

---

**“Co-operation & Conflict:  
Pakeha & Maori in  
Historical Perspective”**

**By Elsie Locke**

Annual Peace Lecture 1988

---



The New Zealand  
Foundation for Peace Studies

## Annual Peace Lecture 1988

Copyright ©

Published 1988 by The New Zealand Foundation for Peace Studies Incorporated,  
29 Princes Street, Auckland 1, New Zealand

ISSN 0112-5192

27th July 1988

13th Annual Peace Lecture — 1988

## “CO-OPERATION & CONFLICT: PAKEHA & MAORI IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE”

by

ELSIE LOCKE

As we all know, the year after next will mark a century and a half since Captain Hobson shook the hands of the rangatira of Te Tai Tokerau and said, "he iwi tahi tatou" -- "now we are one people". Those famous words weren't really true, and we are reminded daily that they aren't true now. How are we going to mark this sesquicentenary? Shall we commemorate, shall we decry, shall we attempt some objective stocktaking? Fifty years ago, in 1940, that question hardly arose, although the iwi of Waikato and a few others said they had nothing to celebrate.

One thing we won't be able to do is ignore this landmark date. For all of us it should be a time of assessment, and we'll gain most from it if we take an honest look at our past and how it influences the present.

History is about events and trends and developments that have happened. We cannot unstitch them and sew them up again. It's a pointless exercise to lament or to feel guilty about any actions of our forefathers, Pakeha or Maori, which have had unhappy consequences. They were the products of their age, just as we are.

In every generation people choose their course of action according to what seems best from where they stand at that time, and this applies both to individuals and to groups linked by a common bond, be it religion or class or race or tribe or nation. Their knowledge and their vision are always limited, and those rare persons who can step outside the frame and be truly ahead of their time are liable to be isolated with no significant followers at all.

Columbus sailed to North America in 1492. If we take that as a beginning date for European expansion over the entire globe, and

the breaking up of the European Empires after the second World War as the closing of the colonial era, we have less than five centuries during which the pale-skinned races deemed it right and proper to dominate those whom Kipling called "the lesser breeds without the law". This is a relatively short interlude in human history. In retrospect the assumptions of Europeans 150 years ago look like amazing arrogance. They were confident that their way of life was superior to all others and their religion incontestably true. Certainly their technology and their methods of production were more advanced, driven by the profit motive and the conviction of the capitalist class that it was not only their right but their duty to exploit any source of wealth that came to hand. The industrial revolution was well under way when James Cook spread the news about Aotearoa. By the nineteenth century competition within Europe for colonial territories had become fierce, and by the end of that century almost the whole world had been carved up. Behind the actions of governments and armies was the pressing need of the capitalist classes to keep on expanding their enterprises, to seize on every possible means of profit and to keep out their rivals.

So let's look at the Pacific, at the time when Aotearoa was annexed to the British Empire. Capitalist exploitation was well established and virtually uncontrolled over all of Polynesia. We are familiar with the record of ruthless destruction of our own kauri forests, the seals and the whales. It was no different in Hawaii. They had their equivalent of kauri in sandalwood, and Honolulu had been a major base for whaling vessels for a full twenty years. In 1840 it had 600 foreign inhabitants and an English language newspaper, The Polynesian. The Hawaiian monarchy was nominally accepted as independent but repeatedly forced into humiliating concessions and limitations of sovereignty by three different interlopers; France, Britain and America, all of which had consuls who were also involved in business ventures with great scope for making trouble. To complicate matters there were bitter rivalries between the Protestant missionaries, who got there first, and the French Catholics.

When two French priests had been deported and sought to return, Captain Laplace arrived on the warship Artemise to demand freedom for Catholics, land for a church and \$20,000 in cash as a guarantee - otherwise it was war. The money had to be borrowed from Honolulu merchants. That was three years before our nodal date, 1840. Three years afterwards (in 1843) the British naval captain Lord George Paulet, in his turn, imposed six conditions and \$100,000 reparations

for alleged discrimination; he even raised the Union Jack, but this impertinent attempt at annexation was repudiated by the British authorities. Hawaii endured 28 years of sectarian incidents and commercial bullying before accepting a defence alliance with America in 1854, the first step towards becoming American territory. (1)

There are distressing parallels in the story of Tahiti. Here too the people were unified under a dynasty, and here too the Protestant missionaries were first in the field, with the influential George Pritchard soon doubling as British Consul. After French Catholic priests had been expelled as in Hawaii, Admiral Dupetit-Thouars arrived in the warship Venus to demand reparations for the "insult". Under threat of armed attack, Queen Pomare was forced to make abject apology, to salute the French flag, to consent to a most-favoured-nation agreement, and to pay compensation of 125 gold ounces, which had to be borrowed from the Protestant missionaries! This was in 1838, two years before the Treaty of Waitangi. Next, Captain Laplace pressed another clause into the treaty putting French Catholics on the same level as Protestants; and in 1842 Dupetit-Thouars, after having already taken over the Marquesas Islands, collected another batch of useful complaints and forced Queen Pomare to accept a protectorate. The next visit was for annexation, deemed necessary to protect French interests. (2)

There was not much respect for indigenous peoples in these take-overs, and there is not now. Hawaii is heavily militarised in the interests of the American "warfare state", and despite protests the tapu island of Kahoolawe has been used for naval exercises and bombing practice. (3) French Polynesians were not consulted when their islands became a naval base and nuclear testing ground.

