



**TURUN  
YLIOPISTO**  
UNIVERSITY  
OF TURKU



## PROVING GROUNDS

The Formation and Use of Competing  
Claims to Knowledge about New Zealand  
Māori in the 1830s British Debates on  
Colonisation

---

Mikko Myllyntausta





**TURUN  
YLIOPISTO**  
UNIVERSITY  
OF TURKU

# **PROVING GROUNDS**

The Formation and Use of Competing Claims to  
Knowledge about New Zealand Māori in the 1830s  
British Debates on Colonisation

---

Mikko Myllyntausta

## University of Turku

---

Faculty of Humanities  
School of History, Culture and Arts Studies  
Department of European and World History  
Doctoral Programme in History, Culture and Arts Studies (Juno)

## Supervised by

---

Professor Leila Koivunen  
University of Turku

Professor Taina Syrjämaa  
University of Turku

PhD Johanna Skurnik  
University of Helsinki

## Reviewed by

---

Professor Tony Ballantyne  
University of Otago

Senior Researcher Linda Andersson  
Burnett  
Uppsala University

## Opponent

---

Professor Tony Ballantyne  
University of Otago

The originality of this publication has been checked in accordance with the University of Turku quality assurance system using the Turnitin OriginalityCheck service.

Cover Image: Detail from Busby, James, 1802–1871 : Despatches from the British Resident, qMS-0344, Alexander Turnbull Library. Photograph by Mikko Myllyntausta.

ISBN 978-951-29-8975-1 (PRINT)  
ISBN 978-951-29-8976-8 (PDF)  
ISSN 0082-6987 (Print)  
ISSN 2343-3191 (Online)  
Painosalama, Turku, Finland 2022



UNIVERSITY OF TURKU

Faculty of Humanities

School of History, Culture and Arts Studies

Department of European and World History

MIKKO MYLLYNTAUSTA: Proving Grounds: The Formation and Use of  
Competing Claims to Knowledge about New Zealand Māori in the 1830s  
British Debates on Colonisation

Doctoral Dissertation, 381 pp.

Doctoral Programme in History, Culture and Arts Studies (Juno)

October 2022

## ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the formation and movement of knowledge concerning New Zealand in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. At the time, New Zealand had not yet been annexed into the British Empire and there was debate in British colonial politics about possibly colonising the islands. Pieces of information about New Zealand and its indigenous Māori flowed through networks of communication. I examine how different groups in Britain utilised sources in order to form varying, competing and seemingly proven claims to knowledge about Māori for arguing their own interests. I also examine, how and why these claims differed from each other.

The groups at the centre of this study are a parliamentary committee that promoted the protection of indigenous peoples from its humanitarian perspective and a land company that sought to colonise New Zealand. I examine these groups' key publications, texts that they cited as sources and correspondence and other material used in communication spanning the antipodes. This material highlights connections the groups used to form their knowledge claims. I follow intertextual references and direct quotations from earlier texts to uncover bases for the knowledge claims and how knowledge changed between texts. I examine such processes with theoretical background from the history of knowledge and imperial histories.

The findings underline the complexity of colonialism, movement of knowledge and related networks and the coexistence of competing knowledges. I demonstrate that the differing knowledge claims were central in the argumentation by the groups. They formed their claims relying on, among other strategies, contemporary empirical ideals for knowledge. Yet, the claims were strongly coloured by their own interests. The groups were able to adapt practices of formation of knowledge to fit available sources to their argumentation. More generally, this illustrates how evaluating knowledge in uses such as political argumentation requires understanding of the formation of that knowledge. For example, relying on citations to credible sources is not sufficient for guaranteeing objectivity. This thesis shows that the historical study of processes of knowledge provides valuable perspective to knowing.

**KEYWORDS:** Colonialism, New Zealand, indigenous peoples, Māori, history of knowledge, knowledge, movement of knowledge, networks, 19th century, missionaries, mission societies, land companies, Colonial Office, argumentation

TURUN YLIOPISTO

Humanistinen tiedekunta

Historian, kulttuurin ja taiteiden tutkimuksen laitos

Yleinen historia

MIKKO MYLLYNTAUSTA: Proving Grounds: The Formation and Use of Competing Claims to Knowledge about New Zealand Māori in the 1830s British Debates on Colonisation

Väitöskirja, 381 s.

Historian, kulttuurin ja taiteiden tutkimuksen tohtoriorjelman (Juno)

Lokakuu 2022

## TIIVISTELMÄ

Tutkin väitöskirjassani tiedon tuottamista ja välittymistä Uudesta-Seelannista 1800-luvun alun väittelyissä, joita Britanniassa käytiin Uuden-Seelannin kolonisoimisesta. Näitä saaria ei oltu vielä liitetty britti-imperiumiin, ja ne herättivät keskustelua Britannian siirtomaapolitiikassa. Uudesta-Seelannista ja sen alkuperäiskansasta maoreista liikkui erilaisissa verkostoissa tiedon muruja. Selvitän, miten eri ryhmät Britanniassa hyödynsivät näitä lähteitä tuottaakseen maoreista erilaisia, keskenään kilpailevia ja näennäisesti todistettuja tietoja argumentoidakseen tavoitteittensa puolesta. Selvitän myös, miksi ja miten nämä tietoväitteet erosivat toisistaan.

Tutkimukseni keskiössä olevat ryhmät ovat parlamentaarinen komitea, joka ajoi alkuperäisväestöjen suojelua britti-imperiumissa humanitaarisesta ja kristillisestä näkökulmasta, sekä Uuden-Seelannin kolonisoimista ajanut maakomppania. Tutkin ryhmien keskeisiä julkaisuja, niiden lähteenään käyttämiään tekstejä sekä kirjeenvaihtoa ja muuta materiaalia, jolla tietoja välitettiin. Nämä tekstit tuovat esille yhteyksiä, joilla ryhmät tuottivat esittämänsä tietoväitteet. Seuraan intertekstuaalisia viittauksia ja suoria tekstilainauksia selvittääkseni tietoväitteiden taustaa ja tietojen muuttumista tekstien välillä. Tarkastelen näitä prosesseja tiedonhistorian sekä muun muassa imperiumitutkimuksessa esitettyjen näkökulmien avulla.

Tulokseni korostavat kolonialismin ja tiedonkulun prosessin moninaisuutta sekä erilaisten, myös kilpailevien tietojen yhtäaikaista olemassaoloa. Osoitan, että toisistaan poikkeavat tietoväitteet olivat keskeisiä ryhmien argumentaatioissa. Ryhmät tuottivat väitteensä muun muassa aikansa empiirisiin tiedon ihanteisiin nojaten. Silti ryhmien intressit värittivät näitä tietoväitteitä vahvasti. Ryhmät pystyivät soveltamaan aikansa tiedon tuottamisen tapoja luovasti, jolloin samatkin lähteet saatiin tukemaan eri näkemyksiä. Laajemmin tämä osoittaa, että esimerkiksi poliittiseen vaikuttamiseen tuotettujen tietojen arvioiminen ja tarkastelu vaativat ymmärrystä myös siitä, miten tiedot on tuotettu. Esimerkiksi pelkät viittaukset pätevän oloisiin lähteisiin eivät riitä takaamaan objektiivisuutta. Näin tutkimukseni osoittaa tiedon historiallisen tarkastelun antavan arvokasta näkökulmaa tietämiseen.

ASIASANAT: Kolonialismi, Uusi-Seelanti, alkuperäiskansat, maorit, tiedonhistoria, tieto, tiedonkulku, verkostot, 1800-luku, lähetystyöntekijät, lähetysseurat, maakomppaniat, siirtomaaministeriö, argumentointi

# Acknowledgements

This thesis is centrally concerned with knowing. How could certain individuals know something and what did they claim to know? Writing the thesis has been a long journey which has, occasionally, even led me to question whether I myself know anything at all. But if there is one thing I know for a fact, it is that this thesis would not exist without the help and support I have received from numerous people.

First, I wish to extend my heartfelt thanks to my supervisors Professor Leila Koivunen and Professor Taina Syrjämaa at the University of Turku. On top of everything I had already learned from them during my undergraduate studies, they received me with open arms when I first expressed an interest in taking on doctoral studies. Since then and throughout my PhD project, they have always been there to comment on my work and give advice, whether it came to plans I had for my research, funding applications or any pitfalls I was afraid of. Their advice has opened my eyes to new questions, perspectives and general outlooks when it comes to the study of history. They have played crucial roles in my growth to become the researcher I am now.

Not only was I lucky enough to have two committed and supportive scholars advising me, but later on my duo of supervisors expanded into a trio. In the latter half of my project, Johanna Skurnik agreed to join in as my third supervisor, even though I had been pestering her first with my Master's thesis and then with the early stages of my PhD work. It had been, after all, exciting to find another researcher from my alma mater who was interested in Oceanian history. Her insightful comments and close reading of even the roughest versions of my texts were invaluable when I sweated over bringing all my thoughts together into something resembling a coherent work.

The work I have conducted has been a properly global affair, for which I have Professor Michael Belgrave from the Massey University to thank. In his open-mindedness and helpfulness, Professor Belgrave let this random doctoral student from Finland come and visit Massey University. This enabled me to live in New Zealand for six months and do crucial archival work there. His expertise and the conversations I had with him were also of immense help in pointing me to the right direction. I am also indebted to Massey University's Professor Philippa Gander and

the Sleep/Wake Research Centre in Wellington for providing me with a place to work at and a wonderful work community for the duration of my visit on the other side of the globe. I especially want to thank the Sleep/Wake Research Centre for the countless litres of coffee that helped fuel my research.

I also want to thank Professor Tony Ballantyne and Senior Researcher Linda Andersson Burnett who examined my thesis and provided encouraging and perceptive comments. These were helpful in making the final touches to this thesis, and will be in going forward with my research from here. I am also very thankful to Professor Ballantyne for agreeing to be my opponent, even with the 10-hour time difference. I look forward to our conversation.

For the past four years I have had the pleasure to enjoy the camaraderie of my colleagues in the Department of European and World History both back in Historicum and then for some time in a more distanced manner over Zoom. Different occasions and coffee table discussions, whether about serious research or about something completely different, have provided a wonderful backdrop and working environment. I am grateful for having been a part of this community, for which I want to thank Janne Tunturi, Janne Mäkiranta, Essi Huuhka (thank you also for all the books I stole from your bookshelf), Erika Antinkaapo, Saara Penttinen, Heli Paalumäki, Pia Koivunen, Pertti Grönholm, Raita Merivirta, Kirsi Salonen, Tuomas Räsänen, Tiago Silva, Maija Ojala-Fulwood and Erja Aarnio. I also want to thank all more recent coffee room company in Arcanum, particularly Maria Syväniemi and Noora Viljamaa, for providing much needed breaks in the final stages of finishing my thesis. Thanks also go to Robert Collis who proofread and edited my manuscript.

I want to give a special shout out to our department's study group for the history of science and more recently the history of knowledge, Tiedepiiri. For the past eight-ish years that I have been involved in Tiedepiiri, it has provided a comfortable environment for discussing more and less (although mostly more) complex topics and approaches in the field of history. In addition to Leila, Johanna and both Jannes (Jr. and Sr.), whom I have mentioned above, I am grateful to Veli Virmajoki, Ahto Apajalahti and all others who have taken part in Tiedepiiri for all the conversations that have taken place over some more coffee, occasional baked goods and other delicacies. Also, a seminar organised by Tiedepiiri in 2014 was the first such occasion I took part in back when I was still an undergraduate student. Participating in that event was probably the first time I considered it a realistic possibility to try to become a researcher.

I have received generous support from numerous institutions for my work: Oskar Öflunds Stiftelse, TOP-Säätiö, The Turku University Foundation, The Juno Doctoral Programme, The Emil Aaltonen Foundation and The University of Turku Joint Research Grant Fund. This support enabled me to visit all the necessary archives around the world and complete my work. Crucial stages of this work were done in

the inspirational atmosphere of Villa Tammekann in Tartu, for which I extend further thanks to the Turku University Foundation.

I have also been lucky enough to have the amazing support of all my friends, whose company has kept me sane. I have had Janne Jr., Essi, Erika and Saara, with whom I could share the delving into the depths of time, as well as a lunch or two. Sami and Camilla, some of my oldest and dearest friends, have been there as support and to take my mind off work when needed. The same effect has been achieved by all the board gaming and drinks with Taru and Henrik, who also came to New Zealand to share a Finnish vappu and all the pizzas on the other side of world.

Lastly, my sincerest gratitude goes to all my family. I was taken down this road of interest in and love of all things New Zealand and Māori by my amazing *whānau*: Phillip, Elaine, Rob, Tina, Chianti, Curtis and Cedric. I don't know what would have become of me without you. The same can be said of my parents Sirkku and Juha, to whom I owe everything, and my sisters Saara and Riikka. I have always known that my family has my back and all this is thanks to you. Since I have been blessed with so many great families, I also want to thank all my in-laws Maarit and Ilkka, Sakari, Lea and Maija, and the whole Lipponen family for all their support. Last of all and most of all I am indebted to my dear wife Saana. None of this would have been possible without her loving help and support. I have been incredibly fortunate to have my best friend with whom I could share this journey with its ups and downs. We went through the same road together all the way from both of us trying to figure out what this is all about and spending an amazing six months in New Zealand to then putting in the long, long hours writing, eventually to see the work finished. You have my eternal love and gratitude.

Taking on this PhD project has led me to situations and experiences I would not have thought possible, or at least realistic. As a great thinker has once said: 'It's a dangerous business [...] going out of your door. [...] You step into the Road, and if you don't keep your feet, there is no knowing where you might be swept off to.'

In Turku, 17 August 2022

Mikko Myllyntausta

# Table of Contents

<b>Acknowledgements .....</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>Table of Contents .....</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Previous Research and Theoretical Perspectives.....	6
1.2 Research Questions and Aims .....	34
1.3 Material, Methods and Outline of the Study.....	38
<b>2 Creating Evidence of Character.....</b>	<b>52</b>
2.1 Evident Natural Savagery.....	54
2.1.1 Sources of Savagery .....	54
2.1.2 An Argumentative Basis for Improvement.....	104
2.2 Evidence and the Possibility of Civilising .....	133
2.2.1 Missionaries as Sources of Improvement .....	133
2.2.2 William Yate in Intertextual Communication.....	171
2.2.3 Commerce, Material Improvement and its Sources ...	193
Chapter Conclusions – Claiming and Proving from One’s Perspective .....	214
<b>3 Arguing for Action with Claimed Knowledge .....</b>	<b>217</b>
3.1 Establishment of Need and Justification .....	220
3.1.1 Shades of European Guilt and Arguing for the Need to Act.....	220
3.1.2 Differences in Alleging Māori Desire for Improvement .....	260
3.2 Arguing for ‘Correct’ Action.....	298
3.2.1 Emerging Arguments for Specific Lines of Colonialism.....	298
3.2.2 Christianising and Civilising as Differentiating Premisses for Improvement.....	331
Chapter Conclusions – Coherent Arguments from Particular Perspectives.....	347
<b>4 Conclusions and Implications .....</b>	<b>351</b>
<b>Abbreviations.....</b>	<b>363</b>
<b>References .....</b>	<b>364</b>

## List of Illustrations

1. *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements); with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index*, 1837, p. 52–53. Document from ProQuest's *House of Commons Parliamentary Papers* displayed with permission of ProQuest LLC.
2. *The British Colonization of New Zealand*, 1837, p. 212–213.

# 1 Introduction

The islands that became known by Europeans as New Zealand were officially colonised and annexed into the British Empire after the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840. However, before this event there was much discussion and debate in Britain about the best course of action towards New Zealand. This group of islands in the South Pacific, today known also by the name Aotearoa<sup>1</sup>, was inhabited by the indigenous people, Māori. By the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, the islands had also become a destination for increasing numbers of European settlers, sailors and other beachcombers. Different parties with vested interests in New Zealand took part in the debates about the future of the islands by providing information and claimed knowledge of the situation in New Zealand, notably concerning the interactions among Māori and European settlers and sailors. Individuals, who included missionaries, pro-missionary humanitarians and advocates for settler colonialism in New Zealand, attempted to influence the British colonial administration. They argued that their proposed lines of action were the most beneficial and suitable. In the ensuing debates, the communication and movement of knowledge, which spanned the opposite ends of the world between New Zealand and Britain, was essential as the argumentation rested on what was supposedly known in Britain about such a distant place as New Zealand. This study examines the formation and use of this claimed knowledge in colonial argumentation about New Zealand.

<sup>1</sup> The historian Bain Attwood has problematised the concept of ‘New Zealand’ in the context of the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. He points out that New Zealand as a name, as opposed to the ‘islands of New Zealand’ implies the unity of those islands, which was not accurate at the time. See Attwood 2019, footnote 21. In the pre-European era Māori did not have a collective name for all the islands. The North and South Islands had many names such as *Te Ika a Maui*, *Aotearoa*, *Te Waka-a-Aoraki* and *Te Wai Pounamu*. The use of *Aotearoa* to denote the collective name of the islands increased in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Nowadays *Aotearoa* and *Aotearoa/New Zealand* are used frequently. See King 2003, 40–42. In this study I refer to the islands of New Zealand or *Aotearoa/New Zealand* as simply New Zealand, as this was the way in which the British individuals at the centre of this study referred to and ‘knew’ the islands in their debates of the early 19<sup>th</sup> century.

British interest groups presented their claims about New Zealand and Māori in such a way as to appear credible and proven knowledge. They did this via their connections and participation in networks of communication that spanned the globe. Advocates of settler colonialism and missionary work, for example, did this to lobby their agendas. This lobbying also underpinned their claims to credible knowledge about New Zealand. Such claims were intended to convince the British colonial administration and wider audiences of what should be done and why. Thus, knowledge and the supposed capacity to know in the context of the early 19<sup>th</sup> century played a crucial role in this political argumentation.

The focus of this study is on the processes related to knowledge in colonial contexts: its movement, formation, boundedness to different circumstances and use in political argumentation. Recent scholarly discussions about the history of knowledge have raised the concept of knowledge again to the fore from a new perspective. Consequently, scholars have posed questions relating to various research topics about how knowledge, or claims to knowledge, have affected historical phenomena. By focusing on claims to knowledge concerning New Zealand in the 1830s, I aim to understand the processes through which Britons on the other side of the globe from New Zealand came to profess knowledge about the state of those islands and, more specifically, Māori as a people. In addition, I aim to analyse the uses of co-existent, yet differing claims to knowledge that sought to further particular positions on colonial action in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. Altogether, this study provides practical examination of the complex nature and intertwining of two significant concepts: knowledge and colonialism.

