the bed and my Aunt Marion was sitting there (gesturing to an imaginary place) and my mother took me up and she said, "This is Dawn", but my Grandmother was just too weak to do anything about it, acknowledge me or anything. We didn't stay long in Aunt Marion's presence.

"So we left and when we got home, I said, "Who was that?"
She said, "That was your Grandmother".

"Oh", I said, "no, that lady couldn't be my Grandmother. She's too dark", and my mother said, "It's your Grandmother")
and I said, "that can't be my Granny", I said, "she's too dark" and she said, "yes, because you would be as dark as her too", not telling me that she was a half caste Maori, "you'd be as dark as her if you worked in the fields all day."

Dawn then went on to explain why her mother had suppressed the knowledge of her background.

"There was a woman who was married into our family, she had a grog shop in Durban, a pretty wild one I believe, and she came to New Zealand because her family were here and she bought a parrot who left a lot to be desired where conversation was concerned. They came to Taupiri. Now she knew Clara, my Grandmother. She stayed on the farm at Taupiri with her and Marion. My mother was there, just reached the age of 16 and beginning to show her heels, so this woman arrived from South Africa, full of bags of money and suggested that perhaps my mother would like to accompany her to Wellington and Gran Campbell said that would be alright, so my mother left with this aunt from the grog shop."
When they got to Wellington this aunt said to my mother, "Would you like to go to Australia?" and my mother said, "I will have to ask my mother", and this woman said that will be alright, we'll send a wireless. So they got on the boat to Australia and sent a Marconi! (When) she came back, she was a young lady of fashion...she came back as the height of fashion. My mother travelled backwards and forwards to Australia from then on she travelled through the Pacific and one of the reasons she was eager to go to Wellington with this woman was that Maori was a dirty word, in her day. We are going back to before the Boer War yet even today as the Maori is still a dirty word in some sections of your community. And this is why I think I knew nothing about my Maori blood until my mother died and we met the Oliphant Stewarts at her funeral.

It would appear however, that it is not as easy to blot out your background as you may hope.

"When my mother died, I had been sitting round the table; her lawyer, her doctor and one of my uncles and we were discussing what we were going to do with her. It was funny really, here she was in Auckland hospital and we were deciding what to do with her - she hadn't left a will and I didn't know what to do. So Uncle Davie and the lawyer - they had all grown up together, suggested she should be cremated and the doctor went along with that and I said, "Oh, I don't know". So then it was decided that she would be cremated, so we sat around and had a cup of tea after that and we discussed if we had made the right decision and it was suggested that yes, she was a very worldly woman and that we should have her ashes scattered, and that's what we did. But oh God, it worried me; for six months I used to sit straight up in bed at night, still wondering had I done the right thing by her and I have heard since then from different Maori people I've met, that Maori people don't like people being cremated, you should bury them so that they can return back to the Earth and you have to give them a starting off place to return to Hawaiki, which they go right to the top of the North Island to do - their soul that is.

I was fascinated by this commentary of my second cousin from the other end of New Zealand, I had never met her before yet her story closely paralleled that of my own experiences from the other end of the country; the evasive
answers to questions as to colour of skin, the silences when questions became to
close for comfort, and the unwillingness to help discover our heritage.

I asked he: "Why do you think the whole family lost that knowledge
as to where it came from?"

"You have got to remember that having European one side of the family and the other part
was Maori - Maori was the dirty part - the part they tried to hide - that you were Maori -
you weren't allowed to speak Maori at school - you weren't allowed to speak

Maori in the playground - if you spoke Maori your friends would walk away from you -
now my mother told me nothing. I was brought up as a European (went to Auckland
Girl's Grammar) and my mother was very strict with me in English - my mother
wouldn't condone me learning Maori music. If I go to a Maori concert now, I do
nothing but cry. I blame my mother for she has robbed me of that part of my heritage.

I can only say, "Why couldn't I have had two?"

We continued to converse about our upbringing.

R - Have any of your family married back into Maori people?
D - No.
R - What about the generation before you (she then named all the family of Clara).
D - They all married into European families.
R - Isn't it interesting how the family became so European?
D - I think you have to put it down to the fact that the Europeans pushed us into it. They
always said, "Don't ever marry a Maori".
R - Who said that?
D - Lots of women, fathers said it the their daughters. "Don't ever marry a Maori" - (you
will be) barefoot and pregnant.

D - My mother said don't marry a Maori or you will have black children - a throw back.
R - That's interesting, for my mother always said that she wouldn't mind us boys
marrying Maoris.

We continued on the theme of the dual heritage for Dawn was the first of the
family I spoke with to raise it voluntarily.
R: You said before that your mother had taken away the dual heritage that you had - that to me is a very important statement.

D: I can't blame her, you can only blame the people of the time because she was part Maori and the Pakehas didn't want anything to do with the Maori people and she just probably made up her mind that no way would anybody call her a dirty Maori, and she completely separated herself from her Maori ancestors - I never knew that my Grandmother was a Maori until that moment when she took me to the hospital - I wouldn't accept her, I said, "No, that is not my Grandmother".

R: Had you not seen her before that?

D: No, never seen her before. I knew there was something going on in the family when they had meetings at Ngāruawahia Court after my Grandmother died - but my mother did not look like a Maori - we all just darkened up in the Summertime. I never associated my relations as being part Maori - I never associated with or lived near the darker ones.

I asked if she knew anything of Irihapeti for I had not been able to find anything about her although I had talked to many of her elderly descendents.

"My mother, Maria Louise remembered her Grandmother, Irihapeti, sitting at the farm at Taupiri beside the old coal range smoking a pipe - a clay pipe. They never said she was Maori - when my mother was saying that her Grandmother used to sit by the fireplace, I always assumed that she was Irish - because she smoked a pipe - the Irish women do. In my mind I can picture her with a shawl and a rocking chair, smoking a pipe - my mother never gave me that picture - that was the picture I drew in my mind. But she was a full Maori women - but that was the picture I drew - childish visions I suppose.

Dawn told me this poignant tale that really explains why memories of my Great Grandmother have been expunged from the memories of the family, and replaced by imported fantasies about European heritage. She was told only a little and yet it was the social context of the period that filled in the picture for her. One gains the impression that the second generation people were happy with this fallacious impression because to be descended as a Maori in those days was not a comfortable experience.

I was interested to know what experiences that my North island
cousins had had of Maori life.

That's where I felt awkward; when my husband was working for the Raglan County, there was a big smash and 3 guys who worked for the Raglan County were killed on a Saturday night and they had the funeral on the marae the following week and that's where I felt awkward. I felt I shouldn't have been there, but I have every right to be there, but I felt it because I have no Maoritanga I shouldn't be there, but we had to go because my husband worked for the County. I still had that awkwardness about me I didn't know if I should step back 2 paces or more over there or move over there or stand under a tree.

Other family members recounted similar tales of interest. Gwen White (granddaughter of Maria Stubbing) explained to me that;

my first real experience of Maori things was at my son's funeral. He had married into the people at Turangawaewae and had become very proficient at Maori ways. They accepted him as one of their own. He took ill, hurt his back, put on a lot of weight, then died suddenly. As I said my first experience was sitting beside the open coffin of my son for a three day Tangihanga. (May 1990).

Also in Whakatane I was to hear similar stories, but this time the reasons began to be revealed. In Whakatane, in May of 1990 Ina Chamberlain spoke about the forces that kept our family in the dark, and she recounted a number of fascinating tales. The first was about a meeting with Te Puea and her Grandmother, near their marae at Poroporo. They were really speaking sternly to each other.

There's a sharp left-hand corner just down from that pa. They stopped and were told by Te Puea and Granny that they were going to wash their hands of each other's genealogy. Te Puea said that she didn't want anything to do with them and they said they didn't want anything to do with Waikato as well. Te Puea is reported to have said to the grandmother, who was Mere MacKay, "You stay over there with your people and I'll stay over there with my people". (May 1990).

Ina and her husband George then told us about another time when other relations had been in touch with her.
Ina. There was another person in town, now wait a minute. They came up the drive—
he came tearing up the drive, a Pakeha guy and he had a Maori woman beside him,
okay. "This is my daughter-in-law", says this chap, Rachel or something.

George takes over.

I was sitting outside in my caravan, I had one at the time. They pulled up and I said, "Can I
help you?" He said they had been to see Romana (the Kaumatua introduced to us by
Ngahua). He said, "Go and see Ernie Noland." They were wanting to know about the old
MacKay crowd and Ernie said, "Go and see her" (Ina). They came in and they talked.

Ina. His wife got out and her mother was Catherine MacKay I think, but she never told
her anything. She didn't know anything Maori. Her daughter went to the same school
as our daughter, played hockey with her.

Ngahua. Did she live in Whakatane?

Ina. She does - the old lady does.

George. She was living...

Ina. You know where the roundabout was by the Wairiki College. There... She used
to live in one of these flats there. What was her name? Anyhow - and we went to her
son......

George. You know just for a bit of information for her. She said, "I don't want to know. My
husband said "Don't get tangled up in that sort of thing". So don't go near.

Ina. She doesn't want to get tangled up.

George. She wouldn't ever be entangled or anything - it was just some information if she
was interested. She may not want to be - but her children in later life might want to be.5

SUMMARY.

This chapter has looked at the the impact of the process of hegemonic
domination, concentrating on Irihapeti Hahau, her two husbands and their
children. All of these children had a similar bicultural heritage, having a Maori

---

5This visit was actually prompted by my receiving the information from Kit Davis about
the land at Taupiri, and the story that our great grandmother, Irihapeti was buried at
Poroporo. I wrote to a cousin of mine in Whakatane to do a bit of searching for me in that
area. This meeting between them and Ina must have been prompted by this letter from me,
but I never heard back from them.
mother and a Pakeha father, yet due to differing circumstances and influences the cultural choices they each made differed. However, overall there is a discernable pattern of Europeanisation that appears to have begun with the parents as early as 1838 and continued with their children.

As well as the two children who moved to Southland, those who stayed in the Waikato married Pakeha men or women or others of a biethnic heritage like themselves, and raised their children as Pakeha. Among those others who left the Waikato some married Maori people, some Pakeha, but often their descendents were subject to strong persuasion to follow a Pakeha way of life. Only those who were taken away from Pakeha influence early in their lives have maintained a Maori way of life.

The process of Europeanisation became inexorable because it included a systematic suppression of knowledge about the family’s bicultural past. It was the barriers created by this process of suppression that created the initial difficulty in instigating this research project. For these barriers to be negotiated the researcher had to attain a sufficient degree of cross cultural competency to recognise and work within those areas that had been suppressed.

Removing the barriers of suppression revealed the complicated matrix of conflicting hegemonies that would have been pivotal in the decision making of my family members. In this chapter it has been suggested that it was the forceful persuasiveness of the Missionary Robert Maunsell that started Irihapeti and John MacKay on the path to Europeanisation for their family. It is also suggested that Maunsell specially targeted these children to aid him in his plans for the transformation of the Maori community within which he had come to live. The next chapter examines the idea that Maunsell created an institution to specifically destroy the biculturalism of the family to further his vision of a new world.
INTRODUCTION

In this chapter I intend to examine the impact of Maunsell the missionary and his schools upon the life choices of the family members. It is necessary to consider this impact within the context of the period, because of the complex nature of the conflicts that were taking place. This examination will demonstrate that the Missionary targeted this family for special incorporation into his own world view through the medium of his boarding school. Consideration will be given to the reasons for the development of a new educational institution in Lower Waikato that developed from the village schools that were initially established. The chapter will then detail how the missionaries designs were thwarted by the advancement of an alternative form of hegemony from the Settler's representatives. Because the missionaries were vanquished in this series of power struggles, their followers and students were also overcome. These followers were made irrelevent to their people and their lifes options were diminished.

The period 1840 to 1865 in New Zealand as a whole, and in Waikato especially, was characterised by a complex power struggle for political control and control of resources, between a variety of interest groups, and at a number of levels. The concern of this period with political issues was so obvious to Reverend Maunsell that he was moved to lament that in the year immediately prior to the war; ...in the Waikato district generally speaking, we have not much to boast at least not in spiritual things. These political questions seem to absorb all the spare thought of the people.(Maunsell to C.M.S. Feb. 5 1862).
This period, the 'crucial decades' for race relations in New Zealand,\textsuperscript{1} reveals a series of petit hegemonic struggles for control between the various Pakeha groups within the broader 'gross hegemonic' struggle for control by European 'civilisation' over the Maori people and their resources. As discussed in chapter two the petit hegemonic struggles were at two levels;

1. Between Pakeha groups
2. Between Maori groups

The gross hegemonic struggles were between two peoples; Maori and Pakeha. Much of New Zealand's 'accepted' history focuses on the latter level, but to ignore the other struggles, is to ignore the germination of the fundamental ideologies that initiated and perpetuated the political system.

Among the causal forces of the struggle was the shift in support given to different groups in New Zealand by the British Government as and when British Colonial policy changed. During the period from initial contact to the outbreak of the wars of the 1860's, the locus of power in New Zealand shifted from the missionaries to the Governors and then finally to the Settler Assembly.

A 'conflict oriented' study of the forces that affected my family during the period 1840 to 1865 reveals that these power struggles between the Pakeha groups in Aotearoa negated much of the local responses and initiatives by limiting the choices open to Maori and Non-Maori alike. The story of my family must be seen within the wider context of the conflicts and struggles for supremacy between European interest groups. This struggle took place beneath an umbrella of a wider struggle for supremacy by European interests over Maori, that eventually united the European interests against those of the Maori.

When the struggle turned toward the need to use the 'coercive force of the state' on Maoridom, there was unification of purpose by the Europeans. There was not a similar solidarity among Maori. The Maori people of Lower Waikato

\textsuperscript{1}These were the crucial decades, for it was during this period as a result of the gross and petit hegemonic struggles taking place, that the subsequent pattern of dominance and marginalisation was initiated. Also developed during this period was the mythology that justified and rationalised the domination/marginalisation relationship.
fought on the side of the British forces against the Kingitanga forces. This caused the 'civil war' aspect of the colonial wars of Sovereignty (Orange 1987).

The conflicts examined in this thesis are but part of this wider picture. Initially the focus is on the conflict between Reverend Maunsell and the Maori people of Lower Waikato, and the mediation of this struggle through Maunsell's hegemony. Maunsell's concerns at the counter hegemonic resistance by the Maori people on his attempts to extend his hegemony, will be explored. Then the conflict between the various Pakeha groups for hegemony of their world views will be analysed. Due to the limited scope of this study, what is missing is a detailed analysis of the aspirations of the various Maori leaders of the period. This latter consideration is a fruitful and necessary avenue for future research.

INTRODUCTION AND BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE.

The Reverend Robert Maunsell was a most significant character in promoting the diaspora and the cultural choices made by many of my family (Maunsell was pronounced Mansel - Hamilton, 1970, p 360). He was a Missioner of the Church Missionary Society, an Anglican Church mission based in London. He was born on the 24 October, 1810 near Limerick. A graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, he was ordained Deacon on 22nd of December, 1833, Priest on the 21st of December 1834. Soon after he departed for New Zealand, arriving at Paihia in the Bay of Islands on 26 November 1835. He opened his first station, with Reverend Hamlin at Moetoa on the Manukau Harbour in 1836. (Maunsell to C.M.S. July 27, 1839). This station closed in 1839 when he moved to Maraetai, Waikato Heads, due to a "declining populace in that area" (Garrett, 1991). Reverend Ashwell assisted at the station until 1842, when he left to establish his own mission station upriver at Taupiri. Reverend Morgan of Otawhao (later to be known as Te Awamutu) also began his journey up the river from the station at Maraetai. (Moore, 1966). As well as Ashwell and Morgan, Stack, Volkner and Purches were some of the other Missionaries 'initiated' at Maraetai. A further shift for Maunsell in 1853 saw his station move upriver to
Kohanga. Maunsell became Archdeacon of Waikato in 1859. In 1863 he became a chaplain to the Colonial troops fighting in the Waikato. He ministered to the troops at Rangiriri. In 1864, following a fruitless attempt to return to Kohanga, he moved to Auckland to a new parish. He became Archdeacon of Auckland from 1870 to 1883. He died in Auckland on the 19th April 1894. (More detailed considerations of his life are available in Wily and Maunsell (1935) and Garrett (1991)).