It is obvious that Aotearoa could not have avoided the colonising net; but there were important differences in the way it was done.

Six years before Aotearoa was annexed, the slave trade in British ships was outlawed. The humanitarians who had for years been campaigning vigorously for this result now turned their attention to indigenous peoples who had suffered as brutally through colonisation. They were the force behind the Aborigines Protection Society - the term "aborigine" used here in its universal sense.

These caring people, to use the phrase current today, were as much products of their time as the predatory merchants getting their hooks into the distant island territories. Witness these assumptions which appear in the Report of the Aborigines Society for 1837.

"Christianity is the parent of civilisation, and true civilisation cannot be produced without it .... It is not to be doubted that this country (Britain) has been invested with wealth and power, with arts and knowledge, and the sway of distant lands and the mastery of the restless waters, for some great and important purpose in the government of the world. Can we suppose otherwise than that it is our office to carry civilisation and humanity, peace and good government, and above all the knowledge of the true God to the uttermost ends of the earth?" (4)

They believed that the natives had a natural right to their land and that their welfare should be safeguarded, but they were not opposed to commerce or to colonisation.

One of the leaders of this movement, Powell Buxton, initiated and chaired a House of Commons committee which produced a shattering report about the treatment of Aborigines in British settlements. This report was heavily paternalistic, proclaiming that it was Britain's duty to give the natives under its care "the opportunity of becoming partakers in that civilisation, that innocent commerce, that knowledge and that faith with which it has pleased a gracious Providence to bless our country". It was also practical enough to recognise that commerce wasn't all that innocent, and said bluntly that no settler government could be entrusted with the care of indigenous peoples.

For several years these views were strongly supported in the British Colonial Office, and they permeated the instructions given to Hobson when he was sent out to govern this newest colony. He was to deal with the Maori with mildness, sincerity, justice and good faith, and to see that the Europeans "did not repeat, unchecked, in that quarter of the globe, the same practice of war and spoliation under which uncivilised tribes have almost invariably disappeared as often as they have been brought into the immediate vicinity of emigrants from the nations of Christendom". Or putting it plainly, he was to consider the interest of the Maori before the interest of the emigrants.

Hobson personally went along with these instructions, and did his best to apply them; but it was another story with the colonists of the New Zealand Company, who got to Wellington before he got to Waitangi. The New Zealand Company used to be presented in our history books as high-principled visionaries who founded a new nation - and this idea still lingers. The fact is that this was a commer-

cial company out to make profits by buying land from the Maori for a few trifles and selling it to the colonists for good, hard cash. The term "colonists", by the way, referred to those with the capital to invest; the others, brought out to work for them, were the emigrants, who often had as hard a time as the Maori in the settlements which were advertised as offering great opportunities.

The Treaty was made with the Crown, not with the settlers. It was a director of the Company who described it as "a praiseworthy device for amusing and gratifying savages for the moment", (5) and a colonist, Walter Brodie, who dubbed it "that most absurd and mischievous treaty".(6) After only twelve years they secured, from the House of Commons, a constitution providing for that kind of settler government which the Report on Aborigines had said could not be entrusted with the care of indigenous peoples. How true that proved to be!

Hobson had been instructed to draw up a treaty which the Maori leaders would sign voluntarily. He could hardly take NO for an answer and go back to England saying they wouldn't consent. It was obvious they would have to be talked into it by one means or another. In practice this wasn't difficult.

There has been endless debate about the wording of the Treaty, the differences between the English and the Maori language versions, and how far the rangatira were hoodwinked into signing when they couldn't possibly appreciate the full implications. All this is important, but I don't think the formulations were critical to their approval. The rangatira of Te Tai Tokerau - for all the rest were tacked on afterwards, often with doubts and misgivings - were ready to accept the Governor because they perceived it to be in their interests to do so. Indeed, letters had earlier been sent to the Queen asking her to send a Governor.

The Maori, in 1840, especially in Te Tai Tokerau, was no longer living the self-contained kind of life that we study in our Museums. For many years ships had been coming from abroad, and many Maori had been to Sydney and knew what the Governor did there. As a seafaring people the Polynesians all over the Pacific were eager and quick to learn seamanship in European vessels. In those days the life at sea was tough, crews were often depleted through death or desertion, and captains were glad to fill up the gaps with these good, keen men. It has been estimated that in the 1840's nearly 2000 Hawaiians a year sailed off as seamen, mostly in whaling vessels. The Maori certainly knew what was happening in the Islands.