In the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, New Zealand was only just becoming an object of knowledge in Europe. After Captain James Cook's expeditions in the 1760s and 1770s and the first Europeans setting foot on New Zealand, the slow trickle of information concerning the distant islands to Britain became a torrent by the 1840s.<sup>2</sup> Within decades of Cook's voyages, an increasing number of texts on New Zealand were being published in Britain, including travelogues, letters from missionaries working on the islands and educational texts directed to a wider audience. Many of these texts were written to instruct and inform various British audiences about the qualities and characteristics of New Zealand's environment, nature and the indigenous Māori. This spread of information from New Zealand and about New Zealand was based on a number of factors in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. By this time an increasing number of travellers were exploring the islands and interacting with Māori. Various groups of Europeans had already settled in New Zealand, including whalers, traders and runaway convicts from the penal colonies of Australia. From

<sup>2</sup> Ballantyne 2011, 236.

the 1810s, missionaries also began their work in New Zealand. The possibilities offered by New Zealand fascinated different interest groups in Britain. Individual Māori also travelled to Britain to learn of Europe and to speak to the King.<sup>3</sup>

This influx of information on New Zealand forms the ground on which political discussion and debate in Britain about New Zealand's future was based. Until the late 1830s, the British government was generally reluctant to intervene in New Zealand. However, the presence of a growing number of British subjects in New Zealand drew British officials' attention to the islands in the antipode. Scholar of New Zealand history Peter Adams has identified two trajectories in British colonial politics that led to the eventual colonisation of New Zealand as a result of that uncontrolled flow of British subjects to New Zealand. First, politicians considered the British government to have a duty to control and protect British subjects, even in New Zealand. Second, there was an increasing degree of humanitarian concern in Britain regarding the fate of Māori. Consequently, many British colonial officials felt that the government was duty-bound to protect the indigenous people from exploitation and crimes committed by British subjects.<sup>4</sup> Concern for Māori did not endure, and in the early 1840s settlers were hanging on to their deeds of purchase in order to receive rights to all the land they considered to have been theirs. By the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century Māori ownership of land had shrunk precipitously. Moreover, they went from being a majority of the population in New Zealand to a small minority. British ideas of Māori as a dying people also gained traction during this time, although this was not universally accepted even at the end of the century.<sup>5</sup> These eventualities, however, do not change the fact that the influx of information and its use in the debates of the 1830s were central in shaping how Māori were 'known' at a time when New Zealand's colonisation was still a matter of debate.

In the 1830s, debate in Britain centred on whether New Zealand should be colonised, and, if not, what lines of action were to be taken. Along with this debate, the flow of information directed at the British Government on New Zealand reached a peak in 1837–38. In addition to, and in the background of, official governmental policy making on New Zealand, there were groups on both sides of the debate that attempted to influence British officials vis-à-vis New Zealand's possible colonisation. These pressure groups took part in the debates and argumentation directed at the Colonial Office and at wider audiences in order to promote their

<sup>3</sup> For an outline of early interactions between Europeans and Māori and European settlement in New Zealand see e.g. Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 3–29; Salmond (1997) 2018, 205–330; Ballantyne 2015, 28–48.

<sup>4</sup> Adams, P. (1977) 2013, xi, xiii; Orange (1987) 1997, 8–9.

<sup>5</sup> See e.g. Mein Smith 2012, 72–96; Stenhouse 1996. See also Ward, A. 1974, 29–30; Belich (1996) 2007, 229–272.

different perspectives and goals when it came to the possibility of colonising New Zealand. At the forefront of this debate were the pro-colonial New Zealand Association (NZA) and the pro-missionary, anti-NZA evangelical humanitarians, who included missionaries, missionary society members and members of influential Quaker families. This latter group were bound together by common humanitarian ideals and personal connections. The humanitarian perspective on British colonies was epitomised in the organisation of the Parliamentary Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) of 1835–37, which consisted of many leading humanitarians and Quakers.<sup>6</sup> As the British colonial government was slow and unwilling to act in relation to the problems arising in New Zealand, these groups managed to use their publications to steer the discussions regarding New Zealand. Several factors were involved in facilitating their interjecting with their views and argumentation. The attention of the Colonial Office, for example, was split between different colonies. It also had limited resources, which resulted in reactivity to different political pressures without a general or a strict colonial policy. Personal connections in the colonial administration also allowed for external influence.<sup>7</sup> For studying the mechanism at play in British colonial politics and decision making, these influence groups and their workings provide a focused lens for examining the role of claimed knowledge in political argumentation, as well as into the complexity of colonialism in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century.

The concepts of ‘information’ and ‘knowledge’ appear significant when examining colonial actions. The connections between the antipodes of New Zealand and Britain and the knowledges that moved due to these connections provide an excellent case study for analysing the role that knowledge and information had in practices of colonialism. Historians have examined the historical production and circulation of knowledge and have emphasised that the focus of analysis is on *knowledges* in plural, as people in different contexts can be considered as having had specifically different knowledges on a given subject. These knowledges were contingent on various factors relating to individuals and their contexts, which included for example their geographic location, societal standing, gender and personal connections. As Johan Östling, David Larsson Heidenblad and Anna

<sup>6</sup> On the back-and-forth debates surrounding the Colonial Office and the participants in those debates see e.g. Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 62–73; Belich (1996) 2007, 185; Ballantyne 2011, 250–259; Attwood 2020, 98–99. The word humanitarian was not used in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries in the same sense of concern for other people. Instead, people involved in these debates often used the word philanthropist. See e.g. Belmessous 2013, 66. In much of the historiography on this subject these kinds of expressions of concern for others have been discussed as humanitarianism and those individuals as humanitarians, and I follow this tradition in this work.

<sup>7</sup> See e.g. Attwood 2019, 101; Lester, Boehme & Mitchell, P. 2021, 2 & 12–19.

Nilsson Hammar from The Lund Centre for the History of Knowledge describe this perspective on knowledge, '[i]t is fundamental to view knowledge as locally situated and to take its historicity and complexity into account, which helps carry the conversation forward. As a consequence, rather than knowledge per se, it is the conditions for knowledge production and circulation that are in the spotlight.'<sup>8</sup> This perspective on the complexity and situatedness of the conditions of knowledge production and circulation provides a starting point for examining the epistemological foundations of different colonial projects in particular contexts. It also helps in developing a more nuanced understanding of colonialism in general.

In the British debates on New Zealand, the role and significance of knowledge is particularly striking. The groups that attempted to influence British colonial policies did so to a significant degree by communicating what they presented as proven knowledge based on sources of information on and from New Zealand. A significant proportion of this communication was related to Māori, their character and ways of living. The groups argued for specific ideas and lines of action towards New Zealand. Thus, it is important to examine the content and nature of their argumentation in order to understand how they attempted to achieve their goals. From this perspective, the concepts of knowledge and knowledge claims become useful tools for examining the argumentation employed by the influence groups. It cannot be assumed in all cases that argumentation was based on knowledge and rational ideas. Nonetheless, the argumentation and expressions used in texts by the NZA and humanitarian actors were strongly driven by what they described as evidence. They claimed that this evidence proved what was truly going on in New Zealand. Therefore, questions pertaining to what was presented as claimed knowledge that had supposedly been proven by evidence and thus used for argumentation become central for us when wishing to understand the debates on the colonisation of New Zealand that took place in the background of the official decision making in the Colonial Office. Beyond the case of early-19th-century New Zealand, this also opens doors to understanding mechanisms of argumentation, movement, formation and use of knowledge in colonialism and colonial politics more generally. As such, this study is an examination of attempts by the Aborigines Committee and NZA to argue and prove grounds for colonial action through the formation and use of knowledge.

Before moving further into New Zealand's precolonial history, it is necessary to discuss the concept of knowledge and what it signifies in the context of this study. Following this, I will discuss how movement of knowledge has been conceptualised and how it provides a perspective for examining the processes involved in the

<sup>8</sup> Östling, Larsson Heidenblad & Nilsson Hammar 2020, 15. On general discussion of the history of knowledge see the whole article. See also Lässig 2016; Mulsow 2019a.

debates on New Zealand. Lastly, I will take a closer look at the historiography relating to New Zealand in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century.

## 1.1 Previous Research and Theoretical Perspectives

### The History of Knowledge as a Perspective to Colonialism

In historical research, the concept of knowledge has been significantly discussed in works inspired by postcolonial scholarship, as well as in fields such as global history. Yet, knowledge as an object of historical research has also emerged as a topic of conversation in the past few decades forming the budding field of the history of knowledge. This scholarship arises from historiography in diverse fields, including the history of science. The current multitudinous and still evolving discussions on what is called the history of knowledge have zeroed in on mechanisms and other aspects of knowledge as its own object of examination. The history of knowledge has engaged the interests of scholars in different settings and has resulted in much discussion in international journals as well as within more local language spheres for example in Germany, Switzerland, Sweden, and France.<sup>9</sup> As scholars have problematised the history of knowledge in a wide range of contexts, their discussions have been integrated to some extent with each other. However, they have also remained quite fragmented. Whilst this focus on knowledge is not new considering earlier postcolonial scholarship, I propose that the recent discussions on the history of knowledge do provide a new perspective to approaching knowledge in colonial contexts. These newly discussed perspectives provide ways of examining knowledge that can complement and offer new insights into knowledge as a part of colonial practices. In this following section, I will examine historiographical discussions on the history of knowledge before returning to postcolonial approaches to knowledge. I will consider what these recent discussions on the history of knowledge have to offer to this study in terms of providing fresh perspectives to examining knowledge in colonial settings.

Knowledge as a concept appears rather abstract but it can provide a valuable perspective for close examination of the functioning of historical mechanisms. Considering the scale of European colonial ventures, both in terms of distance as

<sup>9</sup> For recent approaches to the conceptualisation and problematisation of the history of knowledge see Sarasin 2011; Östling 2015; Burke 2016; Lässig 2016; Bartsch et al. 2017; Jacob 2017; Östling et al. 2018; Joas, Krämer & Nickelsen 2019; Dupré & Somsen 2019; Mulsow 2019a; Daston 2019; Mulsow 2019b; Östling, Larsson Heidenblad & Nilsson Hammar 2020; Sarasin 2020.

well as the number of actors involved, focusing on knowledge and more specifically the different ways of knowing among those contexts and actors can help shed more light on different perspectives and activities that constituted the practices and processes of colonialism. This coexistence of numerous contemporaneous knowledge systems has been raised as one significant perspective in the history of knowledge. The historian Peter Burke illustrates this in proposing that there is no history of knowledge, but rather pluralised histories of knowledges. Focusing on the plural form of knowledges, Burke notes that there can be different kinds of knowledges within a culture, such as abstract and concrete, learned and popular and male and female. What is worth knowing and what justifies that something is known varies within these contexts. These knowledges can, in turn, coexist, compete or be in conflict even within a culture.<sup>10</sup>

In addition to the contemporaneous existence of such different knowledges, the relationships and connections between different systems of knowing are also significant. The intellectual historian Martin Mulsow argues that a focus on knowledge can bring together different systems of knowledge in explicating how people in different situations and professions supposedly knew something. This could indicate what scale certain systems of knowledge had. Moreover, these perspectives could together even function at a global level towards a '*histoire totale*' of knowing.<sup>11</sup> In recent discussions on the history of knowledge, scholars have also proposed other similar views regarding the significance of examining knowledge in order to uncover ways of knowing in certain times and places. Exploring knowledge has been seen as a means to uncover the social reach and relevance of different forms of knowledge in historical contexts. This shows what forms of knowledge were valued at different times. It is also possible to identify shifts in classifications and hierarchies of knowledge over time within and among cultural traditions that have arisen from the changing significances of different forms of knowledge at different times.<sup>12</sup> In sum, these perspectives together underline that knowledge should be seen as something that has been and is changing and contingent on context. The varying contexts can appear in different scales. Using the example of 19<sup>th</sup>-century colonialism, different contexts appear not only as European in contrast to those set in colonies. Instead, different contexts also existed within Britain or even within British metropolitan culture. This multifaceted nature of knowledge means that historical phenomena and actions by different actors that appear to have been based on or connected to some form of knowledge need to be considered by extension as having been equally multifaceted. Applying this to a specific case, such as the British

<sup>10</sup> Burke 2016, chapters 1 & 5.

<sup>11</sup> Mulsow 2019a, 162–173; Mulsow 2019b, 179–180.

<sup>12</sup> Larsson Heidenblad 2020, 47–48; Daston 2017, 145.

debates on New Zealand highlights the need to consider the effects these contexts had on colonial action. This can illuminate how different contexts and knowledges in these contexts played into the actions of various actors in regards to colonial politics, such as the NZA and the humanitarians connected to the Aborigines Committee.

Knowledge as a concept has, however, posed a challenge for the history of knowledge. While the history of knowledge has been a focus of much discussion in recent years, historians have not reached a definitive definition or consensus on what this field of study exactly is or should be as a defined discipline. Scholars in these discussions often bring up that knowledge as a concept is vague and undefined. Östling, Larsson Heidenblad and Nilsson Hammar, however, point to this as a strength since knowledge serves as an umbrella term that covers different topics and research interests and brings them together.<sup>13</sup> This resembles Mulsow's hopeful view of the history of knowledge as approaching a '*histoire totale*', as different studies of knowledge could work towards building a more comprehensive understanding of what, how and in what different ways it was considered possible to know something in a given time and place. The historian of science Lorraine Daston has pointed out one possible problem arising from this wide span and vagueness of knowledge as a concept: If knowledge can be used as an expansive concept to examine a wide range of topics, what does it not cover? In this criticism Daston points to diverse lines of historical inquiry that certain scholars have called the history of knowledge, indicating that knowledge as a concept could be too wide-ranging to the extent of losing its meaning. The crux of this criticism boils down to the problem of defining knowledge as concept.<sup>14</sup>

It is surely problematic to apply the concept of knowledge to historical analysis, if it is not clearly defined what is meant by knowledge. Aware of such difficulties, scholars have made varying proposals regarding what it is that historians of knowledge mean with this concept. Nilsson Hammar points out that it is necessary to view what kind of definition is called for. She notes that there is a difference between what she terms philosophical/epistemological definitions, which have long traditions in theoretical philosophy, and sociological/historicist ones. While epistemological theories of knowledge such as knowledge as a 'justified true belief', that is, the JTB theory, have their place in attempting to define knowledge in some form of absolute sense, they provide limited usefulness to historians who wish to examine knowledge in the past.<sup>15</sup> For a historical examination of knowledge and aspects relating to its formation, use and movement, for example, it is necessary to

<sup>13</sup> Östling, Larsson Heidenblad & Nilsson Hammar 2020, 9–10.

<sup>14</sup> Daston 2017, 143–145; Daston 2019, 174–176.

<sup>15</sup> Nilsson Hammar 2018, 110–111.

focus on a conception of what knowledge was in the past and in relation to the context in question. For example, from a historical perspective the JTB theory poses a problem vis-à-vis alchemy, as it stipulates that alchemy should not be considered knowledge since our contemporary understanding points to it being impossible to produce gold out of base metals. Thus, the JTB theory posits that alchemical theories were not ‘true’. Yet, in the late 17<sup>th</sup> century some considered alchemy as constituting true knowledge of how to make gold, something they had merely not yet successfully achieved in practice. This ‘knowledge’ they had influenced their actions and reasoning, whereby it would be problematic to disregard it in historical examination on the basis that it was not absolute knowledge in the sense of not having been absolutely true. From this basis, Mulsow maintains that knowledge in a historical sense should be categorised as that which people considered knowledge at the time.<sup>16</sup>

This categorisation can have the problem of blurring the lines between different possible categories, such as what a historian would consider someone’s knowledge, belief, opinion or faith. To further define what historians might find useful to call knowledge, Nilsson Hammar points to knowledge as the ‘shared beliefs of an epistemic community, justified by contextually, historically and culturally variable (epistemic) criteria for reliability’.<sup>17</sup> This specification particularly points to the contemporary justification of knowledge and thus has the value of differentiating what people considered knowledge at the time based on contemporary criteria from other belief systems. This, however, also places responsibility on the historian to be clear about why they consider certain claims or discourses to have been knowledge in their historical examination. Yet, on the other hand, this also underlines the significance of why it is necessary to examine and understand the criteria of what people could have considered justified and credible knowledge at any given time. These become significant questions even despite the slight risk of a circular definition of examining something as justified knowledge and proceeding to examine why it was justified.

Such historiographical theorisations of knowledge offer insights into the examination of how individuals formed and used knowledge in coexistent colonial projects in the debates about New Zealand in the 1830s. However, this requires further reflection as to why the debates can be considered knowledge. Maria Simonsen and Laura Skouvig have observed that it can be problematic to adopt an overly narrow and fixed definition of knowledge since the strength of the history of knowledge lies in its diversity and its capability to bridge gaps between different

<sup>16</sup> Mulsow 2019a, 160–161.

<sup>17</sup> Nilsson Hammar 2018, 111. For this definition she applies the proposition of the linguist and discourse analyst Teun van Dijk for a definition of social knowledge, see van Dijk 2014, 20–21.

times and subjects. Thus, they call for pragmatic conceptualisations of knowledge in relation to the subject at hand.<sup>18</sup> In this study I follow both this perspective and Nilsson Hammar's theorisations in order to examine aspects of the argumentation regarding New Zealand as specifically claims to *knowledge*. I posit that the argumentation by the NZA and the Aborigines Committee was presented to influence British political decision making and attitudes towards colonising New Zealand. Additionally, I argue that the manner in which these parties collected evidence from New Zealand to ground their arguments was an important part of the formation and transfer of knowledge concerning New Zealand. The NZA and the Aborigines Committee presented these arguments in a manner that emphasised the supposed truthfulness, accuracy, credibility and other aspects of evidently epistemic values in their arguments. They did this through constant references to what they called proof and evidence, for example. Yet, along the lines of the existence of different competing and possibly divergent knowledges, it is necessary to be clear that the claims the two sides presented were not objectively true and generally accepted knowledge, even in their own time. Thus, I view them specifically as claims to knowledge, the credibility, acceptability and reliability of which could have been challenged and tested at the time.

Despite such definitions, it is necessary to be mindful of the application of the concept of knowledge to avoid it losing its meaning. It should not be assumed that all political argumentation in different contexts is and has been based on absolutely rational argumentation. Nevertheless, it is also reasonable to assume that some form of what was considered knowledge would appear at the base of political debates in most cases. Whether it is knowledge of the subject matter related to decision making, or knowledge of what is assumed to be the result of a specific political decision, or knowledge of political fallout that might come from certain decisions, it is reasonable to assume that there is an epistemic basis for political argumentation that can be examined. This applies to early-19<sup>th</sup>-century British colonial politics. In fact, if no such epistemic aspect were evident in source material on political decision making, it would indeed be a fascinating outcome!<sup>19</sup> Therefore, a significant question to pose is how the knowledge, or claims to knowledge, that different actors intended as bases for political decision making were formed and communicated. By extension it is also valuable to ask how knowledge was used to influence political decision making from outside the official colonial administration.

<sup>18</sup> Simonsen & Skouvig 2019, 24.

<sup>19</sup> Philipp Sarasin has similarly argued that there cannot have been many historical events, situations and structures that did not need to be interpreted and organised by knowledge of the people who confronted them. See Sarasin 2020, 4.

The value of this perspective for examining colonial actions can be illustrated by the signposts and the goals laid out by the editors of *KNOW: A Journal on the Formation of Knowledge* when it was established in 2017. They stated that the focus of the journal would be in ‘uncovering and explicating diverse forms of knowledge from antiquity to the present, and accounting for contemporary forms of knowledge in terms of their history, politics, and culture’. For this they provided general questions that apply to many approaches of the history of knowledge that have been suggested. As matters of interest, they posed the following series of interrelated questions:

What does formalized knowledge incorporate, and what does it exclude? What are the educational, social, and institutional sites from which discourses of knowledge emerge and derive legitimacy? Who may lay claim to it? What is its symbiotic relationship to the society around it? And what is the impact of these conditions and restrictions upon the constitution of knowledge, its circulation, and its transmission to the future?<sup>20</sup>

Matters concerning the legitimacy of proposed or claimed knowledge, as well as its impact and transmission, are also significant themes for examining the impact of knowledge on colonial actions. As the historian Simone Lässig remarks, the historical and changing nature of knowledge also means that aspects of it, such as evidence, reliability and demonstrability, are also changing and fluid in different times and contexts.<sup>21</sup> In this study, I examine wider aspects of knowledge production, rather than simply indicating that a certain kind of knowledge was used to influence decision making on New Zealand’s colonisation, in order to uncover more fundamental mechanisms within colonialism. If knowledge was used to influence political decision making, it is worth asking questions along the lines of those raised in *KNOW* about who formed and produced this knowledge, along with how it was connected to surrounding society and how the knowledge was affected by its surroundings. Aspects of such formation and use of knowledge, for example the bases of from where the legitimacy of this knowledge arose, are illustrative of the functioning of political systems, societies or other communities more generally. This makes knowledge a significant explanatory category.