MAUNSELL AND THE TREATY OF WAITANGI

Maunsell was to be a seminal figure in the lives of those who lived in this area. He was a leader and developer of inland mission stations as well as of Maori run village schools. Garrett (1991) reports that only a year after establishing his first station on the Manukau, he and Hamlin had fourteen schools established and running in the local area. This development was to be replicated upon his move to Waikato Heads. He befriended local Maori chiefs, made many of them his converts, and gained great Mana among the Maori people.

Many missionaries, of the 'early' group, those who had arrived in New Zealand in the 1820's and the early 1830's like the Williams brothers before colonisation became inevitable, were supportive of an independent Maori nation in New Zealand but with European overtones. Maunsell, however became an eager promoter of colonisation because of his increasing concerns at the 'independence' of the Maori and of their ability to syncretise the new institutions with the old (Owens, 1981).

Soon after his shift to the more populous location at Waikato Heads, he was charged with gathering signatures on the Treaty of Waitangi by Governor Hobson. On April 3rd 1840, Captain William Symonds arrived with the only English Language version of the Treaty of Waitangi. Kelly (1949, p. 249), recounts how Symonds had just come from Hamlin's station at Orua, where he had met with considerable opposition, but had finally persuaded several minor chiefs to attach their signatures. Upon Symonds' arrival at Waikato Heads he found that
Maunsell had already introduced the topic of the Treaty to Ngati Tipa and several signatures had already been obtained. There was resistance however when it was discovered that their missionary had not distributed the blankets which were expected, and there were loud demands for the return of the paper. Seemingly it was the timely arrival of blankets that saved the day, and Symonds was pleased to note that the "paper contained the names of many important chiefs to as far south as Mokau" (Kelly, 1949, p. 425). Maunsell, in company with Tipene Tahatika, visited the great chief Te Wherowhero, at his home at Awhitu on the Manukau, to attempt to persuade this most important Tainui chief to sign the document. Kelly quotes Maunsell's response upon hearing of Te Wherowhero's refusal as, "This ignorant old man, if he had signed, I would have given him a blanket!" (p. 426.)

This story is not completely indicative of Maunsell's attitude toward senior Ariki such as Te Wherowhero, for Maunsell did recognise Te Wherowhero's mana as the following incident illustrates. When the Maunsell family had established their 'small piece of England' at Maraetai (Waikato Heads) they were particular to establish that English manners would rule their household as an example to the locals. One of the 'manners' established was that the locals should not enter by the front door. That was only for important guests and dignitaries, and then only on special occasions. One day at Maraetai, Mary Rymill, (the Maunsell family's English assistant) was startled by the unannounced entry of a stranger. She attempted to get "this strange Maori" to enter by a side entrance. However, he strode in through the front door. Maunsell comforted her tattered sensitivities by saying that he doubted if anyone could get Te Wherowhero to enter by a side door (Rymill, n.d.).

Maunsell was not just a promoter of the signing of the Treaty, he also believed strongly that the commitment made by the British must be upheld determinedly. In a letter to Hobson, (reprinted again in GBPP 1848, 1002 p. 8) dated 14 April, 1840, Maunsell spelt out the implications for the Government of the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi at Waikato Heads. He clearly outlined the
obligations on all parties and wrote this letter to accompany the return of the Treaty document to Hobson.

I am happy to inform you that the signatures obtained comprise those of leading men, excepting perhaps two. 2

...that having put ourselves prominently forward in obtaining an acknowledgement of the sovereign power of The Queen on the part of the natives, so we trust, that the acknowledgement will never be made, even apparently, the basis of any measure that may hereafter result in their prejudice.

The steps we have taken have been taken in full dependence on the well-known lenity and honour of the British Government, and we rest assured, that we shall never hereafter find ourselves to have been in these particulars mistaken. (CBPP, 1841, 311, p. 99).

Maunsell was to refer to this letter again when he wrote to Governor Grey on October 18th, 1847 expressing his concern over the proposal by Earl Grey, the British Colonial Secretary to alienate all land not occupied by Maori as 'waste' lands and therefore Crown lands. In expressing his concern at this move, he noted while "a clergyman should have little to do with politics," he was concerned about the potential breach of the trust, fundamental to the Treaty obligations, that was about to be instigated. The select committee of the House of Commons of July 1844 "of which also Earl Grey was, I believe, the chief author" was set up at the request of the New Zealand Company, and proposed that the Treaty of Waitangi be rescinded and that the Crown resume title to all Waste lands not actually occupied by the natives. Lord Howick, (who became Lord Grey and Secretary of State for the Colonies and who was also patron of the New Zealand Company), was chairman of the committee, and he described the Treaty as "injurious and merely a legal fiction". The natives were said to be uncivilised, barbarous tribes, incapable of comprehending the real force and meaning of such a transaction......besides they did not need much land for their support (Garrett, 1991, p. 140).

2significantly these were the Ariki, Te Wherowhero of Ngati Mahuta and a leading rangatira, Whakanoa of Ngati Haua)
Maunsell was so concerned about the proposals to take the 'waste' lands, that he wrote;

in all these documents we see indeed the maintenance of the Waitangi Treaty
ostentatiously put forward, but we detect throughout the whole what far
counterbalances such averments. Not only do we miss the kind spirit of parental interest
that was evinced by former Colonial Secretaries to the aborigines; but we see also a
strong inclination to censure that treaty, and, if not a plain disclaimer, at least a plain
attempt to evade its force. (GBPP, 1884, 1002 p. 9).

Maunsell was further incensed at the invidious position missionaries were placed
by these provisions in relationship to the "New Zealanders." He recounted the
prominent role the missionaries had played in "inducing the aborigines to
acknowledge the sovereign power of the Queen" and he concluded that their
reputation was to be besmirched by these infamous provisions. Some
missionaries were even prepared to abandon the country "as soon as you begin to
act upon those instructions." He hoped that others would have remained in order
to clear the name of the missionaries with their people, to assure them that; "we
never contemplated such measures on the part of our Government when we
induced them to sign the Treaty," and that "though we were guilty of a mistake,
we were not at least guilty of an attempt at deception" (p. 9).

He reminded Grey of the honour implicit in the signing of the Treaty.

I trust, Sir, that I never see the day in which Englishmen will forget that national
honour is an essential part of national dignity. The greater the power the more striking
will be an act of meanness. From the day on which the Treaty of Waitangi was signed, the
conduct of the New Zealanders to the British has been marked by a spirit of chivalry, of
friendship and of good faith. They have cheerfully ceded the rights of sovereignty and pre-
emption, and for a very small compensation have willingly endured fatigues, and face death
against their relatives in defence of that authority thus ceded......What, I would ask has
been given by the British government to them in return?.....this colony has been founded,
not by force, but by compact. A compact implies advantages given as well as received. What
has been received by the British Government is visible to all: what has been given to the
New Zealanders it is difficult to discover... Earl Grey seems only to regard this people as being not far from the lowest in the scale of human existence, and unworthy of the little they now retain. (p. 9)

Maunsell then reiterated his fundamental philosophical stance, his 'monogenesist' beliefs, toward the process of civilising the Maori people.

His lordship will, I hope, recollect that if civilised man has claims, he also has duties; and that to those beneath us in the degree of advancement, (italics added) we should exhibit our eminence not merely in skill and power, but in the more exalted qualities of benevolence and trust. (p. 10).

To Earl Grey he specifically addressed his opinions about Grey's definition of 'Waste', and clearly identifies the 'polygenesist' rationale beneath the arguments;

Waste, unclaimed, unoccupied, are in the vocabulary of Earl Grey one and the same in meaning. Those mystic words 'sovereignty' and 'pre-emption' are then called into requisition, and made to serve the same purposes as did the ox hide in the hands of a proto-colonist of former times: they are to be stretched into such convenient lengths as to enclose just as much as the more powerful and more crafty are pleased to determine.

England had her unoccupied territories, and no doubt Earl Grey has his unsubdued lands....So also has the New Zealander his bird preserves, his runs (the grand source of supply to our colonial markets), his useful timbers, his fisheries, and localities sacred in his 'regards as having been the abodes of his forefathers, the scenes of their triumphs and the resting places of their bones. (p. 10).

Maunsell then asked the key question, especially important to one so prominent in the signing if the Treaty. "And now why does the statesman of such a mighty nation seek to 'confiscate' these, the guaranteed possessions of our friends and allies?" thus revealing the desire of the settlers to seek their own ends, by breaching the Treaty agreements.

Governor Grey used this letter (among others) from Maunsell as justification to recind the instructions from Earl Grey about the taking of 'waste lands'. Governor Grey ostensibly supported the Missionaries and gained Maunsells' support as a result of this and other supportive actions. However
Grey's Machiavellian methods manifested themselves only a few years later when he used these very provisions in another part of the country. Evison (1986) details how Grey effectively confiscated unoccupied land in the South Island leaving Ngai Tahu people with only that which they occupied at the time of the negotiation for the South Island land blocks, in effect instigating the 'waste lands' idea. This duplicity was a constant feature of Grey's administration. He attempted to keep both the missionaries and the settler interests happy by conceding to both groups, when really he was pursuing his own agenda. So duplistic was he that Ian Wards, the Government Historian concludes of Grey;

So difficult it is to find one important subject about which Grey did not lie...that the impact of Grey must be judged from what he did and not what he said. (Garrett, 1991).

This whole issue about the 'Waste' lands illustrates clearly some of Maunsell's central beliefs and concerns. These included his belief in the integrity of the Treaty, his concern at the shift in support by colonial officials from the missionaries towards the placating of the desires of the settlers and also his patronizing, paternalistic attitude towards Maori people in relationship to the British who were offering them stewardship. The waste lands issue also clearly illustrates that Maunsell had an agenda for Maori people based upon his convictions about justice and his notion of their place in the world.

MAUNSELL THE SCHOLAR

Maunsell became an eminent scholar and practitioner of the Maori language. Lady Martin, on a journey down the Waikato in 1852, visited the mission station at Kohanga soon after it had been shifted from Waikato Heads, and commented;

We heard Archdeacon Maunsell preach on Sunday to a large native congregation. He spoke in Maori with great fluency and precision. (Martin, 1884, p. 117).

An exacting measure of his ability was the task he undertook of translating the old testament from Hebrew into Maori. He completed this translation, in 1857,
for the second time. This translation work was to be a testament to his tenacity and perseverance, for the first manuscript, when almost completed, had been completely destroyed when their house at Maraetai was razed to the ground the night of the 21st July, 1843. To recommence this enormous task illustrates those character traits of tenacity and self-denial that were to be of such significance in the twenty years he lived in the Lower Waikato.

RESPONSES TO THE NEW MISSION AND SCHOOL AT MARAETAI.

Following his shift to Maraetai, Maunsell soon established his mission station and school. Initial response was strong. For the first nine months after his arrival there was one European pupil and about twelve Maori (Moore, 1966.). The following year saw rapid expansion;

As early as the end of July 1839, there was an average daily attendance of seventy scholars at the school (Maunsell to C.M.S. 30 July 1839).

Only eighteen months later attendance had grown dramatically.

Our Scripture Evening Meetings, held three times a week, are regularly attended, to overflowing. The average attendance at the Schools has been—Boy's morning school, 36;
Sunday, 200; Girls Morning School, 30; Sunday, 80; Children's Morning School, 12;
Sunday, 26. (Missionary Register, 1841, p. 235).

The response to the school and the desire of the Maori for the benefits of literacy were such that public examinations were held as early as 1840.

The examination at the newly established Church Mission station at Waikato Heads attracted 1500 people, of whom 300 were examined in writing, ciphering and history and another 450 were questioned on the catechism. The feast was prepared in Maori style, in one hangi alone were 12 whole pigs, and there were 100 baskets of potatoes, corn and kumaras. (Barrington and Beaglehole, 1974, p. 29).

Reading, farming and simple industrial skills were the core curriculum of the village school's that Maunsell established. Reading of the Bible and catechism, in Maori, was of paramount importance. This emphasis on the local language,
and the skills necessary for the development of agriculture, Walker (1990) claims makes this period "pedagogically sound." It is significant that contemporary Maori educators are returning to this model with the development of the Kohanga Reo, Kura Kaupapa Maori and Waananga Maori. These institutions incorporate the teaching of te reo Maori and the skills of coping in the modern world within a Maori context.

Schools spread from and around the mission station to the extent that when George Clarke, Chief Protector of Aborigines, travelled through the Thames and the Waikato districts in late 1840s, he found "scarcely a village without its own school" (Barrington and Beaglehole, 1974, p. 26). Parr (1961) concludes that by 1840 there could have been "few if any villages without some inhabitants who could read and write" (in Barrington and Beaglehole, p. 26). Jackson (1967) concludes as to the spread of literacy during this period;

The spread of books (and with them literacy) by direct and indirect diffusion meant that a large number of Maori people were soon literate in their own language. Markham (in March 1834) estimated that there were 'not less than Ten Thousand people in the island that can read, write and do sums in the northern end of the island.' More impressive still were the figures available for book production in New Zealand. From 1835 to 1840 William Colenso printed about 3,500,000 pages of religious material and in 1840 produced over 2,000,000 more. (Barrington and Beaglehole, p.29).

In his report for 1841, Maunsell enthusiastically summarised that;

Our station was formed and occupied amidst considerable opposition and discouragement; but the opposition has died away. Our Settlement Congregations average between 250 and 350: our Outdoor Congregations also consist of considerable numbers; embracing exclusively of those of Manukau, about 1500. Our native teachers, 30 in number, are posted through all parts of the district; while others travel as far as Taranake (sic) and Taupo. To Taupo one visit has been paid by Mr Ashwell, to Waipa and Otawoa, several and numbers are continually resorting hither, from distances of five days journey, to hold conversation, or to seek baptism. (Missionary Register, 1841, p. 235).
Great interest was shown in the new message of Maunsell. He reported that the whole district, spread mostly along the banks of the Waikato river, was made up of some "7000 souls" of whom "we compute that full three-fourths have embraced the gospel". (Missionary Register Dec., 1841, p. 545)

**EVANGALISM**

Although Walker suggests the period appeared to favor Maori practices the underlying approach of Maunsell was assimilationist, for like the other missionaries he was using the 'Civilisation First' model. This method entailed enticing the Maori into the Western World through explaining the methods and benefits of the new materialism, then introducing as the source of these benefits, the new religion of Christianity. By this method the new world view was to be introduced and cemented into place, the material benefits could only be gained as part of accepting the whole world view, and this whole included the underlying value, moral and belief system of Christianity. Maunsells' assimilationist evangelism is clearly expressed in the quote chosen as the frontispiece of the Missionary Register of 1841. The text is from Rev. xv4 (Missionary Register. 1841),

*Who shall not fear thee, 0 Lord and glorify thy name? For thou only art holy: for all nations shall come and worship before thee, for thy judgements are made manifest.*

(frontispiece).

His evangelism was not of a broad Christianity however. In his report of 1839 he requested pictures and materials with which to teach and warned of the "oversupplied Papists who may indeed win through." This concern with Catholic Missionaries threads its way through his letters and journals. He and his fellow C.M.S. Missionaries constantly refer to the problems posed by the "incorrect world view of the Papists."

A subtle, yet very significant message behind Maunsell's insistence that the Anglican 'world view' was the correct view, is that by definition all other 'world views' are incorrect. The concomitant message was that differences were not to be tolerated. In this, Christianity formed part of the gross hegemonic process of
domination by providing that part of the ideology that justified lack of tolerance for differences. This view, along with the myth making of the Settlers Assemblies and the centrism of the Governor, combined as hegemony, the domination of the ruled by the right of cultural persuasion.