Secondly, there was plenty of successful trading with Sydney and with the visiting ships; potatoes, pork and fish exchanged for manufactured goods, the flax trade thriving. "Trade follows the flag" is an old imperial slogan. At that moment in history it applied both ways.

Thirdly, there was the very recent experience of the musket wars. Although the Ngapuhi had initially gained the upper hand, utu was on the agenda as soon as the enemy tribes were similarly armed with muskets. It soon became clear that if this murderous warfare, essentially different from fighting with hand weapons, went on unchecked, the whole race could perish. By the 1830's peace had been made between Ngapuhi and Waikato and others, but both sides remained nervous about the future. The missionaries had already proved their usefulness as mediators in minor disputes. The presence of a Governor who stood apart and was not involved in utu would provide further security.

Hobson found the Maori very ready to co-operate with the new regime. Ngati Whatua sent a top-ranking delegation to invite him to establish his capital on the Waitemata, and to offer the land required. Ngati Paoa, based on Waiheke and the Tamaki estuary, also offered land. Te Wherowhero, the ariki of Waikato, moved to Auckland and buttressed Hobson's security and authority with his own great mana, which in turn was enhanced by the commercial value of the town. These iwi had suffered cruelly from the muskets of the Ngapuhi; they needed the support and friendship of the Governor - but equally, he needed theirs. He had no armed force to back him, very little money and, apart from a handful of personal friends, only such officials as he could pick up in Sydney - and they were a poor lot, the left-overs after the New South Wales Governors had picked the best men for themselves. Without the good offices of influential Maori he would have been helpless.

For the first twenty years there was a kind of dual control in Aotearoa. The New Zealand Company ruled the roost in its settlements, but otherwise the Pakeha government authority could go only as far as the Maori would allow it to go. Vast areas remained in Maori hands with everyday life conducted in the Maori way but enlarged by innovations adopted from the Pakeha. These included commercial practices in which they proved remarkably successful. These were the times when the people of Auckland were literally kept alive by Maori produce; when canoe after canoe came down the Waikato and

over the portages into the two harbours, and the Maoris' own trading cutters came from many points along the coasts, bringing corn and grain and vegetables and fruit as well as pork and fish. Maori markets appeared in all the main towns and often persisted into the 'seventies.

But this very success led to envy and frustration among ambitious Pakeha confined to a relatively small land area while Maori farms flourished as close to Auckland as Orakei, Remuera and Mangere. On top of the inbuilt assumptions of European superiority over all "native" races, there was a steady build-up of resentment and misunderstandings.

Naturally the Maori operators expected this prosperity to continue. They had no experience of the shifting sands of capitalist fortunes. When Hone Heke demonstrated his repudiation of British rule by the felling of the British flagstaff, a contributing factor was the decline in trade at the Bay of Islands when Auckland became the commercial centre. The Victorian gold rushes created a demand for food from New Zealand in the early 'fifties, but disappointment set in when this did not last.

In three different areas, during those twenty years, co-operation broke down into conflict; the war in Te Tai Tokerau with Heke and Kawiti and their iwi; the Wairau affray in Marlborough; and the fighting in the Hutt Valley - Wellington area about disputed lands. Around Auckland where the Government operated, co-operation continued to work quite well until new land regulations introduced by Governor Grey and the mounting clamour to obtain Waikato land led to the alienation of Te Wherowhero and his iwi. The great ariki withdrew to his own turangawaewae while, at the same time, further south, the idea of a Maori King to unite the people was being promoted. After many hui and much debate, in 1857 Te Wherowhero was chosen for this supreme leadership with the title of King Potatau. The Kingitanga aimed to protect Maori land and Maori identity, but at the same time was not hostile to the regime. There was a saying, "the Queen on her piece, the King on his piece, and God over all".

But there was always a basic contradiction undermining all the wishes and efforts to exercise co-operation - and let it be said that there were always some Pakeha who tried earnestly to keep it going on the basis of fair dealing.

The simple fact was that a colony to be successful had to gain access to land - and the iwi Maori, to maintain their identity, their mana,

their tikanga, had to hold on to the land. The early willingness, in some cases eagerness, to sell land to the Pakeha quickly crumbled as disappointments set in and familiarity with colonial settlement revealed its ugly side. Although the first governors were enjoined to keep Maori interests in the forefront, they were also enjoined to assist colonisation, which it was assumed would be acceptable to the Maori. When this assumption proved false, the governors naturally came down on the Pakeha side, and so did most of the missionaries. The Parliament, elected by male settlers with property rights, had been oriented that way from the start.