Scholars discussing the history of knowledge have also raised questions about differences between terms such as knowledge, information and data, which relate to another pragmatic use of terminology in this study. As Burke points out, there are

<sup>20</sup> Bartsch et al. 2017, 1.

<sup>21</sup> Lässig 2016, 39.

different views on what these terms are and how they should be used.<sup>22</sup> For clarity's sake I will here adopt Burke's proposal of a distinction between information as 'raw' and knowledge as 'cooked'. Thus, knowledge can be seen as being produced from the ingredients of information. Notably, no information can be assumed to be purely raw and 'given' as there are always assumptions and prejudices in play. But this pragmatic distinction can clarify discussion about how something that is received can then be, for example, classified, criticised, verified, compared and combined into something that would appear as knowledge. This knowledge could be proven by pointing to evidence that could be termed information.<sup>23</sup> It is, however, necessary to also keep in mind that the distinction between 'raw' and 'cooked' is completely dependent the perspective from which it is viewed. In the case of New Zealand, a missionary living among Māori could receive 'information' from conversations with Māori and process it into 'knowledge' that they pass along to their parent society. However, for the parent society in London this communication from missionaries could appear as information that was processed further in order to be published in missionary journals. These lines of communication are further problematised in the following section on networks of movement of knowledge.

This new scholarship on what has been called the history of knowledge, which has been notably inspired by the history of science and other fields of historical inquiry, provides fresh theoretical perspective on knowledge. Yet as noted earlier, examining knowledge as a concept for historical examination is far from new. Postcolonial scholarship has contributed to how knowledge has been seen in historical research, particularly in imperial connections. For example, Michel Foucault's work on the connections of knowledge and power and Edward Said's criticism of European Eurocentrism and Orientalist 'misrepresentations' of non-Western peoples have been very influential in shaping much postcolonial thinking.<sup>24</sup> These postcolonial perspectives and the concept of colonial knowledge have largely remained separate from the recent discussions on the history of knowledge. Despite the relative separation of these scholarly traditions up until now, the questions posed above that related to the history of knowledge can be applied to contribute to our understanding of the mechanisms and workings of colonialism.

<sup>22</sup> As examples of the different uses of the terms, Burke points to information as more typically having been used in American scholarship in contrast to the more theoretical use of *Wissenschaft* in Germany, which is often translated as knowledge in reference to different forms of systematically organised knowledge. See Burke 2016, chapter 1.

<sup>23</sup> Burke borrows his distinction between 'raw' and 'cooked' from the anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss. See Burke 2016, chapter 4.

<sup>24</sup> For more detailed reviews of the impact of postcolonial approaches to conceptualising knowledge in colonial and imperial contexts see e.g. Kennedy 1996; Ballantyne 2001; Roque & Wagner 2012, 1–8.

In viewing knowledge in colonial contexts, the historian Tony Ballantyne has defined colonial knowledge as ‘the form and content of the knowledge that was produced out of and enabled resource exploitation, commerce, conquest, and colonization’.<sup>25</sup> This definition, along with that outlined in Bernard Cohn’s *Colonialism and its Forms of Knowledge*, for example, point to the role of knowledge, particularly Western-produced knowledge related in some way to colonial contexts, as a product of and a tool for colonialism. Cohn has identified ‘investigative modalities’ that helped classify, categorize and control the colonised social world in India. These defined how, why and for what use knowledge was gathered and turned into usable form.<sup>26</sup> As such, questions posed by the history of knowledge can also be applied to knowledge that arose from colonial contexts.

Here it is also necessary to point out that much of the focus in this study is on how knowledge was formed and used by British individuals in their colonial endeavours. Therefore, specifically Western colonial knowledge is at the forefront of this study. This does not, however, imply that indigenous knowledge systems were not significant or should not be studied. Māori knowledge systems, for example, would most likely present completely different perspectives to European–Māori interactions. But, as is discussed in this thesis, this kind of indigenous knowledge was largely filtered through European perspectives before reaching the political debates in question here, which is why such indigenous knowledge is not at the forefront in this study.

The European biases inherent in European colonial knowledge can pose a challenge when examining knowledge specifically tied to colonial contexts. Such biases have often been identified in postcolonial scholarship. A prime example of this is Said’s approach to Western ideas as a self-referential knowledge system for colonial domination, which were more representative of Western Orientalism than of any correspondence to the ‘real Orient’. Views of these kinds of self-referential knowledge systems and postcolonial views of European misrepresentations of the ‘Others’ often lead to conceptions of deep mistrust of European colonial knowledge and a devaluation of its epistemological value.<sup>27</sup> There is no denying that much of European colonial writing was saturated with colonial power relations. Yet, to dismiss European/Western colonial knowledge as simply a product of colonial power relations and thus epistemologically insignificant can potentially overlook its other aspects. This includes this impact this knowledge had on its contemporaries, who could have considered it as proper knowledge.

<sup>25</sup> Ballantyne 2008, 178.

<sup>26</sup> See Cohn 1996. For Cohn’s classification of his investigative modalities see Cohn 1996, 4–11.

<sup>27</sup> Roque & Wagner 2012, 7–10.

Ricardo Roque and Kim A. Wagner criticise some postcolonial work for overemphasising the idea of inherent power relations in colonial knowledge to the extent that colonial knowledge becomes a purely linguistic and textual phenomenon without connection to its practical effects in colonial economic, military and social life. They point out that some colonial texts had very limited circulation and therefore had limited impact on colonial administrators. Moreover, despite the epistemic violence and racist prejudices they contained, these kinds of colonial texts led to limited realisation of colonial discourses. Thus, it is necessary to maintain some connection to the practicalities of colonial action and to consider colonial narratives, images and knowledge as generated by material situations and bodily practices, in addition to the analysis of power relations inherent in much of colonialism.<sup>28</sup> Ballantyne argues that it is necessary to consider colonial writing as a matter grounded in practices of colonial oppression and dispossession, rather than only examining it in terms of its output. As examples of practical action, he notes the connectedness of colonial knowledge to the history of printing, reading and the book trade.<sup>29</sup> This idea of tying knowledge to the practicalities of colonialism in debates on New Zealand is at the forefront of this study. This is also necessary in applying the perspective of the history of knowledge to colonial settings.

Roque and Wagner and the anthropologist Michael Taussig suggest that there should be a focus on the reality of knowledge rather than on whether it was absolutely true. They propose this as a way to approach European biases in knowledges and their circulation. Whether colonial knowledge appears true to reality or not based on our 21<sup>st</sup>-century understanding is a secondary factor when examining what impact the knowledge had on contemporaries. Instead, colonial knowledge can be viewed as ‘real’, instead of true or untrue, since it had the potential to have an impact on the actions, perceptions and power relations of colonialism in the real world, irrespective of whether that knowledge was true to nature or not.<sup>30</sup> This applies perfectly to viewing competing knowledge claims on New Zealand that different actors made in order to influence British colonial politics. If disparate lines of argumentation for action in New Zealand were presented based on differing knowledge claims of Māori, and considering that the target audience of the argumentation in Britain had very limited information on New Zealand available to them, either (or neither) side’s claims could have been ‘true’. But if the argumentation led to colonial action, it becomes secondary whether the claims were ‘true’ as the consequences were real. This is not to imply that the relation of colonial knowledge to the state of things in New Zealand, for example, is insignificant.

<sup>28</sup> Roque & Wagner 2012, 9–11. See also Kennedy 1996, 350–356.

<sup>29</sup> Ballantyne 2012, 238–240.

<sup>30</sup> Taussig 1986, 121–122; Roque & Wagner 2012, 13–14.

However, the end result of a critical examination of colonial knowledge should go beyond pointing out distortions and biases and should instead connect claims to knowledge to the real world. One significant, practical aspect of knowledge is its inherent connection to communication. Next, in order to understand the movement of knowledge, in addition to the nature of examining knowledge, I will focus on conceptualisations of contextuality, spatiality and movement of knowledge as tools for deeper historical analysis of knowledge.

## Networks and Movement of Knowledge

When examining the formation and uses of knowledge about New Zealand in early-19<sup>th</sup>-century Britain, the movement of knowledge is a particularly essential aspect. For anyone who made claims in Britain based on sources from New Zealand, the information had had to travel across a vast geographical distance. Thus, it is likely that it had passed through the hands of many different actors and had been transmitted through myriad different contexts.

Both the study of knowledge and the global scale of colonialism call for acknowledgement and examination of the significance of communication. In the past few decades, global forms of communication have been of particular interest to historians of empires. Scholars in the fields of history and historical geography have undertaken considerable work on analysing colonial connections and the networked nature of colonial projects. This work has detailed how such connections facilitated movement of information and various colonial discourses across different colonial spaces. Works on imperial and colonial connections by Catherine Hall, Tony Ballantyne, Alan Lester and Zoë Laidlaw have placed colonial sites alongside metropolitan centres as objects of study.<sup>31</sup> This increase in focus on imperial connections has often been linked to the rise of transnational and trans-imperial perspectives in the 1990s. Whereas in older historiography of the British colonies the focus was mostly restricted within modern national borders, interest in transnational perspectives led to closer examination of not only connections between the imperial metropole and the colonies but also among various colonies.<sup>32</sup> This tradition has particularly provided theorisations of networks as conceptualisations for connections between places and individuals. It has also provided tools for examining communication and movement within the British Empire, for example, and I utilise the concept of networks in order to analyse the movement of knowledge in this study.

<sup>31</sup> Lester 2001; Hall, C. 2002; Laidlaw 2005; Ballantyne 2012; Ballantyne 2015.

<sup>32</sup> Lester, Boehme & Mitchell, P. 2021, 2–3. For an example of a study of the connections among colonies see e.g. Ballantyne 2012.

From an even wider perspective to knowledge, whether it be scientific, colonial or other types of knowledge, scholars have raised the issue of communication as an important aspect of knowledge in general. In his seminal article 'Knowledge in Transit' historian James Secord suggests that knowledge-making should be seen as a 'communicative action'. Arising from the perspective of the history of science, he discusses questions and tensions relating to the locality of knowledge and how these locally situated formations of knowledge can be considered as parts of larger global knowledge systems. Secord also identifies a problem in how knowledge has been situated in many earlier works as local and variable. He argues that it has often become a conclusion rather than a method. As a result of this, according to Secord, the history of science runs the risk of becoming fragmented into pieces of locally situated and produced knowledge. The consideration of knowledge making as a communicative action instead brings to the fore processes of formation of knowledge. It entails taking into consideration not only the contents or local contexts of knowledge, but also questions of trust, testimony and communitarian objectivity as factors in how knowledge travels. This also means approaching texts, images, actions and objects as traces of acts of communication 'with receivers, producers, and modes and conventions of transmission'.<sup>33</sup>

Secord's essay has been influential in directing more scholarly focus to mechanisms of transfer and circulation of knowledge as explanatory factors for examining knowledge.<sup>34</sup> This communicative aspect of knowledge is particularly impactful within the framework of this study in its examination of an intersection of colonial action and the significance of knowledge. Considering the colonial connections that allowed for the movement of knowledge between New Zealand and Britain, the range of different local contexts is significant. Hence, simply placing knowledge in these local contexts is not sufficient to gain an understanding of the mechanisms of the formation and use of knowledge. Instead, examining how testimony, objectivity and the receivers, modes and conventions of transmission affect how knowledge moves, as Secord suggests, is crucial for understanding the role knowledge played in colonial actions and argumentation.

When discussing the movement of knowledge among different local contexts, the significance of different spaces of knowledge is underlined. In particular, many historical geographers have emphasised that knowledge is dependent on both temporal and spatial contexts. Local sites for knowing could produce certain meanings that could then be negotiated with other local sites through the movement

<sup>33</sup> Secord 2004, 659–661.

<sup>34</sup> See e.g. Östling et al. 2018, 19–20.

of knowledge to produce further claims to knowledge.<sup>35</sup> David Lambert and Alan Lester have also expounded on the significance of connections between different spaces in their examination of early-19<sup>th</sup>-century colonial philanthropy. They suggest that colonial philanthropy can be seen as ‘spatially extensive webs of communication’, meaning that debates, actions and beliefs did not exist independently of other people or the spaces in which they were realised. Instead, these were co-constituted with and in dialogue with other people in other places. Therefore, a given imperial, or colonial, location should be viewed as having been connected with broader networks and thus partly constituted by these connections.<sup>36</sup>

In colonial contexts, being mindful of the temporal and spatial contexts, of which the networks or webs consisted, can also help the discern the activity and perspective of different kinds of actors, who might otherwise be overshadowed by more prominent figures. In Lambert and Lester’s view sensitivity to spatiality can help form a more nuanced differentiation of colonial discourse and the tensions and convergences between different colonial projects.<sup>37</sup> The historian Frederick Cooper has also argued that too often there appears the implication that there is one system of evenly spread connections all across the globe in attempts to understand the interconnectedness of different parts of the world. Instead, he has called for deeper examination of the structures and limits of how different parts of the world have been connected, especially pointing out the uneven and ‘lumpy’ spread of different connections around the globe.<sup>38</sup> Explicating the ‘lumpy’ spread of connections and the connections between different colonial projects can help bring to the fore the activity of different groups, individuals and perspectives, thereby giving nuance to what could otherwise appear as monolithic.

The networked nature of colonial knowledge is one example where these nuanced perspectives of different actors are called for. The intellectual historians Bruce Buchan and Linda Andersson Burnett point out that a great deal of focus when examining European thought on non-European peoples is still placed on ‘canonical’ thinkers. Consequently, the actors ‘in the field’ or who otherwise took part in networks of communication are often left in the margins, not to mention the non-European peoples themselves.<sup>39</sup> While the likes of missionaries and botanists have received scholarly attention relating to diverse topics in the past few decades, including connections in scientific, cross-cultural or other global networks, the focus

<sup>35</sup> Withers & Livingstone 1999. See also Livingstone 2003; Livingstone 2005; Livingstone & Withers 2011.

<sup>36</sup> Lambert & Lester 2004, 321.

<sup>37</sup> Lambert & Lester 2004, 321.

<sup>38</sup> Cooper 2005, 91.

<sup>39</sup> Buchan & Andersson Burnett 2019, 3–4.

is often on the activity of one such group, rather than different groups functioning alongside or even in opposition to each other. Their participation and the ‘lumpiness’ in networks as a whole are also often less defined.<sup>40</sup>

The focus of this study is European formation of knowledge. However, a spatially sensitive recognition of where and how Māori individuals participated in the networks that facilitated the debates on New Zealand’s colonisation is nevertheless necessary. This is important due to the roles Māori played in the networks of communication, but also from an ethical standpoint to raise indigenous peoples out of the margins. There has been much research undertaken in the past few decades on tracing indigenous activity and perspectives in European texts and colonial practices.<sup>41</sup> It can be difficult to uncover particular interests, motives or even actions by indigenous peoples in their interactions with Europeans in colonial contexts, or to ascertain to what degree they represent indigenous views more widely.<sup>42</sup> Indigenous activity and local knowledge has however often played a crucial part in the formation of knowledge by Europeans. For example, while not often acknowledged by European explorers, local knowledge was essential for European exploration through the help and information explorers received from local guides, go-betweens and other indigenous peoples.<sup>43</sup> The historian of science Kapil Raj has also illustrated how European knowledge was often a product of intercultural encounters in what he calls the contact zone rather than purely European in origin.<sup>44</sup> Correspondingly, Ballantyne points out that missionary texts, for example, were porous and moulded by local developments, such as interactions with Māori. Thus, when historians consider Māori as active shapers of European missionary texts they cannot be written out of history as mere objects of Western discourse.<sup>45</sup>

These perspectives on indigenous and colonised agency are significant in regards to my perspective of looking at how Europeans considered ‘knowing’ places like New Zealand and people like Māori. Not only do they underline the complexity of knowledge as a phenomenon, they also highlight the importance of paying attention to the different actors in play. When examining the processes of communication and formation of knowledge spanning New Zealand and Britain, I am mindful of locating Māori in these networks of communication when possible in order to identify the proactivity and significance of indigenous peoples in the movement and formation

<sup>40</sup> See e.g. Johnston 2003; Schaffer et al. 2009; Bleichmar 2011; Kuper 2019.

<sup>41</sup> For examples of uncovering indigenous activity in European colonial works see e.g. Kennedy 2013; Konishi, Nugent & Shellam 2015; Shellam et al. 2016.

<sup>42</sup> Doubts about whether colonised voices can truly be found in colonial texts have also been raised by scholars in postcolonial discussions. See Kennedy 1996, 354–356.

<sup>43</sup> Kennedy 2013, 1–2.

<sup>44</sup> Raj 2007.

<sup>45</sup> Ballantyne 2015, 14.

of knowledge. This indicates the active roles Māori had in networks of communication. It also illustrates their participation in the British formation of knowledge following Raj's approaches to knowledge production. Moreover, it indicates whether and to what degree these Māori individuals were acknowledged as participants in the formation of British knowledge about New Zealand in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century.

But what does this sensitivity to local spatial and temporal contexts and their connections mean more practically? Recent conceptualisations of the spatiality of knowledge and communication between these spaces provide insight into how to approach colonial connections and in how to position the movement of ideas, people and commodities in transnational contexts. Notably, Ballantyne has argued that the British Empire's connections should be considered as a web rather than as a wheel with a central hub and spokes. Ballantyne's emphasis here lies on the existence of not only 'vertical' lines of communication and movement of people and objects between the metropole and various colonies, but also the presence of 'horizontal' filaments between colonies that by-pass the metropole. This webbed structure enables viewing the British Empire as a complex structure with overlapping institutions, organisations, ideologies and discourses. These webs and overlapping constructions can have many hubs or nodes in which, for example, information was accumulated. Archives and libraries can be seen as such hubs.<sup>46</sup>

Ballantyne considers knowledge to be a central part of these webbed connections. For example, in regards to New Zealand's colonial history, he stresses that knowledge about the environment and Māori, including their traditions and social development, played central roles in British empire-building. In turn, such knowledge was relayed through the webs of Empire via translation, accommodation and improvisation, rather than through unproblematic transplantation.<sup>47</sup> These processes of translation, accommodation and improvisation, as termed by Ballantyne, provide an important perspective vi-à-vis how knowledge moved between different local contexts. Following this conceptualisation of webs consisting of various hubs and nodes with lines of communication between them, these kinds of hubs and their connections provide an analytic tool for examining the practices of information and knowledge moving that are collected and disseminated in this study.

This conceptualisation of such hubs originates from the sociologist Bruno Latour and his influential work *Science in Action*, in which he termed them 'centres of calculation'. In Latour's formulation, the centre of calculation in processes of collecting information acts both as a place of origin for the collecting as well as the place in which the information is successively gathered and processed. Pieces of

<sup>46</sup> Ballantyne 2012, 190.