Morrell (1967) concluded of Maunsell that he wanted Assimilation for Maoridom. He saw;

little value in traditional Maori society and only wished to preserve it in so far as it would in the short run facilitate the Maori's acceptance of the new religion. Ultimately, he too (along with George Grey) wanted a race of brown Englishmen, but they were to be brown English Christians. (p. 246).

One must surely add that they were also to be protestant!

MAUNSELL'S CONCERNS

Maunsell can be seen as the 'intellectual' primarily responsible for the promotion of his mission and school, the hegemonic agency of the civil society. He noticed however, soon after the establishment of his school and mission the beginnings of a counter hegemonic struggle. Early in his reports, there emerged a darker side to the otherwise bright picture he painted. As early as 1841 he reported (Missionary Register, 1841) that;

Of the folly of their own system the natives are now pretty generally convinced; but of the Scripture truth, the natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God, we have every abundant evidence. (p. 545).

While knowledge of the Word of God was rapidly spreading, Maunsell expressed his concern "would however, that we could hail Christian Feelings and Christian Character as advancing in the same proportion" (p. 235.). His aim to create a Christian community was being subverted by Maori combining influences of the old ways with the new. He was also concerned with the increasingly ambivalent attitudes Maori were displaying toward the 'new order'.

On the whole, an attentive examination presents a strange motley of old habits and opinions, seeking to mould and rule the new principle. (p. 235).

The reasons why Maori people embraced the gospel concerned Maunsell. He emphasised that the problem was not attracting potential candidates for baptism, but rather in keeping the numbers manageable to allow the missionaries to select the most suitable. Maunsell was finding that the Maori were taking from the new teachings what they wanted, rather than what he wanted them to learn.

He actually acknowledged that the Maori were indeed very capable of making sense of the message of Christianity and of incorporating it within the cosmology with which they were familiar, in order to make sense of the new world. Indeed this amalgamation of ideas was so successful that it was "too often obtaining the mastery" (p. 235. italics added). His lamentation of the development of this counter hegemonic, syncretic process became a constant theme of his reports and letters and eventually led him to develop another institutional form to counter the process.

Maunsell reacted to the Maori response by introducing a new type of educational institution, a boarding school. This new institution was strictly oriented to promoting the world view of Maunsell. He felt that he could not control the development of the new theocracy adequately through the village school system, for his intentions were too easily subverted and had engendered the counter hegemonic struggle.

This example illustrates the Gramscian notion that alternative ideologies are always present, exerting their counter-hegemonic influences. "Such ideas are not recognised as valid by the agencies of civil society (the missionary) as they present a challenge to the existing order and serve to undermine its legitimacy" (Reid, 1988, p. 56). Friere (1985) contends that domination represents "contemporary and historical ideological and material practices that are never completely successful, always embody contradictions and are constantly being fought over within asymmetrical relations of power" (p. xii). This analysis helps to explain the survival of Maori culture and society into the present.
era, the forlorn hopelessness of the policies of assimilation, as well as providing an understanding of the reasons for the perpetuation of this form of struggle into modern times.

This concern of Maunsell's at the adaptation of religious thought was similar to his lack of approval of the adaptations that Maori people were making in regard to economic developments. That Maori people were able to cope with the advancing new order offered by the arrival of settlers, the growth of towns and the subsequent development of internal and export trade opportunities was not an acceptable consideration to Maunsell. Bishop Selwyn was given a very clear message by Maunsell very early on in his time in New Zealand.

Soon after my arrival in New Zealand I was visited by the Reverends Robert Maunsell and M.J. Hamlin, two of the best linguists in the mission. From them I obtained an account of the state of their districts, which seem to be highly satisfactory, with the one exception of the unsettled and wandering habits of the natives, caused by their frequent visits to Auckland for the purposes of trade. The extent to which this is carried on may be judged by the fact that nearly the whole town is supplied with pork, vegetables, fish and firewood by the natives who receive very fair prices for their commodities and buy in return, English clothing, tools and other goods. This free intercourse had the good effect of encouraging habits of industry, neatness and cleanliness, but on the other hand, it has taken the natives away from the care of their missionaries for long periods, and has introduced irregularity, especially into their schools. (Italics added) (Missionary Register, 1843, p. 379).

At other times, Maunsell was to lay blame for his failures at the feet of the secular invasion. In a letter to the Society in 1841, Maunsell stated that;

Colonisation has brought abundance of seducing and distracting influences while it has not given the required aid towards the moral benefit of the people. (Maunsell to C.M.S. 6 Dec., 1847).
A further level of struggle is indicated by Nathan (1973);

...in the mid 1840's Maunsell observed a general tendency of disillusionment among his converts, manifested in the outbreaks of tribal quarrels and in declining attendance at services. (p. 56).

The implication in Nathan's article is that Maori were returning to their pre-mission practices of tribal quarrels and fighting. Outbreaks of 'tribal quarrels' were in fact, more likely to be the outcome of ill-conceived land sales to settlers, whose purchase methods often did not consider multiple ownership, nor disputed title. (Kelly, 1949, gives details of such events and intra-hapu friction caused by dishonest buyers and unentitled vendors).

The disillusionment was not with education as such, for the Maori had sought education to enable themselves to take part in the new world, but the disillusionment was with the lack of opportunities to take part in the new order. Therefore the rejection of Maunsell's message was tempered by the wider context. The relegation of Maori to a subordinate position in the new order destroyed their enthusiasm to take part in the teaching offered by the missionary. Maunsell was well aware of what was happening for in 1847 he worried that "considering the opinion that is now taking hold of the native mind, that the English nation delights in usurpation and war..." (GBPP, 1848, 1002, p. 9) he was not surprised Maori were turning away from amalgamating with the English. The attraction of the Missionary's message for Maori was its usefulness in passing on the skills necessary for the new order, but the denial of a rightful place for Maori in this new order was a great source of disillusionment and promoted the seeking of alternatives. One such alternative was to grow into the King Movement.

Analyses, such as Nathan's (1973), that do not look to the total context of the time, are limited in usefulness. Maunsell's establishment of the boarding school had much more to do with his own agenda than the needs of the Maori. He saw this as a means of countering those events and happenings outside of his control, both engendered by the Maori and non-Maori of the time.
LITERACY

Howe (1970, 1984), illustrates how Maori people began to adapt and modify Christianity to their own needs. Elsmore (1985, 1989), illustrates this flexibility through a study of the development of the numerous religious reaction movements that arose in the years following contact. Barrington and Beaglehole (1974) also contend that Maori were to take from Christian teaching those features useful to them. These authors and others like Parr (1961, in Barrington and Beaglehole, 1974) and Morrell (1967) conclude that the Maori saw this education system as empowering for it enabled them to take from the European world those technical things and non-material attitudes and beliefs that enhanced their own life-styles, while they were able to maintain their own basic social divisions of whanau, hapu and iwi.

Barrington and Beaglehole (1974, p. 29) maintain it was the striving for literacy that was the most striking feature they could identify about the Maori desire for conversion to Christianity. This enthusiasm had produced an insatiable demand for books. This demand resulted in the arrival in 1834 of William Colenso who by 1837 had, among other projects, completed printing the New Testament in Maori, a volume of some 356 pages. Parr (1961) and Jackson (1975, in Barrington and Beaglehole, 1974, p. 29) insist that rather than literacy being enhanced by Christianity it was more the other way round much to the chagrin of missionaries. Barrington and Beaglehole (1974) posit that it was "a demonstrably useful skill to be able to communicate in this way" (p. 30), but more importantly here was a way to "master the European method of acquiring knowledge". This would appear to be the key to literacy, to taking on agriculture and to learning industrial skills. Maoris wanted to adapt the new features to their way-of-life.

Maunsell was not impressed by this syncretisation by Maori for he had come here to offer a 'package' that guaranteed salvation. He had little respect for traditional Maori beliefs and was insistent that they had no role in the future. One example of his attitude to and intolerance of the culture of the local people is
seen in his reporting the need to give to the natives something more interesting and uplifting than their "filthy waiatas" (Wily and Maunsell, 1938).

As far as their songs are concerned our catechisms have almost succeeded in supplanting them... with our people in this district - Waikato - we have succeeded in carrying... this practice further, very much to our satisfaction. (p 83). Maunsell understood Maori cosmology, and the way they made sense of the world. He recorded in detail many stories from the Lower Waikato in his letters to the Church Missionary Society in London, but he used this knowledge against the Maori people. The world view of the Waikato people was discounted by Maunsell, and his belittlement began at the most fundamental level;

As yet they make but little progress in either regarding or attacking in the abstract, and their objections are almost too silly to be noticed. Their metaphysics and philosophy are for the most part confined to ancient legend, to dreams or to immediate divine agencies, the subject of thought and sensation they...express themselves as...in the Ngakau. (Maunsell to C.M.S. June 8, 1841).

Like Grey, Maunsell saw traditional Maori cosmology (and political and other cultural organisations) as interesting material for the museum, but irrelevant to his time, for now they were to be educated into the "culture" of the Gospel. Salmond (1983) quotes Sir George Grey as describing the traditions he recorded as "puerile" and added,

I believe that the ignorance which has prevailed regarding the mythological systems of barbarous races has too generally led to their being considered far grander and more reasonable than they really were. (p. 314).

However, no matter how much these men tried to belittle the Maori, the reality of the period was that social controls were essentially locally based, and the controlling society was still Maori in content and context. Thus the context for learning remained Maori, their response was syncretic, and this caused Maunsell to create a new institution, ostensibly beyond their control.

What Maunsell was unwilling to come to terms with was that Maori had a satisfactory system of making sense of the world and that this system of symbolic
representations was flexible enough to rapidly assimilate and integrate those aspects of the new culture that were of use and that made sense to them in terms of the old. Spirituality was an integral part of the everyday life of Maori people, so to introduce a new religion where spirituality was a part of everyday life was hardly an innovation. The new religion became attractive when it provided with it the means of gaining access to the obvious material benefits of European life. Ward (1973), compared Maori attitudes to the "concepts and machinery of centralised law and administration" with the "traditional attitudes to authority and dispute settlement" and concluded that;

the Maori response to Western contact was highly intellectual, flexible and progressive and also highly selective, aiming largely to draw upon the strengths of the West itself, and to enable them to enjoy its material and cultural riches equally with the Westerners. (p. viii).

THE BOARDING SCHOOL

It was soon after his arrival at Maraetai that Maunsell realised the need to develop an institution different from that of the village schools he had initially established. He stated the need clearly as:

That attractions of the new and stupendous doctrines of the Gospel were beginning to lose their novelty, and with their novelty, a large measure of their force; children were daily being baptized into the church, and yet the means for feeding these lambs of Christ were most inadequate. An immediate change therefore in our system was absolutely needed, and I, for one, shall always freely acknowledge our obligations to your Lordship. (Maunsell 1849, p.4).

By 1849, he was able to proudly summarise his progress in the Report of the Waikato Heads School of 1847 to 1849;

The Institution comprises four different departments, viz. 1. Boys' School 2. Girls' School 3. Adult men and women under instruction 4. Pakeha Pupils...The boys are taught reading, writing, geography, arithmetic, pronunciation of English, Scripture History, and the Church Catechism...Out of School they are chiefly employed in
tending the sheep and cattle of the Institution, in milking, in the garden, or other
cultivations; assisting the carpenter, post and rail fencer; in some parts of the house
duties, in cooking food for the boys' school, working the oxen and horses, sewing...The girls
receive in school nearly the same instruction as the boys, and out of school are employed in
duties in the missionary's family, in washing, ironing, sewing, and cooking food for the
girls' school (Maunsell, 1849, p. 30-31).

The school regime was very different from any other way of life at the time. For example, the whole School was examined in Scriptures and prayers, in winter at sunrise and in summer at 6.30am. The classes took the following pattern;

- Smaller children - DAY 2 hrs. EVENING 1 hr.
- Larger, and Native teachers - DAY 3 hrs. EVENING - 1 hr, 30 mins.
- Pupil teachers - DAY 3 hrs. EVENING - 2 hrs. (p. 9).

The nature of the "school most needed" was very clearly spelt out by Maunsell in
the pamphlet addressed to Bishop Selwyn.

My Lord, The experience of most of the missionaries will, I believe, decide in favour of
boarding Schools: for this reason, that the native population is, for the most part, much
scattered, and the attendance consequently of the children, when only day scholars, very
irregular. Besides, in a day school it is almost impossible to form those habits the native
population so much need. (p. 5).

The habits, and methods of inculcation that he preferred included;

- Familiar knowledge with the leading doctrines of the Bible, the English language,
singing, reading, writing, geography, arithmetic. (p. 6).

He bemoaned the continual lack of teaching materials,

from which the infant of an Englishman gains so much knowledge... which the
intelligent New Zealander has, from his contracted sphere, no other means of attaining.
(p. 6-7).

His ethnocentrism was revealed in his attitude to singing;

Singing is a branch worthy of cultivation in all schools; but in none does it more need
attention than in a school in New Zealand. (p. 7).
His advice regarding pedagogic style was tempered by his perception of his scholars;

Every effort should be made to establish in the minds of the Scholars habits of steady attention, and consecutive thought. Addresses and lectures are, for the most part, lost upon even the adult New Zealander...This errancy of mind is so striking...that the style of their instructions should be rather historical than dogmatic. (p. 7).

Thus the orientation of this education process was primarily to the theocratic worldview. Above all, he said the missionary must be persistent in pursuing the path that will be opened up by the teaching of;

catechization, and nothing but catechization, will give thought and sound knowledge to the New Zealand scholar. A New Zealand mind, ... though astute and lively, breaks down very soon in any connected process of reasoning. (p. 8)

To someone familiar with Maori culture, its emphasis upon waiata, and the exactitude required for memorisation of long passages, as well as the customs of speech making and consultation through a series of long addresses would be almost forgiven for thinking Maunsell was talking about another country and not Lower Waikato.

Another example of the methods preferred by Maunsell is found in his report to Sir George Grey in 1852, prior to the shift to Te Kohanga. (GBPP, 1852-54, p. 154-155.) He was pleased to note the continued increase in the numbers of students, "our average number last year was 67, our average number this year is 85" but 1852 appeared to be the first time that 'classes' or 'families' were developed and separated according to age.

We find that in order to produce a good effect upon the younger boys, in whom we wish to form more strongly civilised habits, it is quite necessary to keep them detached from the older scholars. (p. 154-155).

These children were kept in a separate "board building" with their "very good European master," and "a very worthy native teacher." They were"well taught in reading Maori, the English language, geography, writing and ciphering" (p. 154-155).
However;

they have their meals by themselves, with their European Master. They also work
in their garden by themselves, and play by themselves. They also have with their
native monitor the care of the sheep, the preparing of their food, and the care of their
house and schoolroom. (p. 154-154).

Maunsell (1849) carefully detailed the principles upon which the school
needed to be organised in order to produce the end result he desired for "his
people". These principals included

- Steady independence;
- A Self Supporting School, in order to cope with the constant shortfall of funding and
  also to promote the habit of self reliance;
- habits of order and obedience;
- a taste for the diet, clothing comforts, and habits, of the European. (p. 12).

Another major concern was, "to avoid that root of all evil, that bane of colonial
born children, idleness. "Work and duties were to be fostered, to battle this
scourge". (p. 12).

His central concern was that the missionary schooling should prepare the
student for life as a Christian with a new view of the world.

Above all things recollect that yours is a Religious Institution; that therefore religion must
be made the basis of your system; religion, not as consisting in a mere attendance on services
and ceremonies, but religion as brought home to the intellect and feelings of your scholars by
a daily catechization in, and exposition of its blessed precepts by yourself. (p. 10).