The two areas where the settlers had that penned-up feeling most acutely were Taranaki and Auckland, and in Auckland especially verbal assault on the Maori preceded the instigation of armed conflict. Bitter hostility grew so intense that many Maori were afraid to come to town. From governors and local administrators down to humble working men the conviction grew that there had to be a showdown, and that Pakeha authority over the Māori had to be established.

The localised wars of 1860-72 occurred in Taranaki, Waikato, Bay of Plenty, South Taranaki-Wanganui, the East Coast and the Urewera. They have been variously called the Maori Wars, the Anglo-Maori Wars, the Land Wars and the New Zealand Wars - the last name being, to my mind, the most accurate and acceptable. The Maori role was defensive; for the Pakeha power and supremacy were more fundamental issues than the land. In almost every case it could be argued that fighting could have been avoided if wiser counsels had prevailed, and those wiser counsels were indeed present on both sides. But since the opposing interests were basically irreconcilable, the showdown was bound to come.

I trust there is no lingering belief that the Maori were rebels. The iwi who were attacked had no choice but to resist, although it was realistically impossible for them to defeat, in the long run, the weight of numbers and equipment of the British Imperial armies. Defeat, however, was never final. In my opinion the iwi Maori would have been much worse off if they had not resisted - and they resisted very capably indeed.

The immediate devastating effects were the confiscations (raupatu) of land from the so-called rebels - and from some hapu who took no part in the fighting, but whose land was suitable and accessible. In addition the first of the Native Land Acts was passed, to be repeatedly amended or replaced, but always with the same basic aim

- to facilitate the purchase of Maori land. In practice this was seldom straightforward. All sorts of deceptions and manipulations were involved in the transfer over the next few decades of far more land than was taken by confiscation. And, finally, the supremacy of the Pakeha government was secured.

However, there was no wish or intention to suppress the Maori completely. The old idea of enlightening and uplifting the Maori to be assimilated into the superior British culture lived on. Not that the Maori wanted this of course but we will come to that in a moment. The governments of the day were very anxious to conciliate the Maori. Before the wars were over the Imperial regiments were withdrawn and the colonial government had to rely on colonial forces and the so-called "friendly" or "loyal" Maori troops who for one reason or another fought on their side. "Military settlers" were placed on confiscated land with the obligation to serve in an emergency - but the successive governments were extremely anxious that no such emergencies should occur. They were prepared to go some distance to meet Maori wishes and provide a small share in the running of the country.

In 1860, when the Taranaki War had already begun, Governor Gore Browne and his officials summoned some 200 rangatira from all over the country to a conference at Kohimārama, the biggest such gathering held to date. The iwi of Taranaki and the Kingitanga stayed away, regarding it as deception, but otherwise it was widely representative.

The Treaty of Waitangi with its practical application was discussed and often criticised, and the sovereignty of the Queen acknowledged; the rangatira saw no contradiction in accepting the mana of the Queen while maintaining their own mana. Alan Ward has summarised its outcome in his valuable book A Show of Justice:

"The central point made by the chiefs at the conference was clear and unequivocal. They wanted to remain in allegiance to the crown and to engage with the European order; but they did not want to do so on terms of subordination and contempt for their values. Rather they wanted to be involved, as responsible and well-intentioned parties, in the machinery of state and the shaping of laws and institutions appropriate to the emerging bi-racial New Zealand. On that basis a bureaucratic state and the rule of law could yet be established with Maori co-operation. But the officials could not overcome their ethnocentrism, their deep-seated view that the Maori

were still fundamentally barbarous and immature." (7)

The non-military steps taken to conciliate the Maori before the wars were over were in line with the ideas explored at the Kohimarama conference.

Firstly - Resident Magistrates were introduced into Maori districts to administer the law in appropriate ways in association with local leaders. Reports from these Magistrates were printed in the Appendices of the Journals of the House of Representatives, available in our principal libraries, and make interesting reading.

Secondly - the four Maori seats in Parliament were set up. (1867)

Thirdly - the Native Schools Act provided for village schools wherever the iwi asked for them, gave the land required, formed a committee and guaranteed a sufficient number of pupils.

The aim of the politicians and the officials was of course assimilation, but the Maori learned to use these innovations to their own advantage. The first Maori MPs were ineffective, being unfamiliar with both the language and the procedures. But very soon they learned to use the machinery to fight their own causes, and so many petitions concerning Maori grievances flowed in that a special committee had to be set up to deal with them. The schools were expected to teach in the English language and style, but in practice they became focal points in Maori community life, besides making it easier for young people to find employment. And although this was the period when Chief Justice Prendergast made the famous legal ruling that the Treaty of Waitangi was, in law, "a simple nullity", its recognition at the Kohimarama conference had given it a boost. Over and over again the Maori used the Treaty as a weapon in fighting for their rights and their identity.