<sup>47</sup> Ballantyne 2012, 6.

information are collected into the centres, where they are then processed and combined. As this processed knowledge also forms the basis for successive gathering of information, this forms what Latour calls 'cycles of accumulation'. Latour illustrates this view by providing an example of French ships journeying to China, with each subsequent returning ship providing new information including navigational information on the coastline of China for future voyages.<sup>48</sup> Latour's concept of centres of calculation has been adopted into discussions of networks and transfer of knowledge and provides a way of viewing how different actors gathered and processed information and knowledge in specific places.<sup>49</sup> Latour uses a very concrete example for his cycles of ships that set sail from and return to France, but this same idea also applies to other, more abstract forms of movement of knowledge. The mechanisms of accumulation and processing and the influence of previous knowledge inherent in the concept of centres of calculation can also be applied to viewing libraries and archives as centres of calculation, as Ballantyne views them as hubs.

In networks of communication these centres of calculation (also referred to as hubs and nodes) only capture part of the movement of knowledge and information. It is also necessary to take into account what happens between these hubs. To further problematise the movement and change in knowledge between these hubs, Ballantyne proposes a useful conceptualisation of the centripetal and centrifugal nature of movement within networks, or webs as Ballantyne terms them. The historian of empires John M. MacKenzie expressed an early conceptualisation of centripetal and centrifugal aspects of empire in 1984. He argued for further focus in imperial history on the centripetal effects of the Empire on Britain in contrast to the much-studied centrifugal effects of Britain on its empire.<sup>50</sup> For MacKenzie Britain was the centre from and to which effects flowed from other parts of the Empire. Ballantyne has applied these centripetal and centrifugal concepts to webs with numerous hubs which can be in the middle of centripetal and centrifugal processes. He has identified archives as repositories of different forms of knowledge and they had a dual function that encompassed centripetal and centrifugal movement:

At one level, archives are the product of centripetal processes, as various webs of correspondence, institutional exchanges, and publication networks draw material together into the archival space where it is collected, organized, and stored. But archives also have a centrifugal function: they are centers from which knowledge was distributed, whether through the act of reading, correspondence,

<sup>48</sup> Latour 1987, 215–224.

<sup>49</sup> See e.g. Lambert & Lester 2004; Wevers 2013; Wintroub 2017, 23.

<sup>50</sup> MacKenzie 1984, 1–2.

the intertextual nature of print culture, or the exchange of manuscript or printed material.<sup>51</sup>

This view of the relationships between nodes in networks of communication can also be applied in other processes of collecting and distributing knowledge. For example, in the communication between New Zealand and Britain different institutions and even individuals can be considered as hubs for the transfer of knowledge with centripetal and centrifugal functions. In other words, centripetal forces drew material together into hubs where they could be selected, combined or otherwise processed together. This occurred in imperial archives, lobby groups that gathered information for their influencing, missionary societies that received journals and updates from the mission field as well as with other networked actors. Then again centrifugal forces from these same hubs distributed the information or knowledge. Yet, it is notable that the material that was gathered could undergo significant change as it was gathered and processed in the hub. For example, the significance or content of what was gathered could differ to a greater or lesser extent from what was then communicated further. Thus, the concepts of centripetal and centrifugal processes illustrate different ways in which information and knowledge move. This implies different ways in which communication could impact knowledge itself. This also highlights that movement of knowledge also included creative processes.

This signifies that information and knowledge do not move in unchanging and simple ways; rather there are many directions in which they are constantly moving and changing due to that movement. This complex and changeable nature of knowledge in active and dynamic interactions between actors has also been illustrated by Kapil Raj's formulation and the successive theorisation of the circulation of knowledge.<sup>52</sup> Earlier, scholars in different fields have also theorised how movement and reception of knowledge are active and dynamic processes, for example, through conceptualisations of the horizon of expectation in literary reception aesthetics,<sup>53</sup> as well as arising from Stuart Hall's concepts of 'encoding' and 'decoding' in communication.<sup>54</sup> All these perspectives underline the dynamic nature of movement knowledge between actors, who have an active role in the movement of knowledge rather than passive diffusionist models.<sup>55</sup> These

<sup>51</sup> Ballantyne 2003, 102 & 113; see also Ballantyne 2012, 190.

<sup>52</sup> Raj 2007; Raj 2013, 342–343. For further discussion on the concept of circulation of knowledge see e.g. Keim 2014; Skurnik 2017; Östling et al. 2018.

<sup>53</sup> See e.g. Jauss 1982, 18–29.

<sup>54</sup> Hall, S. 1973; Procter 2004, 57–67.

<sup>55</sup> On the contrasts between more recent perspectives on the history of knowledge and diffusion models, see e.g. Bodensten 2020, 193–194 & 200–203; Brillman 2020, 37–40.

perspectives emphasise how the actors' expectations, preconceptions, intentions, surrounding cultural codes and conventions and other similar factors influence the changing nature and content of knowledge as it is negotiated and reconfigured, whether this is done consciously or not.

This dynamism in the movement of knowledge, together with Ballantyne's emphasis on the multiplicity of strands crisscrossing within networks, provides versatile tools for examining movement and formation of knowledge within global networks. A focus on centripetally and centrifugally moving knowledge helps spotlight the activity of specific actors, such as the Aborigines Committee and the NZA, and underlines their specific roles in the movement of knowledge and the dissemination of knowledge that could have had a real-life impact in political or other arenas. However, this focus does not raise these actors above any others. The hub that indicates centripetal or centrifugal transfer in networks is dependent on the perspective the historian takes to a given network. In individual historical cases, it is more than likely that there were many hubs that were active simultaneously. Thus, depending on the focus of a given study, any of these hubs could be highlighted as having been the centre of the centripetal and centrifugal processes. In this study, for example, I examine the Aborigines Committee, the NZA and different actors with whom these two sides were in interaction with as significant hubs.

To further pinpoint the focus of my study on individual strands within expansive networks of communication, I utilise the term *transfer* of knowledge to denote the movement of information or knowledge specifically between individual hubs in a relatively direct manner. Many terms adopted by scholars to conceptualise movement of knowledge have not become fully established in their meaning and scholars use them in different ways. In this study, I conceptualise movement of knowledge in a similar manner as Raj in his discussion of the circulation of knowledge. In a similar manner to Raj's discussion of circulation, I use transfer of knowledge to illustrate active participation by various actors in the movement, and, simultaneously, the reconfiguration of knowledge. This does not bear any implication of passive diffusion. My use of the term transfer within networks is also similar to Raj's assertion that '[b]y following the conduits and heterogeneous networks of exchange through which transfers of knowledge passed' his examination of spaces of circulation is able to examine the co-production of the local and the global.<sup>56</sup> Yet, to further clarify and make explicit the scale of the movement of knowledge in question, I signify a hierarchical difference in the scales between transfer, on the one hand, and terms such as movement or circulation, on the other hand. Whereas the terms 'movement' and 'circulation of knowledge' often appear

<sup>56</sup> Raj 2007, 20–22.

as signifying exchanges that can take place on a large scale and can pass through and link together numerous different hubs in networks, my use of transfer of knowledge indicates a smaller scale exchange that took place between two hubs. For example, whereas movement or circulation of knowledge can imply a more general meandering transit of knowledge from New Zealand through many different hubs to Britain, I use transfer of knowledge to pinpoint smaller parts of this process, such as the way knowledge was passed between the Church Missionary Society and the Aborigines Committee. Thus, while such transfer indicates a smaller scale in the movement of knowledge, these transfers between different nodes were linked together to form large scale networks. This illuminates pragmatically and clearly what takes place in the communication and formation of knowledge on a smaller scale, and allows for the detailed explication of the transformations and reconfigurations that took place in knowledge, while also examining these different actors as parts of the larger networks of communication.

The theoretical conceptualisations of networks and the movement of knowledge facilitated by them are central to this study. Tying these theoretical perspectives to practical colonial actions by various individuals in different contexts provides a multifaceted approach to early-19<sup>th</sup>-century colonialism. Ballantyne has repeatedly lamented the limited understanding in imperial history of the circulation of ideas and movement of information across the British Empire due to a continued delimitation of studies into strictly defined spaces, whether they be cities, districts or nations. Instead, he calls for more of an emphasis on the mobility of colonial knowledge, as well as a focus on the constant circulation of information and the heavy intertextuality of many forms of knowledge.<sup>57</sup> This wider focus on the movement of knowledge in imperial networks, which is applied to debates on colonising New Zealand in this study, can help to bind together various actors with each other. It can also enable scholars to uncover the multifaceted nature of colonialism that is often hidden by a focus on limited spaces or types of actors.

### New Zealand as a Space for Colonisation

In order to frame how the concept of knowledge and the conceptualisations of its movement in networks can be applied to New Zealand's precolonial history, I now turn to the historiography of New Zealand in relation to the British Empire. After briefly examining perspectives through which scholars have examined New Zealand's precolonial relations with the British Empire, I then look at the connections spanning New Zealand and Britain. In this latter part of the section, I

<sup>57</sup> Ballantyne 2003; Ballantyne 2012, 190–191.

will discuss different groups and actors that were involved in communication between New Zealand and Britain. I aim to view in more practical terms how different connections between New Zealand and Britain are currently understood based on recent historical studies. Here I will also examine what historiography has revealed about the Aborigines Committee and the NZA as lobby groups in the 1830s.

Influential works on British colonialism in New Zealand leading up to the official colonisation and the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 have shown the central role pieces of information trickling in from New Zealand played in the discussions that took place at the British Colonial Office. Works by Alan Ward, Peter Adams and Claudia Orange on the intentions and practical actions manifest in the British intervention in New Zealand have demonstrated how British conceptions of Māori and their character were pivotal in determining the dynamics of British imperial expansion to New Zealand. Both informal communications and official dispatches from New Zealand, often relating to the state of Māori, influenced how the Colonial Office and the British Crown approached different plans regarding New Zealand. The effects of European actions on Māori well-being, as well as on their sovereignty and rights, were central to British political discussions. Other considerations were notably also at play, such as economic benefit and the safety of British settlers.<sup>58</sup>

Another historiographical perspective to the early-19<sup>th</sup>-century New Zealand has focused on the interactions between Europeans and Māori in New Zealand before and after the signing of the Treaty. Significant works such as James Belich's *Making Peoples* and Anne Salmond's *Between Worlds* and *Tears of Rangi* shine a light on the different forms of contact and interaction that took place between Europeans and Māori in the early days of contact in New Zealand.<sup>59</sup> Thus, in the historiography the focus has been mainly on the two fronts of British expansion to New Zealand. On the one hand, these fronts constituted the interactions between Europeans and Māori in the New Zealand frontier and, on the other hand, the reception of communications and dispatches from New Zealand in the British colonial administration in London leading up to the Treaty of Waitangi. In the classic works on precolonial New Zealand, such as those by Ward, Adams and Orange, British political discussions and responses within the British government to new information arriving from New Zealand have been thoroughly examined. Equally, works on the interactions that took place in New Zealand have importantly raised to the fore the role and perspective of Māori in these interactions and uncovered the nature of power relations. Yet, the focus in these studies has been notably limited to New Zealand or the Pacific Ocean. The emphases on the two fronts reflects the past focus in imperial history to topics within current national borders.

<sup>58</sup> Ward, A. 1974; Adams, P. (1977) 2013; Orange (1987) 1997.

<sup>59</sup> Belich (1996) 2007; Salmond (1997) 2018; Salmond 2017.

More recently the colonial connections between New Zealand and different parts of the globe have brought new perspectives to the islands' precolonial and colonial history. Among this scholarship works by Ballantyne on precolonial New Zealand and the significance of European knowledge of the Māori body, European humanitarian narratives of Māori suffering and the practices of cross-cultural contact have significantly complemented earlier scholarship on New Zealand.<sup>60</sup> Historians have also directed further attention to the effects of humanitarianism in British early-19<sup>th</sup>-century colonial governance that followed late-18<sup>th</sup>-century exertions to abolish slavery.<sup>61</sup> From the late 18<sup>th</sup> century, British humanitarian thought was preoccupied with the morality of British society and the need to atone for domestic social issues as well as the colonial activities that had taken place across the world. This humanitarian concern was directed at finding humane solutions to crime, poverty and other social issues in Britain as well as delegitimising the inhumanity of slavery and later on to the well-being of indigenous peoples.<sup>62</sup> Alan Lester and Fae Dussart have pointed out that while scholars have acknowledged that humanitarian lobbying, especially by missionaries, was prominent in relation to British colonisation of Australia, New Zealand and southern Africa, humanitarian concern and action towards local and indigenous peoples in those areas was also influential in, and in differing degrees constitutive of, governance of these lands.<sup>63</sup> This kind of concern for indigenous peoples placed information regarding these people and the movement of this information in a significant role in political decision making.

While much work has been undertaken on colonial connections, this scholarship also underlines the need for further examination of the connections between the fronts of the New Zealand frontier and the British administrative responses to it. More specifically, what took place in the communication between these two fronts in the movement of knowledge on which political decision making was based can be further interrogated through a focus on knowledge and its use and movement. In addition to interactions in New Zealand and governmental responses in Britain, there were also other actors who mobilised knowledge concerning New Zealand, whose actions influenced the movement of knowledge.

<sup>60</sup> Ballantyne 2011; Ballantyne 2012; Ballantyne 2015; Ballantyne 2016. Ballantyne has also been critical of the simplified bicultural viewpoint of Māori-European-relations that is painted in historiography, which can ignore other cultures in New Zealand's history. For further discussion of this focus on interactions between Europeans and Māori, see Ballantyne 2012, 57.

<sup>61</sup> See e.g. Porter 1999; Evans et al. 2003; Lester & Dussart 2008; Skinner & Lester 2012; Lester & Dussart 2014; Edmonds & Johnston 2016; Elbourne 2016. For a wider perspective on the history and impact of humanitarian thought see Barnett, M. 2011; Simms & Trim 2011.

<sup>62</sup> Skinner & Lester 2012, 732–734.

<sup>63</sup> Lester & Dussart 2014, 1–2.

Influence campaigns by unofficial pressure groups in England have often been discussed as a part of the lead up to the drafting and signing of the Treaty of Waitangi. These groups were significant in relaying different pieces of information from various sources on New Zealand to the British colonial administration. The pressure groups involved in the political discussion on New Zealand's colonisation included mission societies and other evangelical groups that lobbied humanitarian grounds. On the other side of the debate there was also colonialist lobbying from the NZA. In addition to campaigning in Britain these groups were well connected with networks that spanned the globe, which emphasises their participation and role in the global movement of information. This global movement of information influenced, among other matters, British colonial politics. Alongside official British civil servants and governmental institutions such as the Colonial Office, these pressure groups allow us to look into how political decision making was informed. They rank as significant actors that need to be taken into consideration when examining the complexities of colonialism and its connections across the globe. The NZA and the humanitarian groups centred around the Select Committee on Aborigines are of particular interest within the framework of this study. I will now turn to looking more closely at how these groups, other actors that connected New Zealand and Britain and their activity in relation to British colonialism in New Zealand are understood according to current historical research.

The NZA was founded in 1837 with the aim of establishing colonies in New Zealand based on their own colonisation model. The NZA's colonisation plans drew on colonial theorist Edward Gibbon Wakefield's ideas of systematic colonisation. Wakefield proposed colonisation as a solution to Britain's demographic problems, such as poverty and the prevalence of crime. Wakefield was born into a Quaker farming family, but rather than focusing on humanitarian networks like many of the individuals connected to the Aborigines Committee, his life's work centred on colonial projects.<sup>64</sup> Wakefield's theories promoted mobility from Britain to new colonies in which a fair distribution of land was intended to ensure a successful colony. Wakefield worked resolutely in the NZA after having chaired the Association's inaugural meeting in May 1837. Members of the Association were mostly influential, often Whig patrons including Lord Durham and Lord Petre, as well as clergymen like Rev. Samuel Hinds and a number of Members of Parliament. Many of the NZA's founders considered themselves to be colonial reformers, approaching colonies as connected to and even offering potential solutions to issues blighting Britain. Peter Adams and Patricia Burns in particular have examined the NZA's interactions with the British colonial government in great detail, but have

<sup>64</sup> For more detailed look of Wakefield see Lester, Boehme & Mitchell, P. 2021, 73–76.

mostly limited their examination to communications within Britain. This provides a good understanding of how the NZA attempted to negotiate governmental support for their colonisation plans, but largely excludes the global processes of communication spanning the antipodes.<sup>65</sup>

The NZA did have prolonged and complicated negotiations with the British colonial administration in an attempt to receive support for their colonisation plans. By June 1837 members of the NZA had secured a meeting with Prime Minister Lord Melbourne and Lord Howick, the Secretary at War, to propose their plans. However, repeated objections by the Colonial Office led to problems moving forward with the plans. Central figures in the NZA felt that the Colonial Office and its permanent under-secretary James Stephen were liable to be hostile to such colonisation plans due to their close connections to missionary societies. The death of King William IV in June 1837 finally put an end to the NZA's attempts to present their plans to Parliament so that a Bill for colonising New Zealand could have been put forward. After further negotiations, the NZA drafted a new Bill to be presented to the Parliament. Again, the Colonial Office objected on the basis that Britain had no rights in New Zealand, which was in effect still considered to be an independent territory. Hence, the NZA would have required consent from Māori for their plans. Yet, by the end of 1837, the NZA's pressure campaign was bearing some fruit and they were offered a Crown charter to colonise New Zealand. The charter, however, presented the NZA with a serious problem since it would have required it to form a joint stock company so that they would have been liable to take full charge of the financial aspects of the new colony. Members of the NZA only wished to facilitate the colonisation without taking any financial risk. This and other minor problems caused the negotiations between the NZA and the government to collapse without a solution.<sup>66</sup>

Nonetheless, this was not the end to the colonisation schemes for many of the central figures in the NZA. By 1839 the Association had been reformed and renamed the New Zealand Colonization Company, and soon after the New Zealand Company (NZC), with many of the same individuals at the helm in 1839, such as E. G. Wakefield. Due to the possibility of future colonisation being hampered by interventions from the British Government, which would have resulted in the NZC having to buy the land needed for the colony from the Crown rather than directly from Māori and at a steeper price, the NZC decided to take action and send an expedition to New Zealand to begin founding a colony. E. G. Wakefield's brother

<sup>65</sup> Adams, P. (1977) 2013; Burns 1989. See also Hall, C. 2002, 28–30; Salesa 2013, 28–30; Ballantyne 2015, 239; Attwood 2020, 118–119. On Wakefield and his colonial theories more generally see Ballantyne 2014, 29–30, 32–33.

<sup>66</sup> Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 66–83; Burns 1989, 45–51 & 55–59; Attwood 2020, 123–124.

William Wakefield was appointed to command the expedition and the ship *Tory* set sail on 12 May 1839 to New Zealand to secure land purchases from Māori without an express permission of the government.<sup>67</sup> This was part of the final push that forced the British Government out of their inaction and led to the drafting and signing of the Treaty of Waitangi.