PROBLEMS

The Boarding Schools must have posed many problems of adjustment
for the children, especially considering the sparse living conditions, poor food and
long hours of work, schooling and study. The diet was minimal and limited,

Ground corn with milk, (a little sugar or molasses being sometimes for a reward added in.)
is a most favorite meal with native children. The pointing out to the people its proper uses,
will we may hope, soon cause them to discontinue their present mode of preparing the 'kaanga kāpio.' (p. 22).

Clothes were barely adequate, "some boys only had a shirt and no trousers" (Stack, 1935). Nevertheless Maunsell was adamant that "scanty however as may be our resources, we must remember that poverty is no excuse for untidiness" (Maunsell, 1849, p. 23). Three or four boarders had to share a blanket and as late as 1860, 16 boys slept in a room on eleven feet square. The need to provide self generated funding for the schools meant that in the new school "pupils might spend much of their time helping to keep the school going rather than having lessons" (Nathan, 1973). Also, the first two years will most probably be occupied in those labours which are absolutely needed by the Institution, in making and repairing their clothes, in washing, grinding, sifting flour, making and baking bread, fencing, gardening, cooking food, etc. (p. 52).

The Christian spirit of self-reliance through self-denial, discipline and hard work was promoted by Maunsell by his own example, and he expected no less from his scholars.

One of the manifestations of these adjustment problems was the high proportion of runaways. Nathan (1973, p. 57) reports Maunsell's amazement at one small boy who swam the Waikato River to escape, a feat that the missionary had only heard of once before. The time spent catching these reluctant scholars before they reached their homes, put a strain on the staff of the institution.

Doubts were raised by Maori parents and other adults, about the reason for the School at all with its lack of recreation, holidays and emphasis on work. Some bitter complaints were received from the relatives of the children but Maunsell was adamant. He warned of the danger of not persevering with the need to, "judiciously feed their minds with knowledge while employing their hands in action." (Maunsell, 1849, p. 10).

3The Waikato river at Kohanga is over 300 metres wide, and a very large, swiftly flowing river. It would possibly have been even more swift in those days before the mid 1920's when the Dams on the river begin to slow down the river, to the extent that Ben Marshall told me that he could remember the development of the bar at the month of the Waikato within a year of the first dam going in in 1928.
One very significant reason for the success of the school was that Waata Kukutai, the local chief, supported the school. The reasons why Maori people came and sent their children at all was complex, but Nathan (1973) suggests that a prime reason must have been Maunsells personal mana, but she neglects the support offered him by Waata Kukutai, leader of Ngati Tipa, an early convert of Maunsells, who had donated the 750 acres of agricultural land that enabled Maunsell to move his school and Mission from the less arable Putataka Bay in 1853. Kukutai also encouraged six young chiefs to "willingly (submit) themselves to this regime" (Nathan, 1973, p. 57). Kukutai also established a successful tribal farm at Kohanga. He moved all of Ngati Tipa to Te Kohanga to be near his friend and to offer Maunsell his support. Just how much success Maunsell would have had without Kukutai is debatable.

Officials also saw local support in a passive role with the initiative being Maunsells'; W.H. Russell inspected the school in 1858 and said,

such is the zeal and anxiety of its conductor, Maunsell that it will be seen to be by far the most numerously attended of all the schools which I have visited. (AJHR, 1858, E1, p. 66).

There appears to have been little local support for the school, otherwise the obvious poverty of the enterprise would have been alleviated to a greater extent by its supporters. The reason was that Maunsell kept the running of the institution to himself. This is attested to in a letter to the C.M.S. in 1850.

I have just returned from a trip of seven weeks of absence from my station...we had 84 males in this institution before I left, many of whom I was obliged to send away in my absence as I had no means of conducting the institution during that time...I have the work now of 1) gathering the others back into the institution and 2) of reducing those who stayed here into order. The European clothes of the boys have vanished and Mrs Maunsell with her women will have to work some time in repairing the loss. (Maunsell to C.M.S. April 19,1850).

This was written more than ten years after Maunsell's arrival at Maraetai and some four to five years after the establishment of his boarding school, yet he could not leave the institution in the hands of anyone strong enough to control these young men. Kukutai could have. He stopped his young men from going to fight
with the Kingitanga in the wars. He could have offered this control to the school if he had been trusted or if he had understood exactly what Maunsell was intending. That only Maunsell could run this institution is evidence of the resistance of the local community to this type of education. The limited numbers of students whose parents were willing for them to participate, was not enough to offer a pool of support that would enable the school to become a community asset. Optimists like Kukutai supported Maunsell's vision, but Maunsell would not trust any local with his mission, as did Ashwell at Taupiri, where he trained Heta Tarawhiti to replace himself. It is signal that Maunsell does not appear to have developed any novitiate or any apprentices, for he obviously understood or feared that no Maori was going to pursue the hegemonic agenda that he had in mind. This standoff was the result of the interplay of the hegemonic process that Maunsell was engaged in and the subtle counter hegemony of the locals. The process of gaining and maintaining hegemonic control was so important that it could not be risked, by leaving control to the 'Aborigines'.

Maunsell was patronising toward those native teachers whom he did foster. He saw them as having a great potential, but not really being able to conduct such a boarding institution. He considered that "a native cannot at present bear well such stimulants without injury. The missionary must keep a steady and constant eye upon the whole system" (Maunsell, 1849). This may seem strange when one considers his earlier claim of having some 30 native teachers in village schools. However when one considers that the rationale for the boarding school was to promote his evangelical mission, and to do this he essentially had to abandon the village school, Maunsell's opinion is not so strange. He could not trust a 'native' to pursue his Christian orientated curricula in the face of their other syncretic responses. Nathan (1973, p. 58) misinterprets the reason for the failure of these paternalistic schools (for by 1864 the school had all but disappeared). She says it was because Maori were not competent to take over from the forceful, dynamic teaching of Maunsell. An alternative interpretation is
that Maori were too competent and they would have subverted Maunsell's agenda with that of their own!

THE WIDER CONTEXT

Maunsell, as a leading educational practitioner of the period, was one of the major architects of the Education Ordinance proposed by Governor Grey in 1847. Upon its introduction, Maunsell said of this action;

> The Bill lately brought forward by your Excellency for the education of the aborigines, I regard as the only practical acknowledgement as yet made by the Government of the value of those influences by which it has so peaceably established itself in this island. Still, considering the opinion that is now taking hold of the native mind, that the English nation delights in usurpation and war, I cannot but hail such a measure as most beneficial. If it be effectual, it will be a boon to the country, and a boon that you, I am sure, will regard as much an offering to justice as to philanthropy. (GBPP, 1848,1002, p. 9).

The main provision of this Act was the institution of a school as a boarding establishment where there was to be industrial as well as religious training, the medium was to be the English language, and the schools were to be subject to annual inspection. In essence, in return for relief from the constant concern of his mission about funding, Maunsell had agreed to forgo some of the autonomy of his position.

Maunsell then became obsessed with the need to make this new institution self-sufficient, in order that he might limit this diminution of autonomy. He constantly wrote on this and the associated topic of financial destitution and explained his concern that his pupils not become "dependants of the government" (Nathan, 1973, p. 53). This concern was so dominant in his mind that it played a significant part in motivating the move of the mission from Maraetai upriver to Kohanga, where the land was supposedly more appropriate for agricultural self-sufficiency.

Nathan (p. 48) claims the primary objective of this ordinance was to develop industrial boarding schools "as a way of consolidating Christianity, a
means of fostering Western Standards and maintaining racial harmony, and finally as instruments of assimilation." The object was also to remove the child from the "unsatisfactory parents" who were so "because of their casual attitude."

On the surface this may have been true, however such an analysis does not allow for an understanding of the role played by the Maori people. Such an analysis does not present a holistic picture of the conflicts that were taking place. The objectives of the legislation and the institutional developments were ideologically based justifications for an intensification of the hegemonic process in response to the resistance by the Maori people.

Grey had been instructed by Lord Russell, the Colonial Secretary when he was appointed Governor, to "encourage and work through the established missions ...... and to aid, from the public revenue, the efforts of the missionaries to educate and instruct their proselytes" (Barrington and Beaglehole, 1974, P. 36), but the orientation that each wanted the products of this education to follow was to differ significantly.

Maunsell supported Grey. He reported positively on the re-appointment of Sir George Grey.

You have no doubt heard of the improvements in the state of affairs in this part of the island since the coming of Sir George Grey. He has fully sustained his character heretofore (established) as a skillful manager of aboriginal races...... I am hopeful that this will be the beginning of a new state of things and that Sir George will give what the settlers have so much sought by war, a solid peace based upon a fair participation....

(Maunsell to C.M.S., Nov. 27th, 1861).

This was consistent with his earlier opinion of Grey.

It would not however be just to conclude without acknowledging the debt which the schools in this island owe to Governor Grey..... From Governor Grey we need fear but little that will thwart our efforts or damp our spirit. (Maunsell, 1849. p. 10).

Grey on his part was careful to praise the role of the clergy when it suited him. Similarly, he was to diminish their power and influence when he considered this necessary. This latter point is well illustrated by the power
struggle against Henry William's popularity, under the disguise of the question of the land Williams had purchased "for his family" (Garrett, 1991). Walker (1990), is critical of those missionaries who did purchase land:

Only 13 (out of 35) did not indulge in land buying; some of these were Robert Maunsell, William Colenso, and Octavius Hadfield. Some of the largest estates claimed between 1814 and 1838 belonged to George Clarke (7,600 hectares), Henry Williams (8,800 hectares) and Richard Taylor (20,000 hectares). (p. 87).

He concludes that these people had become, "men of the flesh with an eye for their own terrestrial well-being." (p. 87). While this may seem to be a reasonable criticism, it does ignore the dynamic of the struggle. During this conflict Grey sought the support of Bishop Selwyn who "was not at all adverse to reducing the power of the missionaries, and through them of the C.M.S," (Garrett, 1991, p. 162). Grey's duplicity needs consideration in this context and it is necessary to consider these struggles as part of the wider series of petit hegemonic struggles taking place in the period. Grey trying to promote 'strong government', Maunsell paying 'lip service' to his concerns and both of them vigorously pursuing their own hegemonic agendas.

Maunsell's opinion of Grey stands in strong contrast to his opinion of Gore Browne, who was Governor from 1853 until recalled in 1861 as a result of his unsatisfactory handling of the 'Taranaki question'.

Though I look upon the Governor as a well-meaning man, I regard him also as a weak one. Sensitive of his dignity with but little sympathy for the aboriginal race, utterly ignorant of the character as he is of the language of the Maoris, and now become a tool in the hands of a clique for gaining a point that they have long since contemplated. (Maunsell to C.M.S., Feb 28, 1861.).

Maunsell felt that he could negotiate with Grey. Grey and he had similar attitudes to the Maori and interests in the language and legends. Maunsell must have seen Grey's duplicity in action but it would appear that he chose to work with him hoping to get advantages for his own view.
Grey and Maunsell differed as to the pace at which change should proceed, and the educational outcome for the people who were to attend the educational institutions. Consistent with the monogenesist doctrine, Maunsell was of the belief that civilisation could include the Maori but it would take much time and effort to bring them up to the level required. Grey's position was difficult to categorise accurately, for he tried to placate both this group and those who thought the Maori would never be 'civilised' and would always be subservient. Grey left ambiguous messages for both sides, but Maunsell appears to have chosen to see the better side of Grey for this side offered him hope. Gore Browne's intentions however, must have been too obvious, and he was not placatory toward the missionaries.

Maunsell's orientation was toward the 'civilisation' of the Maori communities into model Christian communities that would have maintained their separate identity. Kukutai took this so seriously that he moved most of Ngati Tipa to Kchanga to live in association with the new Mission in 1853, and again upon the cessation of hostilities in 1864, Kukutai proposed that Ngati Tipa would shift from Te Kohanga to a new model village, to be built along modern, that is, English lines. To this end Maunsell opposed further selling of land, fostered industrial training and helped establish flour mills.

Grey, in his attempts to placate the settlers insatiable demands for land and self-determination, was to see the industrial boarding school as the training ground for people who were to be assimilated into a 'new order', which was to be essentially a replica of England, with a class system organised upon a perpetual division of labour. However, the goals of the settlers differed from both those of Maunsell and Grey. Since it was the settlers who were successful eventually in these 'crucial decades', the aspirations of both the Governor (in this context) and Maunsell became irrelevant. The new 'world' which the industrial training establishments were preparing people for was never to come to fruition in New Zealand either as seen by Maunsell or by Grey. However, although Grey's view
was nearer to what actually happened than Maunsells ideals, students were nevertheless marginalised from their home communities.

This marginalisation does much to explain the diaspora of the MacKay family, that turning away from their own cultural community. They were turned away by the type of education they received at the school. This type of education prepared them for a world that never appeared. The next logical step open to them was to turn towards the European world that did appear, for the Maori world was removed from them by the abhorrence the Missionary instilled in them to this heritage, together with the internal conflict created by the Maori civil war that was par: of the War of Sovereignty of the 1860's.

Maunsell was obviously aware of Grey's need to consider the Settler's interests, and his recommendations in his letters to Grey (for example in GBPP, 1852-54, vol. 9), were often couched in terms that both attempted to counter Grey's more rapid approach to Assimilation, and to accommodate the demands being made upon Grey by the Settlers. Maunsell subtly attempted to further his own interests when he recommended that the further development of the industrial schools was essential not only as a matter of justice to the aborigines but as a source of benefit to the colonists. He suggested that if a cordon of schools, amongst the Aborigines, were to occupy the neighbourhood of the chief European settlements, this would not only have a civilising effect upon the 'wild people' but would also have the effect of "attaching by much higher connexion of the hearts of those who now only value the European for the trade that he brings." He then argued that these people will "aid the colonist in his agricultural labours," as well as providing "a shelter to him from assault by the uncivilised tribes in the distant settlements"(p.152-154).

CONFLICTS WITH THE SETTLER ASSEMBLY

Maunsell was consistent in the role he had designed for himself as a protector and steward of the Maori people, a role he had defined initially with his promotion of the Treaty signings. Maunsell was very concerned at the lack of favorable legislation pertaining to Maori during this period. It is also clear that
he saw the locals as being unable to provide their own practical solutions. Indeed, he was most concerned at the syncretic solutions that Maori people had arrived at, for he saw these as futile attempts to cope with the European contact. Therefore, although Maunsell obviously saw what was going to happen to the Maori, given the conflicting aspirations of the European groups in this period, he still chose to follow his own path, as the way to civilisation. He was not wont to compromise, even if this could have decreased the likelihood of the impending war.

Maunsell's concern over the attempts of the Settler Assembly to attain control over 'native affairs', as was proposed in the 1852 Constitution Act, prompted him to protest to Governor Grey. He commenced (somewhat sycophantically) by praising Governor Grey's wisdom in giving "representative institutions to the race that was fitted to wield them, and put the race that was not qualified for such privileges under the care of the Governor assisted by a native secretary" (GBPP, 1860, 492, p. 57).

Maunsell then repeated his desire to protect the 'natives' and he stated how this would be thwarted by the aspirations of the constant settler advocacy that all "New Zealanders should be treated alike." This latter ideology developed into the idea of egalitarianism, and has arguably perpetuated dominance and marginalisation of Maori people until the present day. (A detailed consideration of this is found in Simon 1990a, chapter 2). Maunsell was very concerned that the Settler Assembly would appoint "an officer" to administer Maori affairs. In a letter to the 'New Zealander' in May 1856, he identified the problems such actions would create emphasising that:

Such an officer, it cannot be hoped, will have any considerable knowledge of Maori sympathies, and of the best way of dealing with them. He may treat a case on principles exactly accordant with those adopted in analogous English transactions, and yet the course adopted would in the judgement of every one acquainted with Maori affairs, be absolutely mischievous. (GBPP, 1860, 492, p57).
Maunsell reiterated that the affairs of the Maori, if handed over to the Assembly, would be "managed by those who will be under a constant temptation to regulate those affairs for their own advantage" (p. 56.)