From the end of the New Zealand Wars onwards, self-determination became a persistent and recurring demand of the Maori. I use this term, self-determination, or mana motuhake, as meaning Maori control over matters pertaining to Maori. I distinguish self-determination from Maori sovereignty, which is a term very loosely used, but which often implies Maori control over everything, including the concerns of Pakeha and other ethnic groups, or of all of us combined. In the late nineteenth century a succession of widely representative conferences was held by Te Kōtahitanga, the unity movement, which never quite disappeared and which surfaced very publicly with the 1984 Hiko ki Waitangi, the march northwards from the Turangawaewae

marae in the Waikato, led by Tuaiwa Rickard.

Around the turn of the century Te Kōtahitanga raised the question of a Maori Parliament; about the same time the Kingitanga also promoted a Maori Parliament, Te Kauhanganui. A significant feature of Te Kōtahitanga was the strong participation of the iwi who had remained neutral or who had fought alongside the Pakeha during the New Zealand Wars. When it came to the post-war land grabs, these iwi suffered severely. They certainly received no rewards from the Pakeha government for their support. Iwi who had been ranged on opposite sides came together, making a strong resistance to the Pakeha drive for complete assimilation. The Pakeha now held the economic and political power and most of the land; they did not have to take everything else, the tikanga and the spiritual and cultural life of the Maori. Try as they might, in this the dominant Pakeha never succeeded.

Resistance took other forms, too, in Maori religious movements and in the well-known non-violent resistance of Te Whiti-o-Rongomai and Tohu Kakahi at Parihaka. The use of troops and of unjust arrests in Government attempts to destroy this resistance, on a scale that we would now call massive overkill, reflects the extreme nervousness of the authorities at any sign of what they called unrest. Reaction to minor incidents was similar if on a much smaller scale, and panic reaction led to similar massive overkill with the arrest of Rua Kenana at Maungapohatu in 1916, during the first World War. At Maungapohatu, as at Parihaka, the Maori were doing quite well for themselves when they were left alone, but that very independence appeared to pose a threat.

The years immediately preceding the first World War were among the worst in our history for racist attacks on the Maori, fuelled as they were by the continuing drive to obtain Maori land. The newspapers of this time are appalling, with vicious cartoons portraying the Maori landowners as hopelessly lazy and shiftless, barring the way of the aspiring small farmer eager to make the land productive.

All this was conflict - but at the same time there were also drives for co-operation which took many forms, and I don't mean a simple yielding to Pakeha pressures.

The best known is the movement sometimes dubbed the "Young Maori Party", although it wasn't a party at all. Its stimulus came from the old boys of Te Aute College who had benefited from a sound Pakeha education. This approach is expressed in the whakatauki

which Sir Apirana Ngata wrote in a child's autograph book; beginning "E tipu e rea". Here it is in translation:

"Grow up, oh tender plant, into your own times,  
Your hand to the tools of the Pakeha for your bodily well-being,  
Your mind and heart to the treasures of your ancestors, to adorn your head,  
And your spirit to God, who created all things."

On material matters Ngata tried to get the best for the Maori out of the Pakeha system; and his services to the preservation of Maori tradition and culture were exceptional.

I now come to a most remarkable experience of co-operation - Māori participation in successive wars as soldiers for the nation. For the South African War, thousands of Maori volunteers were declined by the British authorities, for reasons which look very odd today: They did not think it right and proper for dark-skinned men to be fighting against a white-skinned enemy! No such inhibitions applied in World War I where New Zealand troops were under New Zealand command, and the Maori had their own Pioneer Battalion. This was a soundly practical arrangement, because many of them came from remote areas with Maori as their first, or only language, and they naturally looked to Maori officers. The Pioneer Battalion distinguished itself, and in World War II the Maori 28th Battalion won even greater honour.

Why this enthusiasm, from people who for so long had been pushed around, deprived, denigrated and abused? There were only a few exceptions. In World War I the iwi of Waikato were objectors, saying they had no reason to fight for a nation in which their lands had been confiscated. They dealt roughly with their M.P., Dr. Maui Pomare, when he tried to force conscription on them, and some Waikato resisters went to gaol. The followers of Rua Kenana also abstained. For the rest, this Māori participation lent support to the idea that New Zealand had, indeed, become a truly united nation. There was also a general belief that the Māori were warriors by nature, eager to get stuck into a fight.

These are superficial explanations. There was a far more significant factor in the status of the Maori, who from the very beginning of the colony had been downgraded as being inherently inferior to the Pakehā. Here was a golden opportunity to prove themselves equal to the Pakeha troops - and they succeeded magnificently. In World

War II they went a stage further. Through the Maori War Effort Organisation they controlled their entire participation, including recruiting, home support for the forces, and labour for the home front. Organisation was largely on a tribal basis and it worked so well that its leaders anticipated applying the same mode of operation to Maori affairs in peacetime. This, of course, meant a measure of self-determination.