During the course of the negotiations in 1837, in addition to the personal negotiations with government officials, the NZA's plans for colonising New Zealand were also published and publicised through pamphlets and books. These became a much-used medium for the NZA and other similar groups in the following decades. According to author Philip Temple, in the following 15 years the NZA, its successor NZC and other Wakefield-initiated associations and companies published nearly 200 books and pamphlets.<sup>68</sup> Wakefield had also previously used the strategy of publishing works that promoted his colonial plans in advocating for the colonisation of South Australia.<sup>69</sup> This form of political lobbying, which involved the dissemination of printed texts, had been taking place since at least from the 16<sup>th</sup> century, but it became particularly varied and sophisticated by the 18<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>70</sup> The NZA's plans were first put into print after the Association's inaugural meeting in 1837 in a pamphlet entitled *A Statement of the Objects of the New Zealand Association*.<sup>71</sup> Later that same year the NZA published anonymously a book by E. G. Wakefield and John Ward, the secretary of the NZA, titled *The British Colonization of New Zealand* as an extended explication and promotion of their plans. *The British Colonization* largely consisted of presenting the NZA's plan and arguments for colonising New Zealand.<sup>72</sup> To argue for the feasibility of and need for this colonial action, the book consisted of a variety of textual material, which Wakefield and Ward had gathered and presented as pieces of evidence about the state and character of Māori in New Zealand as well as detailed descriptions of the islands and their natural produce. According to Temple, Wakefield and Ward's presentation of the NZA's plans balanced the need to attract investors and emigrants to the NZA's

<sup>67</sup> Burns 1989, 72–77 & 84–88.

<sup>68</sup> Temple 2012, chapter 13.

<sup>69</sup> See *The New British Province of South Australia* 1834.

<sup>70</sup> Raven 2000, 14.

<sup>71</sup> *A Statement of the Objects of the New Zealand Association. With some particulars concerning the position, extent, soil and climate, natural productions, and natives of New Zealand* 1837.

<sup>72</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand; being an account of the principles, objects, and plans of the New Zealand Association; together with particulars concerning the position, extent, soil and climate, natural productions, and native inhabitants of New Zealand. With charts and illustrations* 1837.

plans and the humanitarian spirit of the time when moral views within the Colonial Office were reinforced by the lobbying of missionary societies.<sup>73</sup>

Reflecting the humanitarian spirit prominent in early-19<sup>th</sup>-century Britain, much of *The British Colonization* was devoted to examining Māori. Wakefield and Ward expressed concern for the well-being of Māori in *The British Colonization*. They also outlined, that the NZA's colonisation would not only be moral and systematic, but also that its objectives relating to Māori sought 'to civilize as well as to colonize'.<sup>74</sup> The notion of redeeming and civilising indigenous and enslaved peoples was closely bound up with the humanitarian view of protecting these people in New Zealand, as well as in New South Wales and the Caribbean, for example.<sup>75</sup> This approach to civilising was one example of the outward expressions of apparent humanitarian concern that coloured the whole of Wakefield and Ward's work, along with an apparent concern for the safety and well-being of Māori and an indictment of European actions that were presented as having been harmful to Māori.

Despite the appearance of humanitarian concern, mission societies such as the Church Missionary Society (CMS) opposed the NZA's colonisation plans from the outset. As opposition to the NZA's plans of systematic colonisation, various missionary societies and evangelical groups, including the Aborigines Committee, advocated the preservation of Māori legal independence alongside encouraging Māori to adopt British ways of life through missionary influence.<sup>76</sup> As a pressure group the CMS has been described as the British government's conscience through its promotion of humanitarian ideals related to its foreign mission.<sup>77</sup> Thomas Fowell Buxton was a central figure around British colonial politics at the time and he was also closely connected with missionary societies and other British evangelical groups. Buxton was an MP from a Quaker background and was involved in many influential evangelical circles. He was centrally involved in the early-19<sup>th</sup>-century abolitionist movement and was a member of the second generation of the so-called Clapham Sect, a group of early-19<sup>th</sup>-century politically influential activists of humanitarian, abolitionist and evangelical disposition.<sup>78</sup> James Stephen of the Colonial Office also had close family ties to the Clapham Sect.<sup>79</sup> In addition to his abolitionist work, Buxton was also centrally involved with British colonial politics

<sup>73</sup> Temple 2012, chapter 13.

<sup>74</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 42.

<sup>75</sup> Lester & Dussart 2008, 212–213; Lester 2011, 137; Lester 2016, 502.

<sup>76</sup> Hickford 2006, 130.

<sup>77</sup> Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 63–67.

<sup>78</sup> Lester 2008, 65–66; Blouet 2010; Mitchell, J. 2011, 14–15.

<sup>79</sup> For more detail on James Stephen's background see Lester, Boehme & Mitchell, P. 2021, 20–22. See also Lester 2002a, 29.

due to his leading role in the Parliamentary Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements).

Humanitarianism arose as a significant force in Britain in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. The cultural anthropologist Talal Asad connects the emergence of 19th-century humanitarianism to the global reach of European nations which led to new interactions with peoples across the world. The combination of Enlightenment imperatives to reduce suffering, together with perceptions of more and less ‘civilised’ peoples and theological ideas of converting people resulted in compassionate and humanitarian interest in helping these peoples.<sup>80</sup> Quakers were particularly active in early-19th-century humanitarianism and one of the most pronounced effects of their networks and their humanitarian endeavour were the late-18th- and early-19th-century antislavery campaigns. After abolitionist campaigns had achieved some success, although the antislavery work was not finished, humanitarian concern was redirected more towards the well-being of indigenous peoples, of which the Aborigines Committee is a central example.<sup>81</sup> These humanitarian concerns were a powerful force in directing early-19th-century British political thought, or at the very least the rhetoric appearance of it in public discourse.

The Committee’s recommendations rested on humanitarianism and the ‘relations of peace and mutual good understanding’. Lester notes that the risk of Māori genocide and corruption by European settlers acted as a call for action in New Zealand.<sup>82</sup> The Committee considered missionaries as the main agents of defending indigenous peoples such as Māori.<sup>83</sup> The historian Elizabeth Elbourne has indicated that the Committee’s recommendations called for stricter control of interactions with indigenous people from the executive government in London, including curtailing treaties with indigenous peoples, limiting work contracts with and purchase of land from indigenous peoples and the banning sale of alcohol to them.<sup>84</sup>

While many of the report’s recommendations were not adopted, the Committee’s work laid foundations for establishing the Aborigines Protection Society and it has been considered a high point in humanitarian influence in British politics in the 18th and 19th centuries.<sup>85</sup> The impetus for appointing the Committee arose from a war that took place in 1834–35 in the Cape Colony between Xhosa and British settlers. From his humanitarian background and connections to missionaries in the Cape, Buxton wished to have a committee look into humanitarian allegations about harmful

<sup>80</sup> Asad 2015.

<sup>81</sup> See Porter 1999, 201–207; Edmonds & Johnston 2016.

<sup>82</sup> Lester 2001, 111.

<sup>83</sup> Porter 2005, 52; Elbourne 2003a.

<sup>84</sup> Elbourne 2003a.

<sup>85</sup> Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 65; Lester 2001, 109–123; Laidlaw 2004, 1.

policies instigated against Xhosa and other local people in the Cape. The war in the colony and the death of Xhosa paramount Hintsa gave Buxton the leverage to push his personal connections within the British government. Consequently, in 1835, the House of Commons set up the Aborigines Committee.<sup>86</sup> According to its orders, the Committee were appointed to

consider what Measures ought to be adopted with regard to the Native Inhabitants of Countries where British Settlements are made, and to the neighbouring Tribes, in order to secure to them the due observance of Justice and the protection of their Rights; to promote the spread of Civilization among them, and to lend them to the peaceful and voluntary reception of the Christian Religion.<sup>87</sup>

Select committees were used plentifully in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century, but their impact was often limited due to the brevity of many of their reports. In the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, the reports from select committees were often more expansive,<sup>88</sup> of which the Aborigines Committee's report is a prime example. Reflecting Buxton's interest in southern Africa much of the Committee's work and eventual report focused on the Cape Colony. However, also included in the Committee's work were Canada, Newfoundland, New South Wales, Van Diemen's Land and New Zealand and South Sea Islands. Although New Zealand and Pacific islands were not under British control, they were included as areas where a significant number of British subjects were in contact with indigenous inhabitants.

Over the course of two years, the Committee gathered witness testimony from across the British colonies on matters pertaining to settler abuses of indigenous peoples and the state of indigenous peoples in those areas. Buxton's chairmanship of the Committee allowed it to be shaped by his connections within the evangelical and humanitarian circles. The Committee mainly consisted of Buxton's friends and supporters including his son-in-law, Andrew Johnston. The Committee also included Sir Rufane Donkins and William Gladstone, who had a more pro-settler stance. Zoë Laidlaw has shown that Buxton's cousin Anna Gurney and daughter Priscilla Johnston (née Buxton) also had central roles in collecting and processing information before and after the Committee hearings, although they were not official members.

<sup>86</sup> For a more detailed account into how the Committee was appointed see Lester 2001, 106–109; Laidlaw 2004, 3–4.

<sup>87</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 3.

<sup>88</sup> Eastwood 1989, 285. Eastwood has calculated that there were 353 parliamentary select committees in the final 40 years of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. See Eastwood 1994, 193.

Buxton's close management of the Committee strongly directed it towards humanitarian and pro-missionary ideals.<sup>89</sup>

For a comprehensive examination of the actors and networks in the background of official British colonial decision making, in addition to the lobby groups attempting to directly influence the British administration, it is also necessary to take into consideration the multitudinous connections that existed between the antipodes of Britain and New Zealand. These connections served as crucial nodes in the communication that allowed the Aborigines Committee and the NZA to claim knowledge of Māori. Early in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, descriptions of and stories involving Māori began to trickle into Britain. Sporadic pieces of information from New Zealand began to slowly accumulate. Compared to other areas, such as parts of Africa and Asia, the trickle of information was irregular. In the early decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, New Zealand was not the focus of any concerted or systematic exploration. As the historian Paul Moon has illustrated, the early European voyages in New Zealand were mostly 'individuals caught up in the disorder of everyday life in the antipodes'. As participants in the networks of communication between New Zealand and Britain these individuals often travelled around New Zealand. During these travels they made exploratory remarks on their surroundings and some published books and journals that not only described their travels but also provided descriptions of the spaces, people and surroundings they observed with varying perspectives on New Zealand.<sup>90</sup> These accounts formed a substantial part of the body of information on New Zealand and the Māori that was available in Britain in the 1830s.

The nature of the travel to New Zealand was sporadic with some travellers and authors of travelogues visiting and writing about New Zealand only briefly on their journeys, as it was not the main destination on their voyages. It can be difficult to conclusively determine, therefore, the number and extent of European travel to and travel writings on New Zealand. In his work *The Voyagers*, which covers a reasonably extensive list of European travellers, who later published works of their travels in New Zealand, Moon has catalogued 22 European travellers between 1805 and 1859. Thus, this excludes Captain James Cook and other 18<sup>th</sup> century explorers. Moon has categorised these travellers based on their professions and reasons for travelling into five rough and slightly overlapping groups: soldiers and sailors, travellers and settlers, missionaries, artists and, following the signing of the Treaty,

<sup>89</sup> Buxton's significant allies included Charles Lushington, Joseph Pease, Edward Baines, John Plumtree and Sir George Grey. See Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 65; Lester 2001, 109–110; Laidlaw 2004; Ballantyne 2011, 249–254; Lester & Dussart 2014, 30–31.

<sup>90</sup> Moon 2014, 9–11.

officials.<sup>91</sup> While this is not a comprehensive list, as Moon excludes Daniel Tyerman and George Bennet, for example, who between 1821 and 1829 travelled across the world and also discussed New Zealand in their published travel account,<sup>92</sup> it is indicative of the limited, yet increasing, extent of European travel to New Zealand between the late 18<sup>th</sup> century and the 1830s.

In addition to travel writers, other Europeans, whose presence in New Zealand is notable, were missionaries and beachcombers, such as sailors, whalers and sealers. Adams has calculated that in 1831 the number of missionary personnel in the CMS's four mission stations amounted to 29 adults and 54 children. These were located around the Bay of Islands in the northern part of the North Island of New Zealand, where the mission endeavours of the CMS were focused. Additionally, the Wesleyan Missionary Society (WMS) established a station in Māngungu on the Hokianga River, which was staffed by three missionaries and their families.<sup>93</sup> Much of the emphasis on communication relating to New Zealand centred on the northern parts of New Zealand. Those were the areas most populated by Europeans. They were also the areas that were the focus of most of the information that was available in Britain. Whereas missionaries kept journals and corresponded with their parent societies, which was one of the most voluminous sources of textual information on New Zealand,<sup>94</sup> other visitors, such as the crews and minor officers of ships typically left less of a mark in historical and archival material. From the late 18<sup>th</sup> century, various sailors, whalers, sealers and escaped convicts made their way to New Zealand, with some settling in the islands.<sup>95</sup> Typically very little textual material was produced by these individuals.<sup>96</sup> Ballantyne notes that ship owners did not wish to publicise their activities and sealers might not have been enthusiastic writers, but their experiences in New Zealand did circulate at least among seafarers. Thus, they did contribute to the cartographic understanding of New Zealand's coastline.<sup>97</sup>

Māori visitors to Britain also constituted a significant source of information on New Zealand. Relatively much was written about these travellers, but they themselves produced little textual material. After contact between Māori and Europeans began, from the late 18<sup>th</sup> century and the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Māori were quick to utilise the possibility of travelling from New Zealand to

<sup>91</sup> Moon 2014.

<sup>92</sup> See Maxwell & Roberts 2014, 51–57.

<sup>93</sup> The CMS's four stations in 1831 were Rangihoua, Kerikeri, Paihia and Waimate. See Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 4–6.

<sup>94</sup> Ballantyne 2011, 236.

<sup>95</sup> For examination of early whalers, sealers and convicts in New Zealand see Belich (1996) 2007, 127–134; Ballantyne 2012, 126–138.

<sup>96</sup> Belich (1996) 2007, 132 & 137.

<sup>97</sup> Ballantyne 2012, 130.

Australia and even to Europe in order to secure for themselves desirable contact with Europeans. Dozens of individuals seized this opportunity in the early decades of contact with Europeans. Many returned to their native land bringing new tools, weapons and ideas. This encouraged further interest among Māori groups to travel to Australia and Britain in order to secure similar benefits for themselves. Europeans often perceived that Māori visitors were simply full of wonder for the great European civilisations. However, the Māori travellers were mostly seeking to learn and observe what could potentially be useful for themselves and to facilitate trade that offered them benefits.<sup>98</sup> What followed from all this global movement by Western and Māori people alike was an increasing library of textual material on New Zealand that added to the few sources that were available in Europe.

Following this increasing level of interaction and communication, Māori became a significant object of knowing for interested British parties. The flow of information and the attention directed at Māori as a people<sup>99</sup> are related to a paradox in the climate of early-19<sup>th</sup>-century British attitudes towards indigenous peoples identified by Lester and Dussart. There was humanitarian concern for ‘less fortunate’ indigenous peoples, while at the same time ‘hundreds of thousands of Britons were encouraged to invade and occupy indigenous people’s lands’ and the British government assumed a right to colonise those lands.<sup>100</sup> In a similar vein there also appears a paradox of a kind in New Zealand’s impending colonisation in the 1830s in how Māori as indigenous peoples were taken into consideration. At a time of general British colonial expansion when the British government considered it their right to spread out and colonise new lands, Māori as well as the effects of British colonisation on Māori were prominently raised in British political discussions relating to New Zealand instead of being outright dismissed. Both the Aborigines Committee and the NZA paid plenty of attention to Māori in their argumentation from their particular perspectives of humanitarian missionary-centred focus and colonial interests respectively. Consequently, important questions concern the roles of indigenous peoples like Māori and the claimed knowledge about them in British colonialism.

## 1.2 Research Questions and Aims

The aim of this study is to examine the processes of communication and formation of knowledge related to British colonial projects in the 1830s that were focused on

<sup>98</sup> Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 140–155; O'Malley 2015.

<sup>99</sup> Notably, Māori were mostly discussed in European texts in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century as one people without acknowledging the Māori societal structures of *hapū* and *iwi*, for example.

<sup>100</sup> Lester & Dussart 2014, 1.

New Zealand. This aim of illuminating the communication as well as the formation and use of knowledge related to the debates on New Zealand in the late 1830s also provides further understanding of why and how Māori featured so centrally in this argumentation about New Zealand's possible colonisation and what the role of knowledge claims about Māori was in the political decision making. Altogether, the knowledge claims about Māori made by the Aborigines Committee and the NZA appeared central to their arguments on the respective sides of the debate. It is significant that Māori were acknowledged as a diplomatic party in the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, in contrast to how Australian Aborigines were viewed, for example.<sup>101</sup> However, Māori as a people appeared as an important factor to be considered in the arguments and discussions about the future of New Zealand, even in these more wide-ranging political discussions. This places understanding claimed knowledge about Māori into a crucial role in the examination of precolonial New Zealand and the mechanisms related to knowledge in colonialism.

Māori as a people, their state and character became topics that were discussed with the use of various source materials from New Zealand. Thus, claims related to them were presented as proven and appeared as something that could supposedly be known by individuals in London without having visited New Zealand. However, such 'knowing' of Māori and New Zealand from London entailed complex interplays of sources, actors taking part in networks of communication, goals and the interests of those presenting the knowledge claims and other such factors spanning the globe. The trans-antipodean communication facilitated and resulted in the formation of knowledge claims by the two sides of the debate in Britain, and it is therefore central for understanding how something was claimed to be known or proven. Examining this communication also further illuminates two sides of the debates that presented markedly differing views of what action was to be taken in New Zealand. Hence, in this study I investigate trans-antipodean processes through which information originating from New Zealand was formed into knowledge claims and used in political argumentation to provide support for the differing sides of the debate by the Aborigines Committee and the NZA.

To understand processes involved in forming knowledge claims and the use of those claims as supposedly credible argumentation for colonial action, I approach the debates on colonising New Zealand by posing the following key questions: Why could certain claims relating to Māori made by the two sides appear as credible knowledge in their contexts and what basis did they provide for the practical

<sup>101</sup> See e.g. Standfield 2018. It is however also notable that the Treaty contained many problems among which one was that not all Māori kin groups signed it or were offered the opportunity to sign it. For this and other problems in and current application of the Treaty of Waitangi see e.g. Jones & Hickford 2018.

argumentation on New Zealand? How were knowledge claims about Māori used in different arguments relating to proposed action in New Zealand and why was it possible for diverging lines of argumentation to emerge from similar sources? Answering these expansive questions requires detailed analysis of the processes of communication and movement of knowledge spanning New Zealand and Britain as well as the ways in which the Aborigines Committee and the NZA presented their respective argumentation. As a part of this detailed analysis, I will pose further auxiliary questions at the beginning of the following chapters. These questions provide a fresh perspective on the early stages of British colonisation of New Zealand that have been the subject of historical inquiry for a long time. Yet, more specifically knowledge is the main object of examination in this study. Moreover, by focusing on these questions that arise from the history of knowledge, I call attention to knowledge as a phenomenon that can shed light on and explain mechanisms and practical functioning of colonialism.

As the main objects of my investigation, the Aborigines Committee and the NZA provide two differing perspectives on what was considered necessary for the British to do vis-à-vis the situation in New Zealand. They were inherently intertwined in their use of similar sources and some similarity in their knowledge claims on Māori despite their rather opposite propositions for action in New Zealand. Beyond simply comparing the plans and claims presented by these two sides, examining these two sides alongside each other sheds light on the multifaceted nature of communication and formation of knowledge in colonial projects. This is particularly due to the convergences in how their knowledge claims were formed in their works based on global communication as well as divergences in their approaches to settler colonialism.

The close publication of these two sides' significant works during the time of the debate on New Zealand's colonisation makes them particularly fruitful for examining together as two sides of the same debate. My study concentrates on the 1830s with a particular focus on the argumentation in the years preceding the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840. Both sides published their key works on New Zealand in 1837 and drove the debate on the topic forward. Much of the general discussion on the possible colonisation of New Zealand took place particularly in the late 1830s. I consider the sailing of the *Tory* in September 1839 as marking a significant point after which the debates on New Zealand took a different course, with more immediate action having been required of the British colonial administration. I therefore limit my examination to the period preceding the departure of the *Tory*.