In a second letter to "The New Zealander" in May 1856, Maunsell returned to his concern regarding placing of the "management of native affairs ... under the control of the General Assembly" (GBPP, 1860, 492, p. 57). He warned of the dangers of "inequality in the political status of the two races." He then quoted the example of the treatment of the Irish by the colonial English, and in a very prophetic passage foretold what would become of the New Zealand situation given the victory of the Settler Assembly. He warned of the dangers of neglecting to provide the Maori "a voice in the representation." He maintained that the Maori attitude up to this time was that "our laws are just, that our intentions are good, and that our administration is impartial." His warning was prophetic;

"Let, however, a sense of injustice enter the mind of the native; let him imagine that the white man only legislates for himself; that he cares not for the Maori; that his desire is to shut him off from advantages that he himself possesses, and changes of the most dark and gloomy character will take place in the island. This impetuous and high spirited people will soon be ready for anything desperate;... if the feeling of wrong has taken up its abode in their minds, the first spark may produce a conflagration. (GBPP, 1860, 492, p. 58).

He was insistent that the Maori were convinced of the justice of the new order, through the ministrations of the Missionaries and the actions of Governor Grey. He also showed that he was concerned that greed and avarice by other settlers would stir into political action a group of people currently "quietly following other pursuits." Here he referred to people like John Mackay, those "of our fellow countrymen who have become united to Maori women, ...(who) will not contemplate with indifference the double wrong done to their offspring" (p. 58).

In these letters Maunsell displays his strong concern for and understanding of the people within his parish, albeit modified by his own teachings and
aspirations. This must go a long way to explain the loyalty of local Maori and Pakeha to Maunsell.

**THE SETTLER ASSEMBLY.**

Maunsell was scathing about the Settler Assembly established by the 1852 Constitution Act,

The House of Representatives, in comparison to the House of Commons is few in number, inexperienced in legislation and, like most inexperienced people that have gained a new thing, disposed inordinately to magnify their position; ruled by a constituency whose franchise is much lower than that of English electors, and whose energies seem to have been stimulated to the highest degree by their wants, their prospects, and their new circumstances. (GBPP, 1860, 2719, p. 379).

Compare this with his opinion of the Maori people among whom he lived,

If we contemplate the native population, we find them also in a state of motion rising fast in wealth and intelligence. The next twenty years we must expect will see them very different from what they now are. Towards the Queen, as distinct from the New Zealand Parliament, we find them possessed of the highest feelings of loyalty- the result of the exalted and noble principles by which the measures of Her Majesty's ministers and governors have, from the very first foundation of the Colony, been directed towards them. (p. 379).

Maunsell then almost in a cry of anguish, admonished the placing of the Maori "under the management of men whose interests will be perpetually prompting them to keep them (Maori) in a state of pupillage, and to encroach upon their rights." He was adamant that the Treaty concessions made by the Maori to Her Majesty yielded them the rights and privileges of British subjects. These rights and privileges, once understood by the Maori as and when they became further advanced in political knowledge, if violated, would be a great source of strife.

Maunsell's main concern was to save the Maori people from the control of the settlers. He wanted to save them so they could take advantage of the theocratic vision he had for them. To do this he had to promote the interests of his own institution, among the local people. He constantly bemoaned the limited
number of such institutions established, and the vast numbers of the native population yet to be;

educated and the benefits of the institutions are obvious, for where these institutions have been established, there may be seen a population superior to the rest in industry and intelligence. (p. 379).

Grey saw education as a part of a wider scheme that he had designed for the 'natives'. He was the champion of the policy of 'racial amalgamation'. The industrial boarding school was to be the pivot of Grey's "civilising Mission". Nathan (1973) concludes that;

Believing in the rapid assimilation of the Maori into the settler's society, he (Grey) enthusiastically adopted Bishop Selwyn's idea of boarding schools in which formal education should be combined with training in domestic duties, agriculture, or a useful trade. (p. 47).

It would appear that the idea of the boarding school actually came from the experiences and concerns of the practical educationalist, Maunsell, but this would not be the first time that credit for a significant idea has crept upwards in a hierarchy. Maunsell's appeal to Grey was pointed and couched in terms he knew that Grey would consider, given the right amount of flattery. Maunsell was supported from an unexpected quarter, that of the assembly member and inspector of Schools, Henry Taylor, who wrote in the tense period leading up to the wars;

In my belief, nothing would tend more to promote the peace of the country, to civilise the natives, to lead to the settlement of a large European population amongst them, and to the welfare of that European population when so located in native districts, than that the country should as rapidly as possible be filled up with European Clergymen (AJHR, 1862, E-no2, p. 19).

This was not quite what Maunsell had in mind, but it was better than nothing. However, it was too little, too late.

Grey arrived in New Zealand from a colonial outpost in Australia. He was a forthright man, 'a strong leader' and he had developed a scheme to solve the
problems of New Zealand. In fact he had in effect made 'his own' what the majority of English people considered 'common sense', that is the necessity of amalgamating the races of New Zealand, which meant assimilating the weaker race into that of the superior. Like many 'great leaders' Grey was able to enunciate what was a common thought and make it sound fresh and new. He was able to convince the populace and especially leaders of other rival groups that he was really enunciating their interests. He offered a solution to the problems brought on by the ambiguity of the Treaty of Waitangi, and it's uncomfortable meanings and implications for the settlers. Even the English language version of the Treaty meant that the Maori were to be in control of that which the settlers most desired, their land. These 'ambiguities' created conflicting attitudes toward the role Maori people could and should play in the new state. Opinions varied from the earlier policies of protection and civilising (which sat very uncomfortably with the settlers) and the policies of amalgamation championed by Grey. The lack of any real role in decision making offered to Maori by the Legislators was exacerbated by the increasing demand for the resources of Maoridom by the growing number of settlers.

Grey's solution of racial amalgamation at a rapid pace was initially favourably greeted by colonial officials, settlers, missionaries and Maori alike. However this alliance was soon set asunder by the fundamentally different interpretations put on this concept by all involved, as it reflected their different interests. The effects that these conflicting interpretations and interests were to have upon education will now be examined.

VARIATIONS IN POLICY.

Maunsell's conflict with the settlers grew through the prosperous decade of the 1850's. Reports of the Education Officials of the period reveal this conflict of interests. The Settler Assembly were primarily concerned with gaining full control over those areas of the country still under Maori control (Belich, 1987). They saw the Missionary schools as part of a system that enabled Maori to
maintain this control (Simon, 1990a). To have Maori as equals, albeit in the future, was not the Assembly's intention (Ward, 1973).

Maunsell was interested in a philanthropic assimilation with "peace based upon both Maori and European institutions" (Maunsell 1849, p. 8) whereas the inspectors' reports of the period reveal dissatisfaction with the attainment of the settlers' goals and lack of evidence of any progress that would satisfy the Assembly. It is important to understand that these inspectors were not only public servants, but that they were also politicians, in fact a number of them were also members of the Settler dominated Assembly.

Hugh Carleton, was such a person. He was an inspector and also a long serving member of the Assembly. After visiting the schools of the Auckland province, including Maunsell's at Kohanga, he used his reports to the Assembly to attack the very foundations of Maori society. The perpetuation of the foundation principles of Maoridom were frustrating the advancement of the settler's aspirations and the Mission Boarding Schools were seen in the forefront of promoting Maori aspirations. That the Settlers Assembly was actually opposed to fully assimilated Christian Maori communities illustrates their fundamental Polygenist Racist beliefs, their desire to gain political control over the Maori controlled zones of the country and their desire to wrest control of the resources of the country for their own needs. Carleton focused upon the curriculum and made suggestions that were thinly disguised attempts to use the school setting to promote attitudes and attributes in the emerging society that was to further the interests of the new migrants (AJHR, 1858, E. no. 1, p.75-77; AJHR, 1862, E. no. 4, p. 14-18).

Another report, by the first full time inspector Henry Taylor, following his visit to the schools of the Auckland province (including Kohanga), asserted that an immediate attack should be made upon the cornerstone principles of the Maori system, in the classroom, through the vehicle of the curriculum. The object of this approach was to "carry out the work of civilisation among the aboriginal Native race." He claimed that;
In carrying on the work of civilisation among the aboriginal Native race, through the medium of schools, some impediments to progress, which may be overcome by a diligent course of training in our schools deserve comment, and first and most serious of all, is that state of communism, in which all kinds of property are held amongst them. Their present social condition bears testimony to the ill-effects of such a system. Tribal rights destroy personal ownership....In the school-room by a careful and persevering system of appropriation we may gradually train them to proper perception of and regard of the meum and tuum: but the results of such training will not, I anticipate, develop themselves among the community for some generations to come, still we ought not to abandon the attempt, or give up, because success is doubtful and remote. (AJHR, 1862, E-no4, p. 35).

This attempt at promotion of the vested interests of the Settlers was really a racist attack upon their Treaty partner. The justification of promoting 'civilisation' was purely rhetoric. The rhetoric denied the reality of the impressive progress that Maori were making in agricultural and marketing progress, aided by the Missionaries, but within the communally owned land system of the Maori (Temm, 1990). This settler 'concern' for the Maori was a thinly veiled attempt to promote the interests of those migrants excluded from control of the resource base that was enabling Maori to become rich. To attain their ends, social control had to be wrested from the Maori. To do this, first control of education had to be wrested from the Missionary. Taylor continued his justification in the report;

Native habits of filth and laziness also impede the progress of civilisation....another obstacle to be combatted within the school-room is the apathy and total disregard to the value of time, so common to the race.....the work of education is considerably retarded by the want of co-operation on the part of the Natives; some stand aloof from insensitivity to its real value; others and they are at the present in the majority, form a spirit of opposition to the government. (AJHR, 1862, E-no4, p. 35).

Taylor was very critical of the schools. He suggested that external causes of failure were the Taranaki war, the King movement and 'the increasing demands for child labour' that the growing number of livestock were making upon the
time of students. As well as this he was critical of the internal machinery of the schools; insufficiency of food and clothing:

It is most impolitic to restrict a native in the matter of food, on this point he is most sensitive. It militates against his ideas of liberality and open handed profuseness. (p. 35).

Overworking of pupils, especially in schools called 'Industrial'

The fagging system adopted in such schools is most distasteful to the native, to whose natural independence the idea of labour obtained by compulsion is most revolting, besides they involve a great outlay and produce no equivalent return. (p. 35).

Excessive punishment and overstrict discipline;

...has done much to drive away many children from the schools. (p.35).

Defective teaching. An inefficient teacher;

......is very soon detected by a native......when once a teacher's inability is discovered his prestige is lost, and the school is consequently injured. (p. 35).

Lastly Taylor mentioned the discomfort of the schools.

... want of warmth, light, ventilation elbow room and sitting accommodation. (p. 35).

Kohanga school was in an appalling condition according to the inspectors report of 1855, two years after it had been moved upriver from Maraetai.

The school buildings have been roofed with Toi-toi grass (which does not keep out the rain), from the want of shingles, some of the rooms have also been partitioned with Toi-toi from the want of sawn timber, and the Boys' school room, which is detached and of the roughest kind, is so cold and comfortless as to surprise me that either teacher or pupils can be found to occupy it...there is no Boys' dormitory, they sleep in small temporary raupo houses...The same deficiency of presses and other school furniture exists that I have noticed in the other schools...The clothing was certainly not sufficiently warm for the climate;...for the younger children it was miserably insufficient, some of them wearing only a single article, such as a striped shirt, in cold tempestuous weather which obliged me to wear an overcoat. (AJHR, 1858, E. no1, p. 66).

A further report by W. Harsant (AJHR, 1862, E. no. 4) confirmed that these privations persisted through into the new decade. By this time numbers attending
the school had fallen away (See table 6.1), due to the increasing unrest in the region. The inspector was critical of the sleeping arrangements;

The girls and infants' sleeping rooms are in Archdeacon Maunsell's own house. There are three rooms, all large and lofty. In the first are four beds, in which five women and a little boy sleep, in the second eight beds, in which twelve girls and a little boy sleep; and six other girls sleep on the floor of the room. In the third are eight beds, for the woman, two girls, and twelve young boys; and there are four more children on the floor. (p. 9).

The 'blame' for the lack of progress of the educational institutions in fostering the goals of the settlers (and incidentally of the Missionaries also) was laid upon the Maori themselves. This was not the first, nor the last time this was to happen in New Zealand, for in the 1960's when the Hunn Report (1960) quantified the failure of the education system to meet the needs of Maori pupils for the first time, the educational establishment swung into action to apportion the 'blame' upon the children and their parents. This approach was supported by numerous bureaucratic and academic publications the disseminated a pathological research model known as the 'Deficit' theory. The developing resistance Taylor notes among the Maori was a counter to the denial of the rightful place of Maori as Treaty partners; the denial of Maori of a say in their own self determination. The attack by the Inspectors on Maori people themselves was an ideologically based 'smoke screen' just as was the Deficit theory of the 1960's.

Taylor was concerned that the Maori resistance was aided by Missionary control of the educational institutions. Although the Missionaries were not promoting mana Maori motuhake, (Maori self determination) they were seen to be promoting an agenda that was more supportive of the Maori people than of the Settlers. In his report of 1862, Taylor foreshadowed the need, developed finally in the 1867 Education Act, for the village day school. The key to control was clearly stated; government appointment of the teachers and setting of the curriculum. The inspectors were really expressing their dissatisfaction with the attempt made
TABLE 6.1;

Numbers of Students enrolled at Native Schools from 1858 to 1865.

This table shows the decline in numbers due to the increasing unrest and the eventual outbreak of war in the Waikato in 1863.

NATIVE SCHOOLS.

No. 7.

RETURN OF SCHOLARS EDUCATED IN NATIVE SCHOOLS FROM 1858 TO 1865.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>1858.</th>
<th>1860.</th>
<th>1861.</th>
<th>1862.</th>
<th>1863.</th>
<th>1864.</th>
<th>1865.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Stephen's, Tauranga—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohanga—(Ven. Archdeacon Mainwelle)</td>
<td>92.92</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>77.27</td>
<td>29.90</td>
<td>35.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taupiri—(Rev. B. G. Ashwell)</td>
<td>93.08</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>48.50</td>
<td>33.42</td>
<td>(b)30.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otahuhu—(Rev. J. Morgan and Mr. (Horst)</td>
<td>71.75</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>22.42</td>
<td>15.07</td>
<td>(d)12.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tauranga—(Ven. Archdeacon Brown)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maketu ...</td>
<td>10.00*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turanga—(Rev. Archdeacon Williams)</td>
<td>81.60*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taupo—(Rev. S. Grace)</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>(a)25.16</td>
<td>21.07</td>
<td>(b)7.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakatane—(Rev. R. Burrows)</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>(a)20.06</td>
<td>24.22</td>
<td>66.81</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>(d)11.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of whole Years</td>
<td>398.75</td>
<td>237.0</td>
<td>175.01</td>
<td>138.35</td>
<td>83.32</td>
<td>41.35</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken Quarters, as by notes below</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>398.75</td>
<td>237.0</td>
<td>198.51</td>
<td>138.35</td>
<td>133.80</td>
<td>41.35</td>
<td>13.44</td>
<td>1151.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Transferred to Diocese of Wainui, established 1859.
(a.) For the half-year only.
(b.) For three quarters only.
(c.) For one half-year only.
(d.) For one quarter only.

Total of Scholars educated in Native Schools from 1st July, 1858, to 30th June, 1865, one thousand one hundred and fifty-one (1151.)
Charge upon the same at ten pounds per head, as by Act of 1858 | ... | ... | £11,510 |
Total sums received from the Colonial Treasury, as by Return below | ... | ... | £11,537 |
For extra allowance to St. Stephen's School, as sanctioned by letters of Native Minister, | Return sent herewith.