Unfortunately the then Government under Peter Fraser either did not appreciate this opportunity, or did not wish to try it. They quickly reverted to the old procedures of having Pakeha institutions decide what was best for the Maori. (8)

The armed forces have continued to have a strong appeal to the Maori and one reason is the absence of racial discrimination. The same applies to the sports fields where a player's ability is what counts. The first New Zealand rugby team to tour Great Britain was a Maori team with a small Pakeha component. The third sphere in which the mixing of races now became common was in the workplace.

Here I must emphasise that many of the disadvantages suffered by the Maori also applied to working people. Class and income differences were acute in early colonial New Zealand. Men without property, and all the women, had no vote. The colonists who came with capital could rapidly accumulate more of it and establish themselves as merchants or on large estates. Workers had little bargaining power until they formed trade unions - and when they did, there was no race discrimination with regard to wage rates. However, during the late nineteenth century, when Maori gangs worked on roads and railways and telegraph lines and in shearing sheds, for the most part Pakeha workers did not see much of their Maori counterparts.

What made the difference was the migration from rural kainga to the towns and cities, beginning in the 1930s and accelerated during the war years.

It soon became impossible to pretend that our two races were equal in their everyday lives. There is a saying that there is nothing more unequal than the equal treatment of unequal people. Maori workers with much larger families and much smaller incomes than their Pakeha workmates, unaccustomed to city life and with lower standards of housing and of education, were clearly disadvantaged. Race prejudice and discrimination also showed up. When unemployment set in, the Maori and the immigrant Pacific Islander had more than

their fair share of it.

I personally think that these blatant and tragic deprivations and inequalities are the strongest of many stimuli behind what is sometimes called the "Maori Revival". The impact of Maori demands is now a major factor in our political and social life. During the last twenty years the changes have been immense, but the more progress is made, the more stimulation there is to go further and to achieve that long-standing aim of self-determination in an appropriate modern form.

The Ratana movement, which emerged and gained strength between the wars with its two aspects, religious and spiritual on the one side and political on the other, by the end of World War II held the four Maori seats in Parliament. One of its aims was the ratification of the Treaty of Waitangi, and this was the slogan of campaigners for Maori rights in the sixties and early seventies. "Ratification" was a debatable term, but legal recognition of the Treaty was indeed achieved with the Treaty of Waitangi Tribunal Act of 1975, greatly strengthened by its 1985 amendment, and the Government ruling that from henceforth the principles of the Treaty must be in all relevant laws, and must guide the practice of Government departments.

This is an enormous step forward and we should recognise this clearly - however large and forbidding we find the immediate problems which face us.

I have given a dispassionate survey of our history, although I personally, like many others, was appalled when I began to delve seriously into our colonial past, especially the first 60 years. But since then I have read too many accounts which are passionate but also unbalanced and inaccurate, and if we are going to use the record to help us through our difficulties today, we should get it right.

Three features of this period stand out as enduring and significant.

First - the persistence of Maori culture in its broadest sense, embracing tikanga and wairua, custom and tradition and spiritual values, in the face of continuous attempts at assimilation into the introduced culture by misguided, if often well-intentioned, Pakeha.

Second - the insistence on the Maori right to be different, to be autonomous, and to handle Maori affairs themselves, in their own way - that is, self-determination.

Third - the dead weight of Eurocentrism, involving the assumption

that European values and ways of doing things, and their current political and economic systems, are indisputably right and proper and beneficial to humankind.

We would not say now, as the House of Commons Report on Aborigines did in 1837, that it was Britain's duty to give the natives under its care "the opportunity of becoming partakers in that civilisation, that innocent commerce, that knowledge and that faith with which it has pleased a gracious Providence to bless our country" ... but it's substantially the same concept when good people say "why can't we all be the same? aren't we all just New Zealanders? shouldn't we forget the past and live in today?"

It's easy to brush the past aside when you're Pakeha and enjoying the benefits flowing from over a century of Pakeha domination. Not so easy if you are Maori and still suffering the delayed effects of the raupatu (confiscations) and the land-grabs - some of which are within living memory or the quite recent past; if in your daily life you are still subjected to subtle or crude discriminations and put-downs.

When I hear politicians, and others, saying that the pledges of the Treaty of Waitangi are outdated and don't belong in the changed conditions of this century, I wonder if they really know what century we are living in. This is the era of the end of colonialism, when we can no longer write like Kipling of "lesser breeds without the law", or like G.A. Henty, that writer of adventure stories so popular in my childhood, of one Englishman being equal to any twenty natives. The old Empires have gone, the former colonies have almost all gained their independence, men and women with dark skins and non-Christian beliefs stand tall in the United Nations, the wonderful diversity of cultures and traditions is seen as a great human good. Wherever the former colonies have a majority of the population descended from European immigrants, the indigenous peoples are rebelling against the remnants of colonialism as it applies to them. Racism has come to the end of the road in all its aspects, and the native Americans, the Aborigines of Australia and the Maori of Aotearoa have asserted themselves afresh in remarkably similar ways.