Considering the locality and situatedness of knowledge, which has arisen as a significant theme in historiography related to knowledge, I specifically emphasise the claims made by the two sides of the debate specifically as *claims* to knowledge.

In my examination of these knowledge claims, I emphasise that the presentation of supposedly proven knowledge arose from a particular background or perspective. This also underlines more generally the need to be mindful of whose knowledge or claim to knowledge is being discussed. As an ethical matter, this sensitivity to situated knowledge claims also underlines that the “knowledges” presented in London in the 1830s did not constitute objective knowledge of New Zealand, but rather situated British views that emerged from an imperial context. In contrast, contemporary Māori had different interests and objects for knowing and their knowledge of the same topics was in all likelihood drastically different.

In terms of British colonialism in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, I also aim to provide a more expansive examination of how colonialism was discussed and argued from perspectives beyond the sphere of official colonial decision making inside the Colonial Office, which has been the topic of much historiographical research. My focus on the Aborigines Committee, the NZA and these groups’ central figures provides a starting point to uncovering such diverse perspectives. The Aborigines Committee was appointed by the House of Commons and it included several MPs. There were also MPs in the NZA. Yet, within the wider sphere of British colonial politics of the 1830s these sides appear as background lobbyists attempting to influence official policies. The members of both groups had no direct or official roles in the functioning of the Colonial Office or other strands of colonial decision making. From this approach to knowledge, the coexistent, competing and connected attempts to create credible and seemingly proven knowledge claims and lines of argumentation with their divergences and convergences in order to influence British colonial politics provide a window into the many sides of British colonialism.

Bruce Buchan and Linda Andersson Burnett have also recently called for further work on ‘lesser-known’ colonial actors, such as physicians, botanists, missionaries and merchants and their roles in diverse global settings.<sup>102</sup> Along these lines, this study aims to bring together different actors and groups with differing perspectives to colonial action, including the two sides of the Aborigines Committee and the NZA, but also missionaries and other individuals that took part in the communication spanning New Zealand and Britain. This nuanced perspective also ties colonial writing to more concrete colonial practices and their significance and impact on practical colonial projects. This kind of interaction between travel writing and colonial practices has been called for by the historical geographer Cole Harris.<sup>103</sup> This nuanced approach and the examination of the argumentation which the different sides of the debate on New Zealand used for exerting practical influence on British colonial policies brings to the fore the connections that can be traced between the

<sup>102</sup> Buchan & Andersson Burnett 2019, 3–4.

<sup>103</sup> Harris 2004, 165.

more theoretical aspects of colonial writing and the practical actions of settling and otherwise colonising new lands.

### 1.3 Material, Methods and Outline of the Study

#### Material

I use a variety of textual material to examine the movement and formation of knowledge that was created in the communication spanning New Zealand and Britain in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. This material consists of texts on New Zealand that were mostly published in Britain as well as correspondence and formal documents that provide background to both the communication between the antipodes and the formation of knowledge by different groups in Britain.

The most significant starting points for this study are two published texts that were central to the efforts by the Aborigines Committee and the NZA to influence British colonial administration. These are the Aborigines Committee's final report published in 1837 under the name *The Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* and *The British Colonization of New Zealand*, which was published by the NZA in the same year. Both publications were based on information on New Zealand that the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward respectively gathered and compiled. The information derived from various sources and ranged from witness testimonies before the Aborigines Committee to travelogues on New Zealand that had been published in the preceding decades and letters sent by missionaries to their respective societies, some of which had also been published by the societies. I approach these works as the outcomes of formation of knowledge about New Zealand by the two sides. In these works, the two sides formulated their arguments and knowledge claims on New Zealand for proposing their respective plans for action in New Zealand.

The Aborigines Committee's report consisted of 86 core pages together with over 600 pages of evidence and the minutes of the testimonies gathered by the Committee over the previous two years. Despite the close control Buxton exerted over the Committee, the pro-settler inclined members pushed him to include additional evidence defending the settlers in the Cape in the Committee's proceedings.<sup>104</sup> After the parliamentary session ended in 1836, the Committee presented a brief preliminary report to the House of Commons along with the 'Minutes of Evidence'. They also requested the re-appointment of the Committee in the next parliamentary session, due to the large volume of evidence they had

<sup>104</sup> Lester 2001, 109–110; Laidlaw 2004, 4–5; Ballantyne 2011, 250–251.

collated.<sup>105</sup> The report proper was subsequently drafted by the Chairman, Buxton, as was typical at the time. As noted above, he received much help from his cousin, Anna Gurney, who wrote much of the report. In addition, his daughter Priscilla was also closely engaged in the work of the Committee. Once the report was drafted it was also read by Buxton's allies, including the missionaries John Philip and William Ellis. This indicates the close control Buxton and his inner circle had on the Committee's final work. This had the effect that humanitarian, evangelical and missionary biases were brought to the fore in the report.<sup>106</sup> Generally, 18<sup>th</sup>-century and early-19<sup>th</sup>-century select committees were criticised for reporting little more than echoes of the views of their chairmen. Also, in 1837 a member of the Statistical Society of London criticised select committees for their lack of statistical information. Like the Aborigines Committee, select committees typically relied on the evidence of volunteers who came to give their evidence. Some contemporaries criticised this practice as producing reports 'contaminated with opinions and theories'.<sup>107</sup>

Despite such biases, the final report of the Aborigines Committee was published and presented to the House of Commons in June 1837. It included individual examination of the state of the different areas being analysed, with New Zealand discussed alongside other Pacific islands under the title South Sea Islands. This was followed by a section entitled 'Effects of fair dealing and Christian Instruction' followed by the Committee's conclusions and suggestions. The Committee's reporting was presented as resting on evidence gathered in witness testimonies and the report's marginalia included detailed references to individual pieces of testimony in the Minutes of Evidence included in the 1836 and 1837 reports.

Wakefield and Ward's *The British Colonization*, on the other hand, was a much less formally structured and drafted work. Similar to Wakefield's other works at the time, the text was published anonymously. Wakefield's notable work on his colonial theories, *A Letter from Sydney*, was published while Wakefield was incarcerated.<sup>108</sup> Anonymity allowed his work to be published without any controversies concerning his reputation. *The British Colonization* drew on the same colonial ideas as presented in *A Letter* and its publication strategy followed suit.<sup>109</sup> Two parts of *The British*

<sup>105</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1836*, iii; see also Laidlaw 2004, 5.

<sup>106</sup> Laidlaw 2004, 5, *passim*.

<sup>107</sup> Eastwood 1989, 277, 285 & 286.

<sup>108</sup> Wakefield was incarcerated in Newgate Prison for abducting Ellen Turner, the 15-year-old daughter of a rich manufacturer. Wakefield hoped to marry Turner to further his political standing, but the plan backfired. See Ballantyne 2014, 31.

<sup>109</sup> Ballantyne 2014, 29 & 42. See also Burns 1989, 47. *The British Colonization of New Zealand* is often mistakenly attributed to E. G. Wakefield's son Edward Jerningham

*Colonization* were written by Dr Samuel Hinds and Rev. Montague Hawtrey, two clergymen sympathetic to the NZA's plans.<sup>110</sup> The role of the book was generally to advertise the NZA's plans for prospective settlers and backers. Philip Temple characterises it as 'an attractive and entertainingly instructive book about New Zealand' which was a part of establishing 'a propaganda image of New Zealand as a green, pleasant and fertile land, sparsely populated with friendly natives and ideally suited for the foundation of an antipodean Britain'.<sup>111</sup> The historian Erik Olssen remarks that most historians in the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century have seen the NZA's *The British Colonization* as a somewhat dishonest attempt to avoid evangelical criticism for the NZA's colonisation plans.<sup>112</sup>

Applying Wakefieldian colonisation theories to New Zealand, *The British Colonization* consisted of several relatively brief chapters outlining Wakefield's theories, the state of New Zealand and characterisations of Māori. It also included a presentation of how New Zealand was a suitable space for colonisation based on their claims of the character of Māori. After these chapters (almost 70 pages in length), a part entitled 'Description of New Zealand' made up the remainder and the majority of the book. In this part, which was divided into seven sections, many of the arguments about colonising New Zealand were elaborated upon in greater detail and these parts consisted to a large degree of quotations and extracts from various textual sources on New Zealand, including published travel accounts, missionary journals and even the Aborigines Committee's report of 1837. These sections were often referred to in *The British Colonization* as 'evidence' and 'proof' for what was presented in the book, underlining the nature of the claims made by Wakefield and Ward as claims to knowledge.

Little research has been carried out on examining *The British Colonization* specifically as a medium of communication and political argumentation. In addition, apart from a few more detailed and up-close examinations, the Aborigines Committee and its report have largely been confined to footnote references in studies on British colonialism. The most prominent examinations of the Committee's report are Laidlaw's study of the Committee and the Buxton women's role with it and Alan

Wakefield. However, archival material from the NZA and Edward Gibbon Wakefield make it evident that Edward Gibbon was the other main author alongside John Ward. See also Ward, A. W. 2009.

<sup>110</sup> In October 1837, Wakefield wrote to his sister Catherine Torlesse about *The British Colonization* and noted Hinds as the author of the chapter entitled 'Religious Settlement' and Hawtrey as the author of an Appendix. See Letter from Edward Gibbon Wakefield to Catherine Torlesse, 12 October 1837, Wakefield, E. G., Wakefield family papers 1815–1853, Micro-MS-Coll-20-1887, ATL.

<sup>111</sup> Temple 2012, chapter 13.

<sup>112</sup> Olssen 1997, 212.

Lester and Claire McLisky's studies of the report from the perspective of humanitarian sentiment and discourse. Lastly, Elizabeth Elbourne has studied the report from the perspective of Australia and its reception by Australian settlers.<sup>113</sup> Yet, beyond these studies, both the Aborigines Committee's report and *The British Colonization* have only been accorded brief individual remarks or have been mentioned in passing as examples of humanitarian political discourse of British colonialism without any deeper analysis of their formation or the epistemic background of their argumentation.<sup>114</sup>

In this study, I focus on the time period before the sailing of the *Tory*. The Aborigines Committee is the only parliamentary committee related to New Zealand that I examine closely. Later parliamentary committee reports on New Zealand were published in 1840, for which Wakefield also testified, and in 1844. While these continued the discussions on colonising New Zealand, their context is already very different than the works examined in this study.<sup>115</sup> There was also a further report in 1838 on New Zealand from the Select Committee of the House of Lords with extensive Minutes of Evidence. However, as this committee's report consisted of less than one page, it provides little perspective on the formation knowledge based on gathered sources along the lines of the Aborigines Committee's report for this study.<sup>116</sup>

I utilise a wide range of archival material and published texts in order to uncover the trans-antipodean communication that facilitated the gathering of information for and the formation of knowledge in these publications. On the one hand, the archival sources provide background to the formation and use of knowledge claims in the two publications. On the other hand, they illustrate what information on New Zealand was available in Britain in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century and how information on Māori moved from New Zealand across networks to be eventually used by the Aborigines Committee and by Wakefield and Ward. First, archival material of the NZA's records, personal papers of E. G. Wakefield and similar material of the Aborigines Committee and T. F. Buxton provide background information on the two publications. The records on the Aborigines Committee and the NZA's work shed light on the discussions that took place in the background of the actual publications.

<sup>113</sup> Lester 2000; McLisky 2015; Elbourne 2003a. Ballantyne has also included the Aborigines Committee in his examinations of humanitarian narratives and bodily suffering. However, he has not focused specifically on the Aborigines Committee or the report. See Ballantyne 2011; Ballantyne 2016.

<sup>114</sup> See e.g. Olssen 1997; Samson 1998; Porter 1999; Dalziel 1999; Porter 2005; Lester 2008; Rutz 2008; Mitchell, J. 2011; Lester & Dussart 2014; Edmonds & Johnston 2016.

<sup>115</sup> On these later reports see e.g. Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 155; Birchall 2021.

<sup>116</sup> See *Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords appointed to inquire into the Present State of the Islands of New Zealand* 1838.

The personal papers of the two central figures, Wakefield and Buxton, provide glimpses into the private communications that influenced the formation of the presented knowledge claims. This material also provides indications regarding the interests and objects of the two sides in the formation of their claimed knowledge about Māori, as well as their argumentation on New Zealand and their publications. Copies of the NZA's records are mostly preserved in the Alexander Turnbull Library in New Zealand and papers on the Aborigines Committee and T. F. Buxton are stored in the Bodleian Library at the University of Oxford in the UK.

Second, archival and published material that originated from New Zealand and circulated in networks that stretched to Britain is crucial for understanding the early communication and transfer of knowledge between the antipodes. Prominent in this material were letters and journals from missionaries stationed in New Zealand. These were often sent to their parent societies and were a means to inform the societies of the progress of the missionary work in New Zealand. Much of this fragmentary material has been collected to the Alexander Turnbull Library and the British National Archives. Due to the missionaries' position at the forefront of the British Empire's frontier and the relative lack of textual material from other European settlers, the missionaries' communications were some of the earliest pieces of information on New Zealand that were available in Britain. There were also published travel accounts from travellers who had visited New Zealand that circulated in Europe. I also utilise dispatches from colonial officials in New South Wales to the Colonial Office, which are preserved in the British National Archives, in order to have a well-rounded view of the transfer of knowledge between the antipodes. But as my focus is outside official governmental work and these dispatches had less impact outside government than missionary and travel accounts had, my focus is less on these official papers. Despite the focus in this study being on the debates on New Zealand that took place in the 1830s, much of the archival sources used in this study date from earlier in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. These sources were used for the formation of knowledge in the debates of the 1830s and hence, form a significant part of study. For clarity's sake, I designate the time period from the beginning of the century to the end of the 1830s as the early 19<sup>th</sup> century.

A unique source in this communication is the Minutes of Evidence that were included in the 1836 and 1837 reports from Aborigines Committee. These were transcriptions of the oral witness interviews before the Committee that made up the majority of the evidence they gathered. The Committee transcribed the interviews into the reports. It is possible that they were edited based on the same biases as the Committee had more generally. However, the Committee's proceedings were generally carefully orchestrated by Buxton, which means that any bias was generally already built into the Committee's proceedings, starting from the witnesses that were called to be interviewed. Also, the evidence from the extra witnesses pushed by

Donkin and Gladstone were included in the Minutes, signifying that drastic editing of the Minutes was not in all likelihood undertaken. As such, the Minutes included in the reports appear as the most accurate sources for the testimonies before the Committee that are available.

## Methods

In this work I focus on uncovering processes that affected the transfer and formation of knowledge across both geographical distance and different contexts. In so doing I utilise concepts and theoretical approaches from the history of knowledge and networks of communication as discussed above. Considering the vast extent and complexity of networks of communication that spanned the globe in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, the perspective of formation of knowledge for political argumentation by the Aborigines Committee and the NZA provides a cross-section to the movement of knowledge in these networks and the effects that different forms of communication had on this knowledge. With the Aborigines Committee and the NZA as my centres of focus, I consider the Committee's 1837 report and *The British Colonization* as outcomes of the formation of knowledge. This is a similar perspective to how Elizabeth Elbourne has described the Aborigines Committee as a 'contingent intervention by a particular lobby group' that 'was the product of transnational evangelical networks'.<sup>117</sup> The claimed knowledge and argumentation outlined in the Aborigines Committee's report and *The British Colonization* were products of different processes of communication and formation of knowledge. This does not imply that they were the endpoints of formation of knowledge and were not participants in later processes of formation of knowledge by other actors. Nevertheless, this places these two works as focal points and anchors to which I tie my examination of the complexity of movement and formation of knowledge.

The focal points provided by these two works allow me to direct my gaze into specific parts of the extensive and diverse source material that exists relating to early-19<sup>th</sup>-century global communication on a topic such as New Zealand. I approach the processes of communication that were behind the two publications by examining different official and unofficial sources from the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, most importantly those that were specifically referenced by the Select Committee and the NZA. I follow references and citations marked in the Aborigines Committee's report and *The British Colonization* as traces to sources that were used for making those works, and further references made in these cited sources to other sources. Thus, mapping the networks of communication through these intertextual references, I trace the

<sup>117</sup> Elbourne 2003a.

movement of information and knowledge claims that took place between New Zealand and Britain. This is not meant to provide a comprehensive picture of all the connections that existed between New Zealand and Britain, and I do not disregard other archival material that was not explicitly mentioned in these intertextual references. Rather, this work provides a focused perspective on how specific processes of communication functioned in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century in the context of colonial action. This study also provides a detailed examination of how the Aborigines Committee and the NZA specifically contributed to the formation of knowledge and political discussions on New Zealand in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century.

In terms of examining the processes of the movement of knowledge, which I conceptualise with the idea of networked communication with centripetal and centrifugal forces and directions, I pay particular attention to three aspects of processes on the movement of knowledge that arise from scholarly examination of the history of knowledge and networks of communication: First, I investigate material and social processes through which information concerning New Zealand travelled. Second, I pay close attention to the differences in the contents and the significance of different knowledge claims in different contexts. Third, I am mindful of exclusions as well as inclusions that took place in these processes of communication.

First, the nature of the information and source material that was made available in Britain through networks is a significant matter relating to the material and social processes of communication. Textual production and the global movement of texts played a particularly significant role in this lobbying work. The literary historian Lydia Wevers argues that literacy and textuality were some of the most significant arenas in 19<sup>th</sup>-century British imperialism. She cites Mary Louise Pratt's view that 'the web of imperial meaning-making' consisted of complicated and intersecting exploration, colonisation and production and the dissemination of knowledge through, among other means, collecting and readership. From this standpoint Wevers raises literacy together with religion, exploration and science as significant areas of knowledge and executive power.<sup>118</sup> This view is very much applicable to the work of the NZA and the Aborigines Committee. Intertextual references and connections between these works and other texts provide perspectives into that practical and material movement of knowledge. Relating to this perspective, this study also takes inspiration from the field of the history of the book, in which scholars have paid close attention to themes such as the significance of print culture in disseminating information, the activity of different actors in the processes of creating and reading

<sup>118</sup> Wevers 2013, chapter 2; see also Pratt (1992) 2008.

books and printed text and the instability of text in intertextual connections.<sup>119</sup> Furthermore, Secord has criticised past approaches to examining the movement of knowledge bound in textual form. He has criticised works that have avoided situations in which distances between authors, narrators, texts, works and readers have been extended for the benefit of examinations in which there could be assumptions that the texts that are studied by the historian were universally available to all relevant readers in question.<sup>120</sup> Considering the complexity of networks between New Zealand and Britain, it is therefore necessary to pay close attention to what could have been available and thus could have been used by different actors, thus resulting in a more nuanced understanding of the communication.

The practicalities of the movement of texts and transfer of knowledge between New Zealand and Britain greatly influenced the extent to which source material was available, let alone used for colonial argumentation. This does not imply that non-textual arenas, such as images and maps, were not significant in communication between New Zealand and Britain and the lobbying that took place in the background of colonial government. For example, in 1837 Wakefield commissioned Robert Burford to paint a panorama of the Bay of Islands in Leicester Square based on the sketches of the traveller and painter Augustus Earle. This drew attention to the NZA's plans and the attractiveness of New Zealand.<sup>121</sup> However, in the debates and formation of knowledge claims on New Zealand in the late 1830s specifically, textual media were central in communicating and arguing New Zealand's suitability for colonisation and the lines of action that were considered necessary and most suitable. Therefore, in this study the textual transfer of information and knowledge, while not the only media for communication, is the main focus.