Source: AJHR, 1865, E No9 p.3b
in the 1847 Ordinance and the 1858 Act to amend the agenda of the existing denominational schools to that of the needs of the government. These pieces of legislation developed and persisted with the model of children being boarded in institutions, essentially under the control of the 'managers', which created a situation where the Missionaries maintained control of the educational agenda of the country. This dissatisfaction and the conflict of agendas is clearly stated by Carleton in 1862;

The existing system of Native education falls between two stools. Aiming at a double object, the civilisation of the race and the quieting of the country, it reaches neither end effectively. (AJHR, 1862, E4, p. 17).

This, of course, was not the purpose Maunsell had for his boarding school. Maunsell had designed his institution precisely because the masses could not be reached, and an elitist enterprise was seen to be the ultimate institution to allow for the development of civilisation to spread out from 'civilised enclaves'. Carleton, however continued to disagree by complaining that "it fails to civilise the race, because it does not reach the masses." Maunsell had already tried this system of 'reaching out to the masses' and he had been thwarted by the counter hegemonic resistance and syncretisation of the Maori. Therefore, while he still had control over the institutions he was going to promote his 'enclavist' methodology. This greatly frustrated the inspectors. As to the other stated objective of the government representatives, the quieting of the country, Carleton vents the assembly's frustration with their not being able to control the educative forces to serve their purpose. He charged the educational institutions with failing to "keep down the insurrectionary feeling, for it needs something more than schoolboy lessons to reconcile men to the idea of a lost nationality"(AJHR, 1862, E-no4, p. 18). The frustration of the Settler hegemony is evident here. The notion that Maori could be duped by education to permit their nationality to disappear is fundamental to the concept of hegemony (as discussed in chapter 2). Given appropriately persuasive conditions such a total loss could have happened.
Carleton was astute enough to blame 'the system' and to remove the blame from
the managers, but the implication was that as soon as they could arrange to wrestle control of the institutions from these managers they would do so.

This conflict between the aspirations of the Settlers and the Missionaries ultimately comes down to their differing views as to whose world view the Maori were to be incorporated into. In other words, whose hegemony was to be paramount. To the Missionary, 'civilisation' meant full inclusion of Maori as a Treaty partner, albeit at a pace they would decree, to the Settlers, the inclusion of Maori was to be only partial, into that section of the emerging order that would suit them and not Maori interests. The irony was that because of this 'petit hegemonic' struggle between these two groups together plus the struggle with the Governors over whose dominance would be maintained, there was the need to turn to the coercive forces of the state to decide the issue, because of the strength of the resistance of the Maori people.

The argument over resources and who would control these assets was another aspect of this conflict. Maunsell was one of a small number of Missionaries who never purchased any land for himself, for he believed that the land should stay with the Maori. He believed Maori would need the land, in order for them to take part in the new order for which they were being educated. His attitude to is well summarised in a letter of 1847;

>The position in which the New Zealanders should be regarded was not very dissimilar from that of a ward in chancery, from the simple reason that no matter what moral advances they may have made, their character until properly disciplined will always exhibit a strange mixture of the craft and spirit of the man with the improvidence and fickleness of a child. If herefore left to themselves there is reason to fear that they would soon alienate their lands for any (cause) that might at the time excite their desire and though they got a fair equivalent in money, yet when they found hereafter that nothing now remained to them and that their properties Thus sold were increasing in value, it is more that probable that a strong feeling of discontent would arise in their minds. (Maunsell to C.M.S. 28 Sept 1847).

Waata Kukutai was also against the selling of his people's lands to the settlers, for he wanted to keep the land for his own schemes. Maunsell however
displays another motive in the letter above. At one level, he was clearly
displaying the patronising approach that would reach sympathetic ears in the
Mission society in England. This concern for the welfare of his 'wards' was
elaborated almost to the extent of trying to make the purchasers of the land feel
guilty for taking advantage of a less sophisticated people. Guilt is never a very
strong imperative for change.

However, in the letter above and many more of Maunsell's letters there is
another level at which to analyse the contents. An impression can be gained that
he is writing for a wider audience than just his superiors of the Church
Missionary Society in London to whom the letter is addressed. Indeed the close
proximity and the intertwining nature of patronage of the powerful groups in
England, would almost certainly ensure that his views would be reported to
others interested in the Colony. This technique of promoting one's own position
through 'slanted' despatches to England was a very common occurrence. In fact
this technique had helped persuade the British Government to change its stance
upon annexation for New Zealand in 1837, when the 'slanted' reports about
approaching anarchy, forwarded by Busby, were used to prompt the humanitarian
lobby into action (Owens 1981). One suspects that Maunsell may have been using
the same technique to good effect in these letters. Grey was the acknowledged
expert at writing glowing reports of his successes in New Zealand, while the
settler representatives were likewise not averse to the biased report technique.
However, what was helping to swing the balance in favour of the settlers and the
sympathetic ear away from the missionaries was the removal from power in
England of Colonial officials sympathetic to the mission cause. These officials
were being replaced by Colonial officials, led by Earl Grey, the patron of the New
Zealand Company, who was supportive of self determination for the settlers.
Maunsell's concerns increasingly were falling on deaf ears. He kept up his letters
of concern until the very end when the final irony happened. He abandoned his
'wards' and succumbed to the hegemony of the 'world view' of the settlers. He
abandoned his station and joined the opposing army.
This struggle for control between Missionary and Settler was created by the provisions of the 1852 Constitution Act. Under this act the 'control' of the 'natives' had been vested in the hands of the Governor. Funding had been allocated and had been handed over by Grey to the missions to administer. Any extra funding became very difficult to wrest from the financial controllers of the Assembly. However, that the schools could exist without the assembly, because of this dual nature of government established by the constitution, was a major point of contention. While financially the mission schools were strapped, they still maintained control over the curriculum. Hence the motivation behind the reports of the inspectors was to highlight the failures of the mission schools system, to bring the failures of the system under extreme scrutiny and hopefully to return the control of the schooling to the Settlers. This could be achieved by forcing their closure or modification.

It is interesting to consider that these were much the same criticisms that Maunsell made of his type of school in his pamphlet of 1849 on "Hints for Aboriginal Schooling." According to Maunsell, these criticisms of the schools were warranted, but he considered it was the Settler Assembly that perpetuated these problems by restricting the education vote to not much more than the 7000 pounds established in the 1852 Constitution Act. The Missionaries grimly hung on to their degree of autonomy in the face of the settler government attempts to transform the schools, and thus perpetuated the continued impoverishment of their schools.

The "often appalling conditions" the students were living in were indicative of the conflicts taking place. Firstly, there was overzealous reporting by the inspectors, in order that they may prove their point and gain control of educative facilities. Secondly, Maunsell was determined to retain autonomy of control over his curriculum, and his institution. He justified this often with the Calvinist attitude that "privations were good for the students" but more likely it was a grim hanging on in the face of much opposition. Thirdly, although Maunsell was a person of much mana within the community, he kept such a tight rein on the
control of the institution, it never developed into a form of 'community focus' as did the 'Native schools' of the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The impression one gets is of the school as an enclave within the community, ostensibly a part of the wider community but still essentially separate, and as such more a source of conflict than of resolution.

Maunsell writes in his letters of the kind generosity of the locals, but regardless of this, there is still the impression that this was Maunsell’s school, his to do with as he saw fit. Others had to fit in with his vision. Therefore the impression one gains is that Maunsell kept the community somewhat at arms length, in order to maintain his control over the school. The school was really to be an enclave that was going to produce change within the community. Like a cancer, it was going to grow and eventually take over the host. Thus Maunsell had to forego some of the resources that he could have tapped into if he had been prepared to become an integral part of the community.

THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH

The teaching of English was a signal area of conflict between the inspectors and the Missionary. To Maunsell (1849, p. 8) the teaching of English, "should be cultivated in the school, as well as an object of attraction, as of utility." However, he counselled against too much time being spent upon this pursuit, for,

very few ... will extend their knowledge to any practical reasons. They will return ... into the crowd of their countrymen and lose among them the little English they gained in school. (p. 8).

Maunsell considered that writing should be in Maori and some rudimentary pronunciation of English words was to be attempted

Here he was in conflict with Grey, whose aim it was to promote the philosophy, previously established in the 1844 Ordinance, of developing the close links between the learning of the English language and civilisation. To Grey, the educated were to take their place among the civilised society not to return as
'catalysts' for reform among their own people. Maunsell wanted these people to be 'catalysts' for changing the Maori community from within.

The Inspectors were critical of the lack of progress in the teaching of English in Maunsell's school. Compared to Ashwell's school where scripture was read aloud by the students in English, his students were making "but small progress" (Barrington and Beaglehole 1974, p. 67).

Ashwell's example was not the norm. More common in 1854 was the situation to be found at Morgan's station at Otawhao where there was "very little systematic or efficient instruction in the English language" or at Waikato Heads (sic) where the "English language had not yet found part of the general instruction" (p. 67). The inspectors were adamant that Maunsell was incorrect.

Carleton in 1858 stated that:

In regard to the teaching of the scholars, I consider that too much stress cannot be laid upon the requirement of the English language. I believe that civilisation cannot be advanced, beyond a very short stage, through means of the aboriginal tongue...the Maori tongue sufficed for the requirements of a barbarous race, but apparently will serve for little more. (AJHR, 1858, E no1, p. 77).

Again in 1862 he commented, adding a justification:

The teaching of English must be pronounced a failure almost everywhere. Few, however, of those who have not actually made the attempt, seem to be aware of the great difficulty of teaching to persons unaccustomed to mental exertion, a language wholly dissimilar in structure to their own...it cannot be too strongly insisted on, ...that civilisation cannot be attained through the medium of an uncivilised and imperfect language. (AJHR, 1862, E no4. p. 16).

Taylor in 1862 expressed the following conclusions.

The native language is also another obstacle in the way of civilisation, so long as it exists there is a barrier to the free and unrestrained intercourse which ought to exist between the two races, it shuts out the less civilised portion of the population from the benefits which intercourse with the more enlightened would confer. The school-room alone
has the power to break down this wall of partition between the two races. Too much attention cannot be devoted to this branch of Maori education. The Natives themselves are most anxious on this point. (AJHR, 1862, E-no4, p. 35).

Contrary to the opinions of the Inspectors, and of those Maori who wanted to learn the language of commerce, Maunsell felt that in the predominantly Maori area, such as Lower Waikato, the main reason to teach English was to attract pupils. Once at the school there was no real need to spend too much time at the expense of other subjects. 'English' did not equate with 'education', for Maunsell whereas the opposite conception was increasingly common among settlers and among Maori themselves.

Nathan (1973) states that some settlers accused the Missionary of keeping his flock away from what Maunsell saw as the "potential contaminating influences" of settler society that a working knowledge of English would open. As early as 1841 Maunsell had expressed his concern about the, "great influx of Europeans into the District which has lately taken place, and on the seductions to which undisciplined minds are thereby subject" (Missionary Register, 1841, p. 235). Many settlers and officials saw the need to integrate the Maori into the wider economy as laborers for settlers. Indeed the agricultural training was seen by many officials for just this purpose. Maunsell's main orientation was however to the Maori communities. He had come here to develop a Christian community, for the betterment of the people and for their salvation.

Maunsell had also been accused of limiting his pupils' potential attainment by keeping English out of the school to any meaningful extent. This, Jackson (1967, in Barrington and Beaglehole 1974, p. 29) contends is a reason for the decline and failure of the Mission School. However, Maunsell's pragmatism and missionary vision insisted his schools be relevant to the community in which the pupils were to live. Maunsell's policy of educating a Maori elite to go back to the Maori settlements, contrasted with the Government commitment to a policy of rapid assimilation for which a knowledge of English was imperative. Indeed, some settler representatives recommended that Maori villages be destroyed and
the people relocated into English style landscapes, complete with pastoral farming (Ward, 1973).

Simon (1990a) postulates that the continuation of the teaching of Maori in the face of increasing demands from settlers officials and from many Maori alike can be seen as a rearguard action. The action was carried out in the face of the dwindling effectiveness of the Missions when confronted with the encroaching numbers of settlers and their view of assimilation and in the face of the increasing demands of Maori people themselves to fully participate in the expanding secular world of commerce. The rearguard action was also encountering resistance in terms of the Maori's own syncretic responses to the new opportunities opening up to them. In this analysis the emphasis on the teaching of Maori only was a last ditch attempt to keep Maori students in line with the civilising mission of the missionaries.

Grey and the Assembly were to attempt to gain control over the curriculum of the Mission schools in 1858 with the passage of the Native Schools Act. This Act decreed that, "English should not only be taught in all Government aided schools but that, as far as possible, it should be the medium of instruction" (Nathan, 1973, p. 55). To reinforce this edict, State funding was to be withheld from those not complying. However, other political events were to outstrip the implementation of this attempt at control. The desire to learn English among the Maori pupils had never been as compelling as the desire to learn to read and write had been in the previous decades. The 1840's had seen a fall off in interest, and a "growing disillusionment among his converts and the momentum was never regained". Among possible reasons were that many had what they needed to develop their own commercial enterprises, and were obtaining this knowledge outside of the school, and also because Maori concerns were increasing about the fate of Maoridom under the new government.

Barrington and Beaglehole (1974, p. 31) overemphasise that Maori attempts to understand and master the new world were frustrated through a lack of reading materials in English. They reveal a subscription to the fundamental belief that
Maori people had to change to Pakeha ways for their own betterment. These ideas do not match reality, for in 1840 there were less than 2000 Pakeha in NZ and these lived in isolated enclaves. The rest of New Zealand was essentially Maori. The arrival of large numbers of settlers certainly increased the frequency of English spoken. Like many other historians analysing from a monocultural perspective, Barrington and Beaglehole assume there could have been only one path to the future. What is revealed in Barrington and Beaglehole's book is that non missionary English was useful, given the turn of events of the 1860's, but that bilingualism was potentially as useful. That Maori could have been a perfectly useful internal language with English as an 'auxilliary language' seems to escape them. Barrington and Beaglehole (1974, p. 32), quote Jackson's (1967) conclusion that the missions failed because of this "restrictive policy" regarding the teaching of English. To lay this demise at the feet of a policy of teaching a language reveals a lack of critical analysis and a conceptual shortcomings in the writings of Barrington and Beaglehole. They failed to critically analyse the ideological standpoint of their sources; namely, Jackson (1967), Brown (1845), Earle in McCormick (1966) and Morrell (1973). This lack of critical appraisal of assumptions upon which many of the policies, directives and decisions were made is further revealed when Barrington and Beaglehole claim "shortage of time" was the reason for the failure of "the constructive policy that the Colonial Office had intended for the civilisation of the Maori race" (p. 39). There is a complex network of reasons for the lack of implementation of such policies that is hidden by such simplistic analysis. "Shortage of time" is really a naive explanation given the tenor of the times. The use of 'civilisation' without 'quotes' reveals that either they assumed Maori people needed Pakeha 'civilisation' or that 'civilisation' was inevitable, and ignore that there was indeed many visions as to what 'civilisation' actually meant. This again is an erroneous assumption given the facts of the time, i.e. who was the most powerful group, and who had control of the resources. Gaining control remained the primary concern of the Colonial power tempered perhaps by the humanitarian and reformist
lobbyists within the British Government. In New Zealand the matrix of conflict was to make the contentions about the 'teaching of English' just another element in the struggle for political control.

THE LEAD UP TO THE WAR

As the Maori turned away from conventional Christianity toward overtly syncretic religions, many Missionaries became disillusioned. However, Maunsell was tenacious, and he remained at his station long after hostilities commenced early in 1863, even though the Lower Waikato was the centre of some of the earliest fighting. He argued the justice of the Maori cause in the Taranaki war, of 1860, initially in fairly mild terms, merely pointing out that there was more to the question than the Government would have one believe.