Of course there is conflict. Should we shy away from it, or say like Thomas Jefferson, the author of the American constitution, that "a little rebellion now and then ... is a medicine necessary for the sound health of the government"? (9) Conflict is essential to change, and sometimes the issues are truly insoluble; one side

or the other has to win. Think back to the movement for the abolition of slavery: was it possible for them to compromise?

But co-operation is real and essential too and our history abounds in examples. All Pakeha have not been, always and everywhere, hostile to Maori needs and causes. At every stage the Maori has had allies among the Pakeha, and some of them suffered for the support they gave. There is a growing body of such allies today, of Pakeha who have shaken off Eurocentric attitudes and who see our future as being enriched by a diversity of cultures, with full value from the unique contribution of the tangata whenua.

And allies are certainly needed by any body of people struggling for access to the centres of decision-making. When New Zealand women campaigned for the vote they had to wrest it from an all-male Parliament. They had to seek out, encourage and cherish the male MPs who were prepared to support them. They were able to persuade those Parliamentarians that men as well as women would gain from the women's franchise. The Maori minority today have to deal not only with Parliament but with news media and many public institutions and organisations which are poorly tuned in to their viewpoint and needs.

When conflict has to be faced, it is necessary to identify the opponents correctly. History, including the history we are making today, is not a matter of goodies and baddies or of deep-laid plots by masses of people. All Pakeha were not, and are not, an undifferentiated mass blocking the path of Maori progress. The Maori have had their share of leaders who have not done the right thing by their own people. Short-sightedness is not confined to one side of the argument.

It's too easy for exasperated Maori to line up the Pakeha as the enemy in the belief that Pakeha as a race are the seat of power. But when 2000 odd meat workers at Westfield, Islington and Burnside find their jobs wiped overnight, a human disaster, did the Pakeha among them have any part in that decision? Maori and Pakeha were equally victims. In the affairs of the nation and of the so-called western world, the wage workers, the housewives, the small-scale farmers and businessmen and women have all been powerless to control the upheavals of current economic re-structuring.

The truth is of course that it is only a small segment of Maoridom which regards all Pakeha as inveterate enemies; and I have mentioned it only because of the fear and apprehension so easily stirred among

Pakeha who have very little knowledge and understanding of the changes taking place amongst us. In 1984 the Hikoi ki Waitangi was followed by Te Runanga Waitangi at Turangawaewae, Ngaruawahia, the most representative such gathering of our time, which succeeded in reaching remarkable consensus. (10). Its resolutions were then carried on to the Hui Taumata at Parliament and it was the following year when Parliament passed the crucial amendment to the Treaty of Waitangi Tribunal Act. Many other heights have been gained in the onward march: the greater recognition of te reo Maori, taha Maori in schools, funding for MASPAC (the Maori and South Pacific Arts Council) and so on - to the extent that some protesting voices are raised, of unfair favouritism towards the Maori. Yet there is some distance still to go before the long-sought objective of self-determination is gained and the tangata whenua plays its full part in the multi-cultural life of the nation.

I am not one of those who fear that tension may develop into violent confrontation or terrorism. Co-operation is alive and well. I have seen an excellent example of this in the Kai Tahu case before the Waitangi Tribunal, which has had invaluable support from the dedicated work of one part-Maori and three Pakeha historians. It is also true, however, that we have a mighty educational task before us to raise the general level of public understanding if we aim to bring the conflict to a peaceful resolution.

Our struggles in our small country are not unique.

Human rights, including indigenous rights, are a world-wide issue. They will not be won on a universal scale unless our planet survives the twin threats of environmental degradation and nuclear war. Aotearoa/New Zealand has gained a unique place in global politics as a small nation prepared to take a nuclear-free stance in the face of great power pressure. Peacelovers want to take this further and exercise a strong influence for world peace in other ways as well.

Clearly we will make the strongest impact if we can demonstrate an end to injustices, discrimination and disharmony in our own country; that here in Aotearoa/New Zealand we have ethnic groupings where human rights are fully exercised and recognised.

Taking a positive view, the diversity of peoples on our planet is one of its greatest glories; and in the last analysis there is only one race, the human race, which embraces them all.

Elsie Locke

## About the Author

### Elsie Locke

ELSIE LOCKE, writer, radio commentator, peace activist and historian is well known as an author and speaker on many issues of justice and peace, especially relationships between Pakeha and Maori.

She received the Katherine Mansfield Award for Non-Fiction in 1958, and the University of Canterbury conferred on her an Honorary Doctorate of Literature in 1987, in recognition of her work as a writer and historian.