Tying together the formation of knowledge that was carried out in London and the practical aspects of knowledge moving in the complex networks that existed in the background of this formation of knowledge, it is also possible to reach wide perspectives on the different actors that took part in the communication. With a focus in this study on mainly British actors, with even the archival material behind published texts originating from British pens with varying traces of Māori voices, there is always the risk, as Ballantyne states, of 'view[ing] the empire and its history from London' and thus 'return[ing] indigenous people to the margins of history'.<sup>122</sup> However, historians of imperial and colonial history in the past few decades have

<sup>119</sup> Finkelstein & McCleery 2003; Darnton 2003, 10–11 & 18–22. Further details of texts that can be studied to illuminate these themes include for example the physical form of texts, textual versions, technical transmission, institutional control, their perceived meanings and social contexts. See McKenzie 2003, 29.

<sup>120</sup> Secord 2004, 662.

<sup>121</sup> Temple 2012, chapter 13.

<sup>122</sup> Ballantyne 2002, 2.

endeavoured to break out of this delimitation by bringing to the fore moments of colonial encounter and by focusing on the ‘bundles of relationships’ that constituted empires and the interactions between various kinds of actors, whether they were indigenous, European or subject to any categorisation. These are not viewed strictly within spatial bounds, but as having been mobile with the ability to travel between locations ‘to take stock of the constant traffic of people, ideas and material goods’, as Ballantyne suggests.<sup>123</sup> Thus, while the two publications at the centre of this study originated from London, the analysis of the processes of movement of knowledge within networks provides a far more extensive perspective than simply that of London-based individual actors. The focus of this study is not on identifying what impact Māori in particular had on the movement of knowledge concerning New Zealand. However, this study does strive to identify whenever possible their presence and participation that can help us to place them in these networks.

Second, the difference in the content and the significances of different knowledge claims in a variety of contexts is important. This is particularly emphasised by Secord’s criticism that the locality and variability of knowledge has often become a conclusion rather than a method. Beyond identifying different knowledges in different contexts, it is necessary to interrogate the differences between diverse claims to knowledge that were intertextually connected and bring forth the contextual differences in which such different knowledge claims were presented. This provides explanatory frameworks for these differences. In the history of knowledge scholars have theorised different ‘orders of knowledge’ and the ‘cultural translation’ that took place between them, illustrating the differences between, for example, scientific texts, popular ways of thinking and poetry.<sup>124</sup> This kind of translation and change can also be seen on a smaller scale between geographical or other contexts within a network of communication. The use of an identical piece of information by different actors, in different relations or regarding different matters can affect the apparent significance of the piece of information. Missionaries seeking support for their work, land company members looking for financial or political backing, Māori interests in their interactions with Europeans or contemporary humanitarian thinking can serve as explanatory frames for these kinds of differences.<sup>125</sup> The dynamism of these differences becomes apparent when they are examined in connection with each other.

<sup>123</sup> See Ballantyne 2002, 3; Buchan & Andersson Burnett 2019, 4–5; Lester, Boehme & Mitchell, P. 2021, 5.

<sup>124</sup> See e.g. Burke 2020, 2; Sarasin 2020, 2.

<sup>125</sup> For an examination of these different contexts see e.g. Belich (1996) 2007, 140–155; Rutz 2008; Ballantyne 2016.

In reality it is to be expected that networks of transfer of knowledge were not as straightforward as the intertextual references point to. There were likely strands within these networks that a historian cannot trace with the available published and archival material. Some pieces of information or knowledge could have come to the attention of actors within these networks from different routes than were eventually put to paper. This is particularly relevant when it comes to published works, considering the scholarly attention from the perspective of the history of the book to editing that took place between original observations by the author and the eventual publication.<sup>126</sup> As Secord notes, it is rarely the case that modes of communication are relatively transparent.<sup>127</sup> Yet, as the Aborigines Committee's report and *The British Colonization* were written as argumentative works intended to influence political matters, the networks that were made visible point to how this argumentation through formation of knowledge was constructed by the authors themselves. Furthermore, even if it is not possible to reach a complete and definitive picture of how information and knowledge moved in reality, texts that were in some form involved with this transfer of knowledge can provide glimpses into how information from New Zealand was received in Britain. By placing different texts that were related to these networks in their particular contexts, it is possible to uncover what took place in communication across the antipodes and how the different contexts influenced the nature, form and content of the knowledge.

Tying the different knowledge claims to their particular contexts also helps place these differences in relation to other contemporary perspectives. Ballantyne notes that some historians have been 'uncomfortable' with attempts to historicise humanitarianism and conceptualise it as a movement.<sup>128</sup> For example, the legal historian Lauren Benton has argued that characterising the early to mid-19<sup>th</sup> century as the origin of global humanitarianism is problematic. She argues that such characterisations can lead away from the significance of more practical matters such as repeating legal conflicts across empires that consolidated Empires as the dominant political formations.<sup>129</sup> Humanitarianism has also been viewed as having received too direct a causation with British colonial policy in which there were a range of factors at play.<sup>130</sup> Irrespective of the possibility of too much focus given to humanitarianism in historiography, the acknowledgement of the complexity of different coexistent perspectives is necessary, with humanitarianism constituting one of these perspectives. While humanitarianism or individual legal conflicts alone

<sup>126</sup> See e.g. MacLaren 1994; Keighren, Withers & Bell 2015, 18–21.

<sup>127</sup> Secord 2004, 662.

<sup>128</sup> Ballantyne 2016.

<sup>129</sup> Benton 2012, 92–93.

<sup>130</sup> Ballantyne 2016.

might not provide a complete picture of colonialism in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, casting a wide net to incorporate different approaches, actors and contexts to be studied alongside each other enables us to have an understanding of their connections, dynamisms and effects in a comprehensive manner. This does, however, carry with it the problem of becoming inundated with different themes, topics and actors. For this reason, I anchor my examination in the Aborigines Committee's report and *The British Colonization* as two disparate approaches to New Zealand. They function as a starting point for examining the multitude of actors in play between New Zealand and Britain and provide a focal point for the study.

Third, as Secord points out, every act of communication excludes as well as includes.<sup>131</sup> By examining what was available to be disseminated further by actors within networks of communication, it is also possible to uncover what was not. What was communicated in the texts across networks is indicative of the processes of communication, but also clear exclusions from material that was communicated further by an actor are significant signposts for what was seen as necessary, useful, relevant or expedient for further communication. Altogether, this focus provides tools for identifying parts of the uneven and contingent nature of transfer of knowledge. This works towards understanding the lumps, as Cooper has named them, in the complex movement of knowledge, and identifies obstacles of movement of knowledge, more examination of which Burke has called for.<sup>132</sup> The inclusion and exclusion inherent in communication is also closely associated with historicised questions of authority when attempting to uncover reasons for the inclusions and exclusions. In the formation of knowledge that was intended to be credible and convincing, inclusion of a source can give a glimpse into what were considered appropriate and credible criteria for claiming knowledge in a given time or context. Alternately, exclusion of a source or piece of information raises questions of whether the excluded piece was not suitable for credible knowledge formation or whether there were other reasons for why it was not suitable for given knowledge formation or argumentation. Thus, the examination of formation of knowledge and communication provides insight into matters significant to the history of knowledge, such as questions of trust, testimony and authority, in a given context. These appear as further social perspectives that influenced how people communicated information and what information reached further nodes within networks of communication as it was siphoned through various perspectives and nodes within those networks.

Uncovering the differences in knowledge claims in different contexts with a focus on these three aspects of knowledge could lead to the conclusion that colonial knowledge claims and argumentation were what is often called 'boosterism'. This

<sup>131</sup> Secord 2004, 662.

<sup>132</sup> Burke 2020, 2.

entails an implication of colonial promotion that was unreliable propaganda. However, Ballantyne argues that while there was boosterism in much colonial writing, this is a narrow reading of such texts and can dismiss other aspects of networks which disseminated information.<sup>133</sup> Equally, it is presumable that the Aborigines Committee's report and *The British Colonization* included something related to boosterism that was unreliable in relation to the true-to-nature state of things. But as noted from Roque and Wagner's examination of colonial knowledge, these texts can still be read as real in the sense that they were intended to influence their readers and had real effects. Thus, despite their probable inaccuracies to the true state of things, as argumentative works it is to be expected that they had some congruence with contemporary criteria for knowledge formation and argumentation.

Examining wide networks of communication spanning vast geographical areas poses a further challenge for clarity of expression. This particularly relates to the Aborigines Committee, in which there were a large number of people involved in the proceedings and the drafting of the report, who had differing opinions and views on a number of matters. As my focus in this thesis is not on the inner workings of the Committee, but on the argumentative nature of it based on the formation of claimed knowledge, I designate the Committee's report as a work and expression of the Committee as a whole. This is despite the fact that Anna Gurney and Priscilla Johnston had key roles in drafting the report, Buxton's allies commented on the draft and various Committee members had differing ideas about the wording of different sections of the report.<sup>134</sup> As the Committee's report was centrifugally presented as having been agreed to by the Committee, I term the contents of the report as the views of the Committee collectively. However, when indicated by further archival material, I point out matters that appear as specifically arising from the perspectives of Buxton and his inner circle, meaning Gurney, Johnston and his other close associates and allies in the Committee's work. As a further distinction from the Committee's views presented in the report, I discuss individual pieces of testimony from the Minutes of Evidence as the expressions of that witness despite having been transcribed by the Committee. This distinction between what was expressed by the Committee in the report and what was brought up in the witness interviews has not always been clearly made in the historiography of the Committee with pieces of the Minutes of Evidence having been discussed by scholars as views of the Committee.<sup>135</sup> Also for clarity, in addition to the distinctions between 'raw'

<sup>133</sup> Ballantyne 2012, 241.

<sup>134</sup> See the Proceedings of the Committee, *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 88–90.

<sup>135</sup> For example, despite their otherwise meritorious analysis of Khoesan Andries Stoffels's testimony before the Committee, Lester, Boehme and Mitchell do not give

information and ‘cooked’ knowledge, I will describe individuals’ recounting of an incident, discussion with another person or other such occasion as a ‘narrative’ of the said occasion. This is to provide more clarity over the abstractness of the term information to indicate a specific narration by an individual.

## Outline and Scope of the Study

The outline of this study is organised to analytically illustrate the movement, formation and use of knowledge regarding Māori in the early-19<sup>th</sup>-century debates on New Zealand. To this end, it is divided into two main chapters, each of which illustrate and discuss a larger theme in these processes, but do not as such follow the outlines of the Aborigines Committee’s report or *The British Colonization*. Chapter 2 is centred around the formation of claimed knowledge about Māori and chapter 3 is focused on argumentation about New Zealand. The knowledge claims were utilised significantly in the more concrete argumentation and this was in many ways based on those knowledge claims. Thus, I perceive the formation of knowledge claims by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward as parts of their respective argumentation. However, in order to underline and more closely examine the different processes at play and the formation of knowledge as its own topic of examination, I first dedicate the whole of chapter 2 to the formation of the knowledge claims with less emphasis on what the two sides proposed should have been done in New Zealand. Following this, I examine how these knowledge claims played into the more practical argumentation as its own theme, which, nonetheless arose from the formation of knowledge. The order of the main chapters illustrates my analysis of how knowledge claims were first formed and then used for argumentation even though this sequence was not explicitly presented in the outlines of the Committee’s report and *The British Colonization* and the knowledge claims and the practical argumentation were interspersed in these works. I also raise certain more specific topics and incidents in both chapters to show how they related to the different aspects of formation of knowledge and colonial argumentation respectively.

These two main chapters are further divided into subchapters in which I raise more specific topics related to these themes. The examination of formation of knowledge vis-à-vis Māori in chapter 2 consists of two different sides of what kind of knowledge was presented of Māori: first, the claimed knowledge of Māori as ‘savage’ in early-19<sup>th</sup>-century European terms and, second, further claimed

any indication that it was barely cited in the report proper, apart from appearing in the Minutes of Evidence. This gives the appearance of equal argumentative value for both the report and its extensive Minutes, which is debatable. See Lester, Boehme & Mitchell (2021), 119–120.

knowledge of their supposed improvement. These two perspectives on Māori character were significant in the more general argumentation. They therefore provide a good analytic basis for examining the formation of knowledge regarding Māori. The main themes in this chapter are the use, selection and presentation of sources for forming knowledge claims as indications of contemporary criteria for credible knowledge, and questions of trust, credibility and authority related to these sources. This chapter also provides specific insight into how the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward presented Māori.

The examination of the argumentation of the two sides in chapter 3 is also divided into two parts. First, I examine how the two sides in the debate justified action in New Zealand. I will show that these arguments arose from knowledge claims about Māori and further sources from New Zealand and the knowledge claims provided a backdrop against which the two sides presented their proposed lines of action. I finish my analysis by examining the arguments for the actual suggestions for action in New Zealand by the two sides, collating these arguments with different previously discussed aspects of the knowledge claims and arguments by the two sides. Alongside these arguments by the two sides the use of different sources is also discussed, but this discussion is centred on the use of these sources for presenting the argumentation rather than their credibility and authority as a more general question of the history of knowledge as is the focus in chapter 2.

## 2 Creating Evidence of Character

Māori as a people were in great focus in the Aborigines Committee's 1837 report and the NZA's *The British Colonization of New Zealand*. In these texts, the two sides presented argumentation from their respective perspectives concerning New Zealand. The argumentation related to what they proposed was to be done with situation in the antipode. Much of the argumentation in these texts rested on claims to knowledge regarding what Māori were like as a people. This included their general character and level of civilisation, for example, as perceived by European standards. In order to understand how such knowledge claims regarding Māori were used to argue for action in New Zealand, it is first necessary to examine how those knowledge claims were formed. In this chapter I examine the centripetal processes that took place in transforming the information that flowed from New Zealand into claimed knowledge about Māori for the purpose of supporting argumentation on New Zealand's possible colonisation. The formation of these knowledge claims by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward took place in Britain and the authors of the report or *The British Colonization* had not visited New Zealand. Thus, they relied on information from others. From this background, a central focus here will be on the trans-antipodean communication. How did movement of information and formation of knowledge allow the creation of supposedly credible knowledge claims? Why did certain pieces of information, for example narratives and recounted stories of Māori, appear as appropriate sources for creating those knowledge claims? Following this line of inquiry, in this chapter the central focus is on the use of sources by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward. A majority of these sources originated from New Zealand and were later used to present 'proof' and 'evidence' of Māori to form the two sides' knowledge claims. While my focus here is mostly directed towards these centripetal processes, my examination will not be completely separated from the centrifugal presentation of knowledge claims. How those sources were presented centrifugally as proof or evidence is also an important factor that needs to be taken into account when examining formation of knowledge.

In presenting knowledge claims of Māori character, the concept of 'improvement' played a central role in how Māori were considered. The view that British civilisation was superior to others and something those 'others' should aspire

to was subscribed to by many British actors up to and through the 1840s. Only from around the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century did more Social Darwinist and ‘scientific’ classifications of fixed traits of racial groups begin to take root.<sup>136</sup> Thus, helping Māori to improve and reach that aspirational level of civilisation was a common goal in British views of New Zealand in the 1830s, and such ideas were especially raised in humanitarian discourses. This idea of spreading civilisation and Christianity among Māori was built into the Aborigines Committee’s assignment,<sup>137</sup> but it was also evident in Wakefield and Ward’s proclamation of the NZA’s plans, which outlined an intention to civilise as well as colonise.<sup>138</sup> To shed more light on these sides’ conceptions of the supposed improvement of Māori and the related knowledge claims, this chapter is divided into two parts: first, I examine what was given as the original character of Māori as a people before any interaction with Europeans and how these claims were presented with given evidence. Following this, I examine how it was claimed that Māori had already improved after they had come into contact with Europeans and what the origins of that improvement had supposedly been. In *The British Colonization* and the Aborigines Committee’s report the supposed improvement of Māori, both in their capacity to improve and the manner in which this appeared to have taken place, provided a basis onto which further argumentation about action could be built. As such this dichotomy between early-19<sup>th</sup>-century European conceptions of ‘savagery’ and ‘civilisation’ is a major topic in this chapter.

Altogether, by bringing the savagery–civilisation dichotomy into focus, this chapter provides a perspective for examining two sides in the formation of knowledge and argumentation by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward. On the one side, this chapter provides insight into British colonial thought on New Zealand and how Māori specifically were presented as a people whose supposed character made further British colonial action feasible. On the other side, this functions also as a more wide-reaching example of how supposedly credible knowledge claims were formed of geographically distant topics as part of political influencing and how different forms of communication played into this. To this end, different aspects of the apparent credibility of sources will be discussed throughout this chapter.

<sup>136</sup> See e.g. Moloney 2001, 153; Hall, C. 2002, 338–339; Andersson Burnett & Buchan 2018, 185.

<sup>137</sup> Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 169; Elbourne 2003a.

<sup>138</sup> See *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 42.

## 2.1 Evident Natural Savagery

### 2.1.1 Sources of Savagery

‘The New Zealanders are a thoroughly savage people.’<sup>139</sup> Such was the overarching description and the beginning of a wider discussion on Māori and their character in the NZA’s *The British Colonization of New Zealand*. This would appear to have been a straightforward and damning judgement of Māori, who were presented as one unified people without individual or kin-group distinctions, which were a constitutive part of Māori society. However, on further examination European perceptions of Māori and their so-called savagery in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century were not as straightforward. The matter of Māori character as presented by Wakefield and Ward in *The British Colonization* or by the Aborigines Committee was not straightforward either, despite this decidedly negative statement of Māori. Nevertheless, it was commonly held in early-19<sup>th</sup>-century Britain that Māori, as with most other indigenous and non-European people, were considered to have been savage to some degree, or at least not as civilised as the British. Due to this centrality and complexity, it is first worth pondering the significance of this perception and the presentation of character more generally.

The ‘natural’ state of indigenous peoples, whether ‘savage’ or ‘noble’ has been a subject that has fascinated historians. Much work has been undertaken in examining and decrypting European interpretations, ideals and preconceptions of Polynesia and ‘the South Seas’. European conceptions of Pacific islands as paradises, where people who were ‘noble’ in their savage way of life, have been analysed in relation to the European search for Eden and a fantastical southern land. On the other hand, such places were also described as tainted by cannibalism and other horrific acts by those people.<sup>140</sup> In *Nature, Culture, and History*, the historian K. R. Howe leads into the subject of these representations and imageries of the Pacific islands with two fundamental questions: ‘How do we know what we see? Why do we know what we know?’<sup>141</sup> This leads Howe to examine Western understandings of Oceania and how they were constructed. Following this train of thought, one can scrutinise early-19<sup>th</sup>-century political actors regarding how did they know what they knew of Māori. Or more specifically, how did they claim to know what they claimed to have known of Māori? The questions posed by Howe not only lead to examining the kinds of representations there were of Māori in political debates, but also to looking deeper

<sup>139</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 28.

<sup>140</sup> See e.g. Smith 1989; Calder, Lamb & Orr 1999; Howe 2000; Jolly, Tcherkézoff & Tryon 2009; Gascoigne 2014.

<sup>141</sup> Howe 2000, 1.

into how these representations were formed and why they were claimed to have been 'known'. Accordingly, when examining claimed knowledge of Māori savagery, it is necessary to not only ask what constituted views of Māori savagery, but also why could this purported savagery be presented in any certain terms in the Aborigines Committee's report and *The British Colonization*. This leads to examining the evidentiary status of sources given in these works.