'The whole question rests on one point. Did the land, sold by Taylor belong to him exclusively (or was there) any right on the part of William King. This is a difficult point to decide as these two men are close relations, (in ) as such their titles to the land are in much (disagreement). (Maunsell to C.M.S. May 1860).

Again in November of the same year, he became stronger in his argument.

The main question between Government and King was whether there was any tribal right affecting the land and whether the tribe or community consented or not...I feel grief deeply that this is a most disgraceful war and do hope you will (lift) up the friends of Aboriginal races. (Maunsell to C.M.S. 19 November 1860).

By the following year Maunsell was able to offer more exact detail of the cupidity of the government claims about 'wholesale Waikato support' for the struggle in Taranaki.

Our people here in Waikato are profoundly quiet, apparently unconscious of the impending blow, building no fortification, trading as usual. As a body, both they and the King are innocent of (the aid to ) Taranaki as only 600 of them went (there) acting on their own suggestions against the wishes of the King. (Maunsell to C.M.S. 25 June 1861).

However, by 1863, Maunsell's views had undergone considerable transformation. All his previous concerns about his congregation's counter hegemonic moves
appear to have come to a head. He was becoming increasingly angry with his Waikato people;

never did a church more need a violent humbling and shaking than the Maori church. The spirit of worldly mindedness, self-will and pride for a while restrained by the spirit of the gospel seems again in too many places to be rising its head and power. Drunkenness has prevails in some places and Christianity has very extensively assumed the form of a cold formalism. (Maunsell to C.M.S. 20 May 1863).

Maunsell was returning to his familiar theme; the abhorrence he felt for the syncretic response of Maori to Christianity. He was also questioning those events that had given the Maori a "low idea of English and an exalted idea of Maori prowess." The dramatic change in his attitude was exhibited by his support for the invasion of the Waikato by the British troops. He concluded his letter with the justification that the forthcoming conflict would actually be good for the Maori for it would bring them to their senses. He hoped that the Lord would be "pleased to chasten and humble, not to destroy them in the forthcoming conflict."

Here we see a converging of Pakeha opinion in times of crisis. The idea that European hegemony could be rejected totally was so abhorrent that the warring factions 'agreed' to coalesce their efforts. There were various rationalisations put forward. Governor Grey, for example, pursued the war in the name of peace for all, but in reality he wanted to humble the Maori in order to reestablish his authority, and he justified this by claiming that it would be in the best interests of all concerned that he do so. The Settler Assembly representatives were also to claim that the war was necessary to bring 'rebellious factions' into order, and Fox, (premier of N.Z.) in 1864, said the war and the subsequent confiscations, would help the Maori by ridding them of the 'pernicious' system of communal land ownership! (AJHR 1864, E No.2 p. 8).

The final victory for the forces of oppression must have been the removal of that steady opposition to the motives and actions of the Settler representatives by the Missionaries that had been a feature of the previous decades. Maunsell's change of attitude must have come at a very crucial time. Belich records that
members of the C.M.S. even went to the extent of giving support, if only in principle, for the confiscations of land, (Burrows. R. to C.M.S. 30 June 1864 CN/O 8c in Belich 1987). European superiority was being challenged, especially by a movement (Kingitanga) that asserted Maori could actually run things themselves without the necessity of European overlords. This engendered a coalescing reaction that was to ensure that white supremacy was dominant. The petty hegemonic struggles between the Pakeha groups was put into abeyance, for a short period at least, in order that the gross hegemonic domination would succeed. Needless to say the petty hegemonic struggles reemerged almost as soon as the war commenced. The struggles between the Governor and the Assembly continued strongly throughout the war years, and the subsequent period until the final victory of settler self determination. One final victory for the Assembly was cemented after the war when the Church Missionary Society withdrew from the Mission field in New Zealand.

Maunsell joined the army and became an Army Chaplain. His reports of the time he spent as an army chaplain are full of the same enthusiasm he had displayed two decades before upon his arrival at Maraetai. The 'Christian Civilising Mission' had given way to his enthusiasm to control the Maori people. Concern that a 'sharp lesson' was needed permeates his and the reports of other Missionaries report of this period, (G.A.Selwyn to Will Selwyn 31 Aug.1863; William Williams to C.M.S. 14 Aug. 1863; CN/O 969c ; Ashwell to C.M.S., (37) Sept.1863, 26 Nov 1863; Burrows to C.M.S. 30 June 1864 CN/O. 8 (c) quoted in Belich, 1987).

Maunsell became adamant in his support for the war because he saw his earlier efforts at civilising being thwarted 'temporarily' by Maori resistance. He had supported aspects of the resistance against the demand for wholesale land sales, for he too was opposed to land sales by the Maori, but his deeper fears outweighed his concern for the Maori. His support of the war effort appears to have been for a temporary admonishment that would get his people 'back onto the track'. However in this he misinterpreted the savagery with which the
Governor and the Settler's representatives were to pursue the annihilation of the Maori people. Maunsell also made another serious miscalculation about the Maori people when he considered they would return to the 'correct path' after the war. He returned to Kohanga as soon as the fighting moved away from the northern Waikato. Here he planned to recommence his school. However, he appears to have underestimated the Maori resistance, and the problems that 'loyalist' Maori would face after a civil war. He was not the only one to underestimate this phenomenon. Kukutai was to find himself very unpopular with his Kingite cousins when the war finally ceased. It would also appear that both of these men had severely underestimated the lengths that the settler Government would go to to extend their control. Thus, when a difference of motivations finally emerged, Maunsell left the Mission station and Kukutati became extremely disillusioned. Maunsell was motivated by a desire to admonish and return 'his natives' to the right track to full assimilation. The settlers were motivated by a desire to remove the Maori from the choicest areas of land, to remove them from the sphere of economic competition as they had been before the war, and to exert unquestioned control over the destiny of the people and places of New Zealand, including Maori. The settler insistence on one rule for all, meant just that, their rule!

Beneath this conflict lay the fundamentally different ideologies of race that these two 'representatives' applied to the Maori. Maunsell exhibited a Monogenesist belief in that his faith that Maori could be civilised never faltered. Those outside influences that limited the adherence of the Maori to his 'civilising influence'; the secular Europeans, the enticements of trade, were 'temptations' to be resisted, and if resisted then the Maori could be the equal of all other men. Likewise Maori resistance could be overcome by 'subtle' persuasion or in the last resort, coercion. They were simply 'misguided' if they did not accept his way to the future. His belief was that there was nothing inherently inferior about the Maori and that they were eminently capable of civilising. This stands in contrast to the Settlers representatives who from the earliest days exhibited the
Polygenesist belief that Maori were inferior, that Maori were not only incapable of being civilised but in futilely attempting to do so, the just rewards due to the settlers would be squandered upon the Maori. Maunsell underestimated the strength of the convictions of the Settlers, he was effectively sidelined by their racism and his naivety in returning to Kohanga so soon after cessation of hostilities only confirms his underestimation.

THE CHILDREN

John and Irihapeti MacKay sent their children to these schools of Maunsell's, the older children initially to the village day schools and then all of the children to the boarding school. They had been persuaded that a Christian education was essential for their children. Maunsell recorded in his report about his boarding school of the years 1847 to 1849:

Among the girls are included two half-caste children, who are brought up in the missionary's family strictly as European children, and a third, who at present comes as a day scholar. (Maunsell, 1849, p. 31)

These could have been Marion, Annie and Catherine MacKay for in 1847 they would have been 9, 7 and 5 years of age respectively.

Maunsell was concerned these half caste children should be educated "strictly as European children." He obviously persuaded their parents that in this he was correct.

Morgan, another of the Church Missionary Society missionaries and a virulent anti Kingite, (Howe, 1970) at Otawhao, initially concerned himself with educating half-caste children. He thought they should be gathered into boarding schools and rescued from "poverty, ignorance, and vice, and from the degradation of being brought up as Maoris " (Barrington and Beaglehole, 1974, p. 51). To Morgan, these children were to help educate others to raise them up "the scale of civilisation." Howe points to the failure of Morgan's plan at Otawhao for within a few years,
the school had a mixture of Maoris and halfcastes (sic) who were indistinguishable both socially and intellectually. (Howe in Barrington and Beaglehole, 1974, p. 51).

However, this implied criticism by Howe misses an essential point. While the initial idea was to separate the 'half-caste' children from the others in order to develop them as an elite, (presumably because their 'half-European' blood would enable them to be educated faster and more effectively), the resultant control over the curriculum and the pedagogy remained with Morgan, (and similarly with Maunsell). They designed and controlled the curriculum, and the whole mode of learning toward the goals they had set, not withstanding the racial classifications. Here Howe's criticism is irrelevant because the whole institution was geared to the type of education the half-caste children would have got anyway. Howe would tend to indicate that an analysis of the students was indicative. What would possibly be more revealing is an analysis of the control the missionaries maintained.

No matter who attended his school, Maunsell's standards were very clear as is indicated by his concern that "European children" be brought up to avoid contact with the habits of the locals as much as possible. He expressed some of his concerns for children of missionaries.

Mixing as they must unavoidably more or less with the aborigines, a people so slovenly, lazy, lounging, and gossiping in their habits, it would be almost a miracle if their own character was not very considerably affected by such examples....Let him insist upon his learning his lessons, and learning them well, and with a view to forming habits of action and business. (Maunsell, 1849, p. 13).

Maunsell wanted to create an elite who would work with their own people as catalysts for change toward a predetermined goal. In this way he was very successful. The oral recollections of my relatives often pointed to those characteristics that Maunsell instilled in his scholars being the guiding principles of the lives of many of the MacKay children. However these children were marginalised from their own people, because Maori in Lower Waikato were forced into development beyond that had been worked out between Maunsell and
Kukutai. Maori who remained were forced to become as one with Kingitanga, and to accept the lifestyle and limited life chances forced upon Maori by the majority culture. Nowadays Ngati Tipa are one of the tribes on the river who host poukai for the Kingitanga, whereas the children of the mission school made the cultural choice to join the European world, just as Grey had designed it. Those who remained as Maori were marginalised and impoverished (despite the fact that they had remained loyalists) just as the settler assembly had planned it.

There was a range of responses to the European presence in the period 1840 to 1865 that allowed Maori people a range of alternatives. This range was drastically curtailed by the War of 1863 to 1865. Because of their upbringing, their education, and the political forces bearing upon them my family had no alternative but to join the Pakeha world. The alternative option for which they had been heading, that is towards, a Christianised Maori community, was eliminated.

Analysis of the outcomes of this period is often fraught with difficulties brought about by the level of generality at which one works. Simon (1990a, p. 6) supports Nathan's contention that the industrial training of the schools may have suited the settler government's agenda of breaking in the land, and of providing a labouring class for the settlers to use. (see Grey's oft quoted remark about our having a nation to build). Barrington and Beaglehole (1974) also assert that the need for industrial training arose from the undeveloped state of the colony. But an alternative view may be that the schooling and the conflicts it engendered were part of a larger more complex scene. The causes of Europeanisation of my family needs to be seen within this complex matrix of conflict. This should caution us about ascribing simplistic motivations to a situation where a multiplicity is the reality.
A number of conclusions may be drawn from this thesis, many having implications reaching beyond the family members. Specifically, these conclusions have implications for New Zealand educational institutions and educators today.

In this thesis, I have detailed a theory and a methodology it is suggested will enable my family to consider the reasons for the 'life choices' made by our ancestors, those cultural determinations that created a cultural and a locational diaspora of the family. The reconstructed lives of most of the children of Irihapeti Hahau and her two husbands have been outlined and then the thesis went on to examine one strong causal factor in the determination of their life choices. It needs to be emphasised that in no way is this the only factor that needs consideration, but time and space preclude examination of other factors in this study. The factor examined in this thesis was the resolute determination of the Reverend Robert Maunsell to pursue his Christianising mission and the special targeting of my Grandfather and his siblings for incorporation into this new world.

Schools were opened in conjunction with the mission stations in order to educate local people to an understanding of the new theocratic world view the missionary, Robert Maunsell had planned for them. These schools were initially successful in attracting local people, but they quickly began to meet with resistance. The Missionary then designed a new institution, the boarding school, to counter this resistance. Those who attended the new school were destined by Maunsell to become catalysts for change in the Maori communities from where they came. These 'catalysts' would then aid the Maori communities to develop into replicas of English civilisation.

Instead of this happening, the increasing dominance of the Settler Assembly in this period, meant the destruction of the advances Maori had made in agriculture, commerce, trading, literacy and political initiatives.
'Loyalist' Maori in the Waikato were treated as harshly as 'rebels'. The destruction of the economic, social and political base of Maoridom made the vision of the Missionary irrelevant, as were the students he was preparing as catalysts for change.

It is important to consider the struggle for supremacy between the various Pakeha interest groups, culminating in the victory of the Settler Assembly over that of the Missions and the Governors. This victory was to remove from Maori people the spectrum of opportunities that had existed before the wars of Sovereignty in the 1860's. The victory of the group who believed that Maori were inherently inferior to the white people, and were destined to die out in the face of a superior race, was to remove from Maori people any opportunity to take part as equal partners in the development of the new nation.

Therefore it is not sufficient to say the lifestyles of the family members of the first generation were as designed by Maunsell, rather it would be more correct to say that the lifestyles that they eventually led were those designed for them by the Settler Assembly and their adherents. There was an overall process of Europeanisation that all Pakeha groups subscribed to, but the lifestyle that was foreseen by Maunsell, in pursuit of this end, differed markedly from that planned by the other Pakeha interest groups. Maunsell was outmaneuvered. Maori initiatives were destroyed and the choices open to the students of his school were limited to those decreed by the settlers and their representatives.

Whether the lifestyle designed by Maunsell for his pupils was ever very realistic is debatable, but at least it offered a possibility of maintaining contact with the dual heritage of the family, and thereby allowing resistance to the overwhelming dominance of Europeanisation. In contrast the lifestyle forced on the family by the Settler Government demanded unquestioning adherence. The diminution of choices available to bicultural and Maori people in the 1860's has been perpetuated into present times by the political
and education systems of New Zealand (Walker, 1990). This diminution of choices is the very problem that Maori educational initiatives are addressing today.

That these issues have not yet been addressed by the educational establishment of New Zealand has created a number of crises in New Zealand education. Maori people face the imminent loss of the language which would mean the loss of the key to their own culture. Also of crisis proportions is the failure of educational institutions to prepare Maori pupils for their fair share of the life chances that should be available to them. Maori people have had to continue their long standing resistance to total domination by European Governments by taking the radical and expensive step of withdrawing from the mainstream and establishing educational institutions based on Kaupapa Maori principles and practices. They have taken these radical steps in order to address the educational crises; to open up more educational and life chances options to their young people.

This in many ways is similar to the response of the Waikato people in the 1860's when years of 'being sidelined' and ignored led to the establishment of the Kingitanga. For years moderate leaders like Wiremu Tamehana had tried to get the political machinery to recognise the rightful place of Maori people in the decision making process of New Zealand. They were constantly thwarted and eventually resorted to replicating European institutional forms to establish their own mana. They were then attacked for being separatist! The clear message for the New Zealand educational establishment is that history is repeating itself. Since World War Two Maori leaders have tried to awaken the educational establishment to the need to address Maori issues on Maori terms, but to little avail, (Walker, 1990; Smith, 1990). That Maori people have had to go to these extremes of establishing their own educational institutions in order to highlight the crises facing them and New Zealand in general, attests to the successfulness of the domination of New Zealand by ideologies based upon the fundamentals of polygenetic
racism, a hegemony that promotes monoculturalism and marginalisation. That Māori have had to go to these extents over a century after the establishment of the Kingitanga indicates that mainstream New Zealand has still not relinquished its orientation of hegemonic assimilation to the European world view. It also indicates that mainstream schooling is still extremely slow to respond to educational implications of a bi-cultural Aotearoa.