Readers may be interested in Elsie Locke's bi-cultural history of Aotearoa/New Zealand, *Two People's One Land* (1988). Like most of Elsie Locke's books, it is written for both children and adults. It can be read together with *The Kauri and the Willow* (1984), which is made up of 54 historical pieces (1800-1940). Both books are published by the Government Printer.

Many of Elsie Locke's books have bi-racial themes. Books still obtainable are: *The Runaway Settlers* (1965). Canterbury, 1860s. (Puffin). *The End of the Harbour* (1968). Manukau, 1891, tensions arising from the war in Taranaki. (Cape, now obtainable from author). *Explorer Zach* (1978). Growing up near Timaru, 1820s. (Pumpkin Press). *Journey Under Warning* (1983). Nelson and Marlborough, Wairau surveys and conflict, 1843. (Oxford University Press, now obtainable from the author). *Canoe in the Mist* (1984). Tarawera eruption, 1886. (Cape).

### References:

- (1) I.C. Campbell: "Waitangi in Context: Pacific Islanders and the Great Powers in the Nineteenth Century", in: Historical News, University of Canterbury, 1987.  
W.P. Morrell: "Britain in the Pacific Islands", Oxford, 1960.  
John Dunmore: French Explorers in the Pacific, Vol. II, Oxford 1969.  
Edward Joesting: Hawaii, an Uncommon History, New York, 1972.
- (2) As above, and Colin Newbury: Tahihi Nui, University Press of Hawaii, 1980.
- (3) The National Geographic Atlas of the World, 1975, notes on its map: "This island is covered with live explosives".
- (4) Quoted from the thesis by Keith Sinclair: The Aborigines Protection Society and New Zealand.
- (5) Colonial Office papers 209/4: 537. See Peter Adams: Fatal Necessity, 1977, p184.
- (6) Remarks on the Past and Present state of New Zealand, 1845.
- (7) Alan Ward: A Show of Justice, 1973, p118.
- (8) Letter to Madison.
- (9) See Puao-Te-Atatu, Appendix, the report of the Ministerial Advisory Committee for a Maori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare, 1986.
- (10) See Tu Tangata No.21, December 1984/January 1985, and He Korero mo Waitangi, 1984. Available from Project Waitangi.

The Foundation for Peace Studies gratefully acknowledges funding for the 1988 Annual Peace Lecture from the University of Auckland.

A special Peace Studies lecture fund has been established as a result of a generous and anonymous donation which was specifically intended for such a purpose.

## The Aims of the Peace Foundation

The New Zealand Foundation for Peace Studies aims to promote peace within and beyond New Zealand. This involves developing a public awareness of the ways in which individuals, groups, institutions and nations act on one another, both constructively and destructively.

To this end, the Foundation aims to:

- ★ stimulate education at all levels on ways of achieving peaceful relationships among individuals, groups and societies;
- ★ provide resources and information on relevant themes of peace and violence;
- ★ work constructively with like-minded groups;
- ★ encourage the implementation of peace-oriented processes and programmes at all levels of education;
- ★ initiate research into the causes and solutions of violence in society.

## The Foundation's Record

Since its incorporation over ten years ago, before 'peace' became the issue it now is in the public forum, the Foundation has worked steadily to promote public awareness of peace issues.

- ★ At its headquarters near Auckland University, it has maintained a documentation centre, library, and the country's largest range of peace-related audio-visual resources and static displays.
- ★ Over the years it has made its resources available to a host of individuals, groups and schools as part of its policy of peace education. It has also made available books, magazines and visual aids otherwise difficult to obtain.

- ★ It has been an important initiator of peace education programmes. In collaboration with WILPF, it produced **Learning Peaceful Relationships**, 6000 copies of which have been sold for use in schools.
- ★ It has maintained regular communications with like-minded organizations overseas.
- ★ Because of its commitment to disseminating accurate information in an area where 'misinformation' is prevalent, it has had an important role to play in monitoring media treatment of conflict areas. Its publication, **Peace Digest**, also furthers this aim.
- ★ It has brought to New Zealand a number of important speakers on peace issues and has organized many public seminars and lecturers on peace related problems.
- ★ Since 1984, it has managed and part-financed the New Zealand Media Peace Prize, which recognizes the important role the media can play in either fomenting or resolving conflict.

*The Peace Foundation relies on public support for its work. Ways you can help:*

## FINANCIALLY:

Membership of the Foundation entitles individuals and corporate organisations to the Foundation's newsletter which reports on its activities. The annual subscription rates are:

Individual membership	\$22.00
Student membership	\$11.00
Corporate membership	\$55.00
Student-based corporate membership	\$22.00

**DONATIONS AND SUBSCRIPTIONS  
ARE TAX DEDUCTIBLE**



The New Zealand  
Foundation  
for Peace Studies