Beyond reviewing from whence these claims arose, the attributions of peoples' so-called character have been identified as a significant matter in the historiography of colonialism. Race and racial thought are now seen as having been a fundamental discourse in European imperialism in general. Different and even arbitrary appropriations of such discourse took place in distinct sites and times for different colonial ends. This kind of thinking and discourse also had a real impact, since social relations were expressed, experienced and contested through them.<sup>142</sup> Attributions that were given to different people's characters were a part of this racial thinking. According to the historian Peter J. Cain, in Victorian Britain views of character were complex and not clearly defined. However, they did include themes such as a people's energy, industry, thrift, prudence, perseverance and honesty. In the later Victorian era, in particular, the British character, which was seen as epitomising these traits, was perceived as the foundation of British success in the world. This view rested on notions of dynamism and progress in the human condition, which was based on Scottish Enlightenment philosophy. Related to this philosophical view was also the notion that all humans were basically of one common origin and thus possessed unified possibilities for progress.<sup>143</sup> This progress was not, however, always viewed as a simple and essential future for all peoples. Instead, there were tensions between the perceived universal aspects of human progress and the inherent differences between peoples that was described. While progress was central to this thought, there were still contemporary views of the dynamism of Europeans in contrast to the immobility of those seen as savage alongside the view of progress. Thus, tensions between unity and difference remained in the Scottish philosophy.<sup>144</sup>

This view of character was not restricted to the British and their perceived success, but it was also extended to the idea of civilising and helping other peoples to improve. The view of a British obligation to help others to civilise towards the putative epitome of British civilisation was in part based on the recognition of those peoples as capable of receiving such civilisation. The perception of a capacity to improve placed the concepts of 'savage' and 'civilised' in juxtaposition with each other and called for the spreading of Western civilisation to areas of the world in

<sup>142</sup> Lester 2001, 2–3; Evans et al. 2003, 9; Ballantyne 2012, 26.

<sup>143</sup> Cain 2007, 252 & 254–255; Cain 2012, 559–560. See also Pocock 1999, 315.

<sup>144</sup> Sebastiani 2013, 8–9.

which it was perceived as not having been established.<sup>145</sup> From this background also arose the presentation of knowledge claims regarding Māori character, including their supposed savagery, by the Aborigines Committee and by Wakefield and Ward.

The centrality of the matter of indigenous character in debates, such as the one that occurred on action related to New Zealand, can be paralleled to Catherine Hall's examination of anti-slavery endeavours in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. She points out that there was a war of representation of Africans between West Indies planters and metropolitan abolitionists. Anti-slavery supporters claimed Africans were brothers and sisters, who would receive Christian instruction and were capable of becoming the figures of 'the black Christian man and woman', whereas planters saw Africans as lazy, childlike and different from as well as inferior to white Europeans.<sup>146</sup> The centrality of character, or the appearance of character, in Hall's analysis is similar to the centrality of Māori character in the argumentation that took place in the debates relating to New Zealand. Yet, a major differentiating factor in Hall's analysis, in comparison to the New Zealand debates, was that the anti-slavery and planter representations in the former's study were drastically different, whereas there were significant convergences in how Māori were presented by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward. This departure can be attributed to a more pronounced contrast in the backgrounds of the opposing sides of the slavery debate, compared to the backgrounds of the sides that took part in the debates on New Zealand. A far greater difference can be seen in the backgrounds and perspectives of metropolitan abolitionists and West Indies planters than in the two sides debating about New Zealand. Both of the latter groups were mainly located in London and argued from at least a rhetorical humanitarian starting point. A closer parallel to Hall's examination would be the difference between the Aborigines Committee and settlers in New Zealand, Cape Colony or Australia, with a perspective similar to that of Elizabeth Elbourne's examinations of the Aborigines Committee's report.<sup>147</sup> However, what remains central in both Hall's case and the New Zealand debates is the centrality of presenting the character of the colonised or indigenous people.

Textual presentations of Māori have been seen as having played a part in how they were colonised. Peter Gibbons, a scholar of New Zealand's past, has suggested that knowledge derived from Māori was made available to settlers in colonial New Zealand and writing and printing were crucial technologies in maintaining and

<sup>145</sup> Howe 2000, 15–16; Cain 2012, 562–564; Boisen 2013, 351. Illustrative of the different sides of what constituted character, in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century there were also environmental explanations of climate and surroundings influencing people's level of civilisation and character. See e.g. Grant 2003.

<sup>146</sup> Hall, C. 2002, 107–110.

<sup>147</sup> See Elbourne 2003a.

extending the power of the settler society over the indigenous inhabitants. In this he states that Māori were ‘textualized by Pakeha[sic], so that the colonists could “know” the people they were displacing’ and ‘the colonists produced (or invented) “the Maori”, making them picturesque, quaint, largely ahistorical, and, through printed materials, manageable’.<sup>148</sup> Viewing this production related to pre-colonial New Zealand, a closer examination of *The British Colonization* and the Aborigines Committee’s report reveals networks of communication and transmission of knowledge between New Zealand and Britain in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. These networks carried among other substance representations and narratives of Māori savagery, and such sources of information were gathered and processed to form the knowledge claims presented in the Aborigines Committee’s report and *The British Colonization*. With these networks of communication in mind, the reception and use of different kinds of sources can be viewed as a central process in constructing knowledge of Māori savagery in the political debates of the 1830s. How was claimed knowledge of Māori savagery constructed using source material that originated from different contexts and was originally produced for different uses? Also, why was this source material suitable or credible for these goals, and did the meaning of the narratives or claimed knowledges on Māori change as it was transferred to and reproduced in new contexts? If so, to what effect?

To begin answering these questions, it is necessary to unpack ‘savagery’ as a concept used from a British perspective on other peoples in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. As Europeans encountered various kinds of peoples, many of whom practiced some mixture of horticulture, fishing or hunting as their main form of subsistence, the term ‘savage’ was more often than not used to define these peoples. The term ‘savage’ signified ‘primitive’ or ‘the natural man’ in contrast to what were viewed by Europeans as their civilised societies. In addition to connoting certain wildness to Europeans, the term later gained further connotations implying ‘an almost subhuman level of fierceness and cruelty’. Such a range of meanings had the common significance of communicating inferiority in comparison to the presumably ‘civilised’ Europeans and could be used to justify political subordination of ‘others’.<sup>149</sup> Another aspect of how savagery has been viewed relates to the idea of the ‘noble savage’, or the idea of a certain nobility arising from society’s closeness with nature. This has been particularly connected to the influence of Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s philosophy on thinking of other peoples in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. To be sure, Bernard Smith notes that the ‘noble savage’ was but one of the competing

<sup>148</sup> Gibbons 2002, 9 & 13.

<sup>149</sup> Pocock 2005, 3–7 & 158–161; Ellingson 2001, xiii & 21–26.

and conflicting stereotypes that existed regarding indigenous peoples.<sup>150</sup> Through colonial encounters the word savage also became a near synonym for ‘Native’ or indigenous, yet with implicit connotations of inferiority. Looking more specifically at the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, Paul Moon has identified three overlapping uses of the word savage vis-à-vis Māori: first, as an alternative to the word ‘Native’, or Indigenous; second, as an openly derogatory term similar to ‘brute’ or ‘barbarian’ and; third, signifying a lack of civilisation and viewing Māori and other indigenous peoples as children in contrast to the more civilised Europeans. With the overlap of these uses and the subtle differences in different contexts, Moon emphasises that savagery was not a simple notion of merely categorising the primitive ‘Other’. He further argues that by the late 18<sup>th</sup> century ‘savage’, along with its implied sense of inferiority to Europeans, had come to mean indigenous people to such a degree that even initial encounters with indigenous peoples resulted in them having been to be presumed savages without any need to elaborate on its basis. Moon also notes that the British designation of Māori as savage arose completely from their perspective. Māori themselves played no role in being identified as such.<sup>151</sup> These aspects of the British view of savagery are also quite apparent in the Aborigines Committee’s report and *The British Colonization*, in which Māori and other Polynesian peoples were uniformly labelled ‘savages’.

This adaptability of the nomenclature of savage does not imply that its use was something other than explicitly denigrating at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. In early travel writing and newspaper coverage of Māori, savagery was a frequent referent to their cultural traits and customs that Europeans viewed as wild, evil and barbarian.<sup>152</sup> As such, Māori were generally considered ‘savage’ in one significance or another. As Peter Adams puts it: ‘From a Eurocentric point of view [...] New Zealand was part of the “barbarous” or “uncivilised” world’.<sup>153</sup>

Emphasising certain, often negatively perceived traits in non-Europeans in British writing was nothing new. The missionary historian Jeffrey Cox has noted that a technique of ‘defamatory synecdoche’, or taking one or a small number of characteristics and using them as representative of the whole of a given culture or people, was typical in early-19<sup>th</sup>-century missionary writing. In his discussion, Cox identifies cannibalism as a definitive emblem that was given to many Polynesian peoples. In missionary writing these kinds of unflattering narratives of foreign cultures were often used in rhetorical ways to gain support or justification for

<sup>150</sup> Smith 1989, vii; Belmessous 2013, 78. On ideas of the ‘noble savage’ see also Smith 1989, 5; Samson 1998, 8–9; Jahoda 1999, xv–xvi; Ellingson 2001; Moon 2017.

<sup>151</sup> Moon 2017, 3–6 & 10.

<sup>152</sup> Moon 2017, 7.

<sup>153</sup> Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 30.

missionary work. Due to the broad audience of missionary writing some of these characterisations of certain peoples persisted for a long time in the public imagination.<sup>154</sup> Similar uses of different characterisations of Māori, including cannibalism, are evident in the Aborigines Committee's and in Wakefield and Ward's presentations. For the most part claims of Māori in the Committee's report and *The British Colonization* were very broadly directed to depict Māori as a whole. Moreover, even the more detailed narratives were given as evidence of Māori as one people, undivided and unified in their supposed savagery. As such, this kind of defamatory synecdoche worked in two ways: Similarly to Cox's examination of missionaries, who were frequently used as source by the Committee and by Wakefield and Ward, individual characterisations of Māori were used to paint them very broadly as savage. Narratives of individual Māori were also implicitly given to represent all, that is, as a defamatory synecdoche in which a part represented the whole. Yet, on closer examination it will become evident that there was more nuance to how Māori were presented than as merely savage.

What then were the general characterisations that were used to present Māori as savage? The concept of savagery was not only complex, but it was also used in such implicit ways that it was not always considered to warrant definition or explanation in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. In British views of the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, the forms of savagery connected to Māori could have been signified, for example, by slavery, warfare, taking heads as trophies and cannibalism.<sup>155</sup> Here, I begin my closer examination of the gathering and use of sources for claiming knowledge of Māori savagery by taking a closer look at one aspect tightly bound-up with savagery that appeared in the works of both the NZA and the Aborigines Committee: Māori warfare. A warlike character and by extension violence appear in the two works as negative and undesirable characteristics that were presented as typical for Māori and as needing to be rectified by European action. Thus, this was closely related to presenting Māori as having been inferior to Europeans, and namely 'savage'. War and the martial character of Māori were the most evident characterisations of their savagery in Wakefield and Ward's as well as the Aborigines Committee's presentation of Māori. This warrants close examination and provides a useful, defined window into the use of sources in the formation of knowledge in the two publications. After this focus on war and sources used for forming knowledge of Māori martial culture, I will expand upon the two sides' presentation of Māori

<sup>154</sup> Cox 2008, 118–119. To a similar effect Tabish Khair notes that in post-Enlightenment accounts of India certain aspects of Indian culture were selected as the distinctive aspects to be reported despite those aspects having been common or uncommon, or actual or not. See Khair 2016, 387–388.

<sup>155</sup> Johnston 2003; Ballantyne 2015, 226–227.

savagery and further examine the impact and significance of presenting claimed knowledge of other alleged and supposed savage aspects of Māori character, including cannibalism, so-called superstitions, Māori use of land and their other customs.

Beginning with *The British Colonization*, warfare was a feature in Wakefield and Ward's general description of Māori. This followed and somewhat elaborated on their portrayal of Māori as 'thoroughly savage people':

[T]hey are divided into a number of small and completely independent tribes, almost perpetually at war with each other [...] they scarcely cultivate the earth, and are often exposed to famine. They make war sometimes in order to obtain provisions by plunder, sometimes from motives of revenge only: and the common result of their warfare is the extermination of the conquered tribe, partly in battle or by massacre afterwards, and in part by carrying off the survivors and reducing them to slavery [...] and there can be no doubt of the cannibalism of the New Zealanders.<sup>156</sup>

This general presentation was not bound by Wakefield and Ward to any specific piece of evidence or any specific sources but rather served as an overarching portrait of Māori as they were perceived from Britain. Yet, the centrality of war and the scarce cultivation of the earth and the supposedly ensuing famine appear as obvious explanations for the 'thoroughly savage' state. This is similar to Andersson Burnett and Buchan's observation of how a British traveller in Africa in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century drew connections between recurring wars among African peoples and their supposedly low population and level of improvement.<sup>157</sup> Warfare was generally a rather prevalent theme in early European narratives of Māori. This relates to a broader European conception that Māori were seemingly constantly at war with each other. In his seminal work *A Show of Justice*, Alan Ward has drawn together early European writings in order to examine contemporary European generalisations about the pre-contact Māori societies, their laws and customs. He has ascribed the early European view of the Māori as having been constantly at war and never completely at peace to the complex Māori customs of redressing wrongs and other customs that defined relations among different Māori kin groups.<sup>158</sup> Thus, what might have appeared to Europeans as constant and unrestrained warfare, could have actually been a part of more nuanced Māori customs that was not understood by European observers. Such warfare, however, carried different significances in European

<sup>156</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 28–29.

<sup>157</sup> Andersson Burnett & Buchan 2018, 179–180.

<sup>158</sup> Ward, A. 1974, 7–9.

narratives. Wakefield and Ward's focus on the theme of warfare in *The British Colonization* was consistent with the broader contemporary characterisation.

### The Intertextuality of *The British Colonization*

Wakefield and Ward presented characterisations of Māori and claims of their warlike character as part of their supposed savagery by drawing on a few different sources, including a popularised book on Māori, a pamphlet written by the British Resident to New Zealand and individual references to people who had visited New Zealand. These were all given as credible sources of information in Wakefield and Ward's presentation. Section 4 of Wakefield and Ward's expansive 'Description of New Zealand' was entitled 'General Character of the New Zealanders'. Herein, Wakefield and Ward first set out to present Māori in terms of their 'capacity, intelligence, and moral feelings' at the time of the initial European contact with them. This presentation purported to provide an outlook onto what was viewed as the natural or 'aboriginal' character of Māori. This was presented as a relatively brief look into the past, since Wakefield and Ward argued that such descriptions of the natural state of Māori were 'fast becoming a matter rather of history and curiosity than of useful information[...]',<sup>159</sup> due to contact with Europeans. In their view, Māori were already changing and therefore the authors did not wish to dwell on this matter extensively. Later on in the section, the authors discussed supposed successive improvement in Māori, which had allegedly taken place in their character towards European civilisation. I argue that this classification between past character and later improvement indicates that the supposed Māori savagery was a foil and acted as a veil and preamble to their later civilising.

In the beginning of the section, Wakefield and Ward extracted a long quotation from a book called *The New Zealanders*, which was published anonymously in 1830 as part of the *Library of Entertaining Knowledge* series. This series was part of the so-called penny press in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century that was intended by the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge (SDUK) and similar societies to provide cheap books and prints to wide audiences among Britain's working classes in order to disseminate useful and all-round instructive knowledge on a variety of topics.<sup>160</sup> The author of *The New Zealanders* was George Lillie Craik, a literary scholar living in London, who worked prolifically with the publisher of the SDUK and wrote numerous works for this penny press agenda of disseminating knowledge on a

<sup>159</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 166–170.

<sup>160</sup> For more on this penny press and the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge see Secord 2000, 48–51; Mitchell, R. 2008; Topham 2009, 831–832; Beavan & McDougall 2009, 364–365.

variety of subjects.<sup>161</sup> The quoted passage from Craik was presented by Wakefield and Ward as ‘[t]he most graphic and correct delineation of New Zealanders in their primitive state’. The passage was over three pages in length, and it contained many references to the apparent warlike disposition of Māori:

They present a striking contrast to the timid and luxurious Otaheitans [Tahitians], and the miserable outcasts of Australia. The masculine independence they at once manifested in their first encounters with us, and the startling resistance they offered to our proud pre-eminence, served to stimulate the feelings of curiosity with which we are now accustomed to regard them. [...] The New Zealanders are not a timid or a feeble people: [...] They did not stand still to be slaughtered, like the Peruvians by the Spaniards; but they tried their strength of the club against the flash of the musket. [...] Their passion is war; and they carry on that excitement in the most terrific way that the fierceness of man has ever devised;—they devour their slaughtered enemies.<sup>162</sup>

This kind of comparison of different indigenous peoples and the classification of Māori as having been higher ranked in their character than many other peoples was typical for the early 19<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>163</sup> It also shows that savagery was not a uniform classification in such discourse, since different supposedly savage peoples could have been further classified based on the characteristics of their apparent savagery.

*The New Zealanders* presents one node within networks in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century in which knowledge moved via printed material. Many improvements in paper making and printing were made in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. This resulted in a slow but steady increase in the amount and availability of printed material, which made movement of knowledge in print more prolific.<sup>164</sup> Much of what was presented of Māori in *The New Zealanders* was gathered from various other printed sources, as was also the case in *The British Colonization*. These sources were intermittently referenced in footnotes in *The New Zealanders*. The published travel accounts of Captain Cook’s voyages were included, as were accounts from other travellers and the journal of Rev. Samuel Marsden, who was a driving force behind the beginning of the CMS mission in New Zealand. Marsden’s text had been previously printed in the CMS’s publication *Missionary Register*.<sup>165</sup> This network of intertextual transfer

<sup>161</sup> Hawes (2004) 2019.

<sup>162</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 171–172. The same passage originally in Craik 1830, 14–15.

<sup>163</sup> Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 167; Belich (1996) 2007, 125–126; Moloney 2001, 159.

<sup>164</sup> McKitterick 2009, 2–3.

<sup>165</sup> See e.g. Craik 1830, 21, 22, 23, 30, 67, 106 & 142.

of knowledge continued as Craik's work was further quoted by Wakefield and Ward. The sparsity of references in *The New Zealanders* presents occasional difficulties in identifying the precise source for a given piece of information on Māori. The passage quoted by Wakefield and Ward appeared in Craik's introduction and provided general characterisations of Māori. In this manner, Craik presented Māori in their early interaction with the collective 'us' of the British without reference to any specific interactions.

As quoted by Wakefield and Ward in *The British Colonization*, this passage appears in some contrast to the earlier general characterisation of Māori. Rather than a mere abstract generalisation, it was cited as deriving from an allegedly authoritative and 'correct' source. It also differs in tone. This presentation of Māori as warlike was not as absolutely condemnatory as might have been expected after a general description of Māori as 'thoroughly savage' and the further characterisation of their martial character. In fact, the passage quoted from Craik seems to allude to an apparent nobility in Māori, which their strength provided, in comparison to the Tahitians and Peruvians. After Cook's voyages and up to the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century a certain viewpoint of Māori as 'noble savages' of a masculine and martial bent had pervaded many early European representations. This nobility arose from 'the cut throat thrust of warfare and oratory', as expressed by Ballantyne.<sup>166</sup> Māori warfare and their perceived warlike character carried with it some aspects of nobility and masculine