Gramsci's notion of hegemony is used in this thesis to highlight the centrality of the notion of persuasiveness of ideas as an analytical tool. This concept was useful in enabling an understanding of the interactions between the context and the individuals located in Lower Waikato in the crucial decades of the middle nineteenth century. Gramsci's notion of hegemony is also potentially emancipatory because it subsumes and incorporates the dynamic concept of resistance. It was suggested that just as the Māori people were able to create an institutional transformation because of their resistance in the 1840's, the family is also able to bring about reform within contemporary institutions by informed resistance to the progression of monoculturalism in the institutions of our contemporary society. It is suggested that understanding how a powerful group is able to convince others that their world view is the best option, through the persuasiveness of individuals, can empower a family to seek to understand how their lives have been channelled by the hegemony of the ideas of others.

However, it is crucial to consider the warning of Bates (1975), when he offers that an old order cannot be made to vanish "simply by pointing out its evils, any more than can a new order be brought into existence by pointing out its virtues" (p. 365). It is not sufficient to hold that the system of oppression that created this family's diaspora was hegemonic and inappropriate to the needs of a bicultural family. Nor is it sufficient to replace this view with an ideology that emphasises the virtues of diversity of world views. It is necessary that those of us in the family who are concerned about
the implications of this story, work positively against the inexorable tide of Europeanisation. Among the imperatives is the need to recognise the bicultural heritage of the family and by implication there is a need to become bi-culturally competent in order to participate in this heritage. This is necessary so that not only can we pick up what was lost in the past but that we can improve the life-styles and life chances of the future for the family members. The implication of this recognition in the wider context of New Zealand is that many more people will be able to be identified ethnically as Maori, they will be able to become part of the revitalisation of Maoridom and positively work toward a bicultural reality.

Therefore, the importance of the concept of hegemony is not only its explanatory function, but also its emancipatory function. It essentially points to the need for the 'oppressed', (those groups denied the full range of 'life styles' and 'life chances' options), to develop political strategies which recognise the methods of persuasiveness and undermine the consent of the present ruling group. The central foundation of such a strategy is to attempt to build an alternative bi-cultural hegemony within those elements of the civil society; the schools, churches, etc, upon which a new society can be founded.

One such hegemony to be confronted within this family, is that the removal of Maori language and culture from the family's heritage was not a loss. The suppression of the full heritage of this family removes from family members the opportunities and understandings of the world that an alternative culture has to offer. A further consideration is that culturally encapsulated individuals are unable to appreciate their own cultural motivations because of cultural blinkers, while at another level cultural encapsulation perpetuates the denial that Maori is a fully functioning culture in New Zealand today. The denial of the richness of music, literature, values, life styles and spiritual perspectives of a Maori world view to many of the descendents of the family was often expressed as a concern. This concern also
extended to the denial by the monocultural majority of the intrinsic worth of the culture and therefore its participants. This state of affairs is reflected strongly in societal institutions, such as schools. This denial affects the very being of the individual and continues to perpetuate the denial of our bicultural heritage.

The culpability of the education system in perpetuating the view that Maori is a subset of Pakeha demands careful examination. The full implications of the fact that Maori and Pakeha cultures have demonstrably different underlying structural formative principles need to be addressed by our education system. One inevitable outcome of this examination for educators will need to be an assessment of the portrayal of Maori people to Maori and non Maori alike. These issues include the portrayal of Maori peoples' ability to cope with 'life's problems', attitudes to Maori preferred means of information transmission, the means of doing research affecting Maori people, the models used for this research and indeed an analysis of the underlying assumptions of the reform models proposed.

One major theme that emerges from the thesis is the inexorable progression of Europeanisation in Aotearoa/New Zealand. It was contended that through the hegemonic institutions of the 'civil society', the missions and schooling, through legislation, plus the coercive function of the 'state', there has been created a distorted monocultural view of the world. This 'new' cosmology was based upon what the dominant group required to become common currency, to justify the breaking of the promises of the Treaty of Waitangi, and the subjugation of Maori people.

In New Zealand today Maori and Pakeha people have access to widely unequal opportunities to share fully in the reward systems of the society. The basis for this present unequal distribution of rewards is determined by the elitist groups on whom power is centered. Myths of equality and egalitarianism were created to justify and rationalise the obvious discrepancies in participation in the reward system. History has been made
opaque in order to perpetuate and to obscure the origins of these inequalities. History teaching and the education system in general has been part of this process of "making reality opaque" (Freire 1987, p 36), and as such need rigorous scrutiny.

In various times in history powerful groups have used various criteria to include or exclude individuals. Inclusion among the powerful groups is determined by the closeness with which an individual can emulate the desired traits and characteristics of the powerful group. There were, however, reminders for those who attempted to become assimilated, for example Catherine Patterson could never escape the appellation of 'half-caste' (MacIntosh 1975, p. 178). In our society the powerful groups decide what traits are necessary for full participation in the wider society. In the nineteenth century my Grandfather and his siblings had to emulate the desired characteristics and traits of 'colonial settler society' in order to participate in that society. Their other characteristics had to be suppressed; their first language, their knowledge of Maori tikanga, their family relationships, and their knowledge of their whanau, hapu and iwi rights and obligations.

Gramsci's concept of hegemony enables us to understand how these people were persuaded to take on those traits and characteristics of the dominant society in order to participate within that society. The dominant society demanded that they relinquish those other characteristics of their heritage and eventually to suppress the knowledge from perpetuation. However, it was not totally successful, for Granddad left behind the names, that were like a trail to be picked up in the future.

In nineteen century New Zealand, as a result of the struggles for power during the 'crucial decades' following the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, White English Male Protestants with property, controlled most social, economic, political and military institutions. This was a familiar pattern found in those countries or areas colonised by the English, such as Australia, (Pilger, 1990) United States of America, (Banks, 1988, p. 181) and South Africa,
(Michener, 1978). In New Zealand this powerful group gained the upperhand, then almost totally excluded Maori groups from decision making and invented and disseminated myths and stereotypes about the unsuitability of Maori people for inclusion into the institutions of the new order (Ward, 1973; Belich, 1987; Simon 1990a).

The hegemony of the earliest Europeans, the missionaries, was initially successful in extending the world view of their Christianising mission, especially when aided by the support of the local chiefs, such as Waata Kukutai. However, the resistance by the Maori people to full assimilation into the world depicted by missionaries such as Maunsell was to create a counter resistance in the form of new institutional developments by Maunsell. This struggle was but part of the complex matrix of struggles that was to typify this period. Maunsell's struggles with the Settler Assembly's hegemony was to take much of his time and energy also, which in turn had a serious debilitating impact upon his new school.

Fundamental to Maunsell's drive to create a new society where Maori were assimilated into every strata of English civilisation was his monogenesist belief that Maori were capable of being 'civilised'. The Settler Assembly and the Governor were less successful in extending their hegemony over the Maori people because of their fundamentally exclusive racist, polygenesist belief in the inherent inferiority of the Maori. This ideology was so obvious that attempts to extend hegemony on this basis were continually rejected by Maori people and this created the need to fall back upon the State's coercive apparatus to discipline the 'miscreants'.

The methodology of 'Reconstructing Life Histories' was chosen in this study in order to bring the family members 'to life', to imagine how they would have explained the 'life choices' they had made. The aim of 'contextualising' the stories is to empower present family members to discover the likely options that were open to their tupuna. In this context it has become clear that those options were inexorably leading to certain
restricted 'life choices'. This question was uppermost in the minds of many of the family informant group, for ignorance is not bliss. Ignorance is the silent partner of hegemonic domination. Knowledge is bliss. Knowledge is potentially conscientising. This 'conscientising' is empowering to the family, in that it can lead to an understanding of the reasons for the actions of family members. Such knowledge is tapu, for it has the potential to resist the process of colonisation that is still active within society.

The form that colonisation takes in our society now includes the perpetuation of the myth of white supremacy. This racist stance was fundamental to the various hegemonies that struggled for supremacy in New Zealand during the 'crucial decades'. This myth of the supremacy of one branch of their heritage was instilled into my family by the mission education, was perpetuated through the subsequent decades and resulted in the suppression of the family's heritage. This suppression, assisted by the social pressures of the period from the Wars of the 1860's until only very recently, was based on the idea that the heritage from one side of the family would enable them to cope with the demands of the modern world far better than that heritage from the other side of the family. These attitudes of suppression are still residual in the family, but are fast disappearing under the onslaught of information from the others in the 'third generation genealogist' group who have helped me so much with this research project. The resistance of our family group, working until now in ignorance of one another, often for decades, has finally begun to coalesce. This thesis is but one example of the cooperative strength of this group. As the family ties are rediscovered, more and more interested individuals are being found. The common cry is "Why do we not know about both sides of our heritage?" The answer necessarily involves a critical appraisal of why some of our ancestors suppressed the knowledge. One answer suggested in this thesis is that this suppression was a necessary part of a limited 'life choice' for these ancestors of ours. The focus of the thesis is not to apportion blame to our tupuna, nor is
it to apportion blame to those people by whom they were influenced, but rather to understand that complex matrix of interactions that inexorably influenced the choices open to and made by our ancestors.

There are also implications for educators of the new historiography that is emerging about the period of the 'crucial decades'. Among these implications are that;

a) Maori were in control of most of New Zealand until 1863 and they exhibited a diverse range of life styles, life chances and responses to Europeans. That alternative paths to the future could have occurred based upon Maori structures and controls is examined by Owens (1981);

In the absence of annexation and massive European immigration, this synthesis of a 'new people' would have been much more Polynesian than European. Tribal decisions would have continued to be important with emphasis on the small scale community and the pressures of unwritten custom rather than the controls and legislation of central government. Divisions, based in the European manner of class, race and sect would have had little meaning. (P 53).

b) Europeans in New Zealand until 1863 were located in enclaves, initially relevant to Maori because of the usefulness of their new ideas, the access they offered to markets and new technologies but then they became increasingly irrelevant as Maori adapted to the new order in New Zealand.

c) The Waikato wars were the turning point in shifting the balance from the dominance of the Maori to that of the European, and these wars were justified by Europeans as necessary because attempts at persuasive hegemony failed.

d) Maori were able to cope with change. The implications for the stereotyping inherent in such racist ideologies as the cultural deficit theory needs to be questioned in comparison with Maori high levels of literacy and command of commercial enterprises in the 1850's.

e) Maori were wealthy and were able to produce wealth. New Zealand in the 1850s was one of the wealthiest countries in the world, the Waikato area
being one of the major areas producing this wealth. This wealth was produced by Maori people, living as Maori, subject to Maori controls. Therefore it is suggested this is evidence that Maori society was flexible enough to adapt to the opportunities offered by the new order to the extent that they were among the wealthiest people in the world in the 1850s.  
f) Maori did want to take part in the new order that was developing in the 1840's and 1850's (Ward, 1973). One of the significant findings of the Waitangi Tribunal's hearing of the Ngai Tahu Claim was that the Crown had had the opportunity to give the Ngai Tahu a chance to take an active part in the community after the purchase of the Otago land block. The crown failed to allow Ngai Tahu their 'Treaty based' place, therefore the Ngai Tahu were "deprived of establishing their rightful place in a developing nation." (Langsbury, 1990).  

Also in need of challenging is the myth in New Zealand that Maori have always been separatists, and this fueled by the polygenesist racism endemic in the minds of many of our community, latches onto the 'radical' movement exemplified by Awatere (1984) and claims that Maori have always secretly wanted Pakeha out of New Zealand. This myth is a direct descendent of that which justified the wars of the 1860's as being provoked by the Maori to "drive the Pakeha into the sea."

It would appear from the evidence presented in chapter six that the concept of hegemony as presented in chapter two needs refinement when used in the circumstance of colonialisation. There was not a single 'ruling group' as such, but more a complex interacting series of conflicts between groups attempting to attain or maintain their dominance. There was a series of competing 'world views' within the overriding ideology of cultural superiority that was indicative of the context, 1840-1865. The impact on the people and the situation can better be seen as a result of a matrix of petit hegemonic struggles; conflicts between intellectuals for the particular world view of their group, within an overriding hegemonic struggle for supremacy.
It is also notable that when the overriding process of gross hegemony is threatened by syncretic institutionalisation, then the petty hegemonic struggles weaken temporarily, and the 'state's coercive apparatus' is brought into play, i.e. petit hegemonies coalesce to counter the resistance of the alternative struggles.

This thesis indicates how the three 'intellectual representatives' of differing Europeanising world views were engaged in petit hegemonic struggles throughout the decades following the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi. Toward the end of these decades they cooperated, to the extraordinary degree of Maunsell virtually destroying his life's work and participating in the subjugation and domination of the 'King Movement' by the State apparatus. The King movement, while a political threat to the Settler Assembly was anathema to Maunsell for it was based upon the syncretic religion, Pai Marire.

Each petit hegemonic group had its own view of the future. Maunsell until 1862 was still supporting the Taranaki Maori cause and excusing the King Movement of culpability. Grey on his return to New Zealand in 1861, attempted to pull New Zealand back from the precipice, by reintroducing the long neglected institutions of law and order to allow Maori to participate in law enforcement and decision making. He spent long hours debating the efficacy of the King Movement, for he wanted his control to be paramount. Even many settlers were accepting of a place for Maori in the emerging order, but it was the Settler Assembly's 'intellectuals', those members of the 'historically progressive group', who exercised such a power of attraction that they subordinated the intellectuals of the other Pakeha groups. To Gramsci this was the production of a solidarity among intellectuals. The Governor and the Missionary sided with the Settler Assembly members to go to war to strike down the threat to the overall progress of Europeanisation. It was to be the victory of the Settler Assembly's world view for it was their particular method that gained ascendancy in this overall struggle for domination.
Even during the war the missionaries were made irrelevant to the Maori people, and soon after the war the Governor was also 'sidelined'. The designs of the Assembly toward the Maori were then pursued, through the Land Courts (Ward 1973), legislation (Project Waitangi, 1988) and the education system (Simon 1990a). These features were created by the need of the Settler Assembly to 'dominate' the development of New Zealand's ideascape.

One useful finding of this thesis is an examination of what biculturalism means? Was Maunsell bi-cultural? He spoke fluent Maori, He understood the cosmology of the Maori, and he understood their legends and their myths. Yet it is doubtful if Maunsell was truly bi-cultural. Therefore bi-culturalism must be something beyond the level of acquired knowledge of languages and the esoteric elements of two cultures. The key would appear to lie in the attitude to the two cultures. Did Maunsell value the two cultures equally? What were Maunsells' reasons for learning about the Maori language and culture? That he loved his translation work is attested to by his great-granddaughter, Helen Garrett (1991). That he respected the Maori people is also evident from her book. However he still considered their level of civilisation to be inferior to that to that of his first culture. Therefore a definition of bi-culturalism should include the attitude of the individual towards the two cultures. Are the two cultures valued equally or is one judged as inferior to the other?

The notion of tapu versus tapu has much to offer, for if the object is for one tapu to dominate the other, then that cannot be biculturalism. It is to the ritual of encounter, (powhiri) that precedes the meeting of two groups that we can turn for a model to explain how two tapu can meet without domination being the result. The whole purpose of a powhiri is to handle in a safe way the two tapu that are meeting. Each stage in the powhiri is essential, irrespective of the gender of the participants, each stage bringing the two parties, the two tapu closer together, until finally both sides judge that it is
safe to make contact. There are attempts made to outdo each other, there are
times when things go horribly wrong, but essentially the ritual encapsulates a
safe process whereby a non-dominatory relationship can be established. If this
were taken as a model for interaction between the two cultures in the wider
New Zealand context, then it offers the possibility of a new form of
encounter. If the rituals of encounter are carefully agreed to before and
domination is not the agenda then biculturalism has a future. This concept
of beginning a new relationship between two peoples based on mutual respect
and understanding needs to be applied with urgency to the context of
education within Aotearoa.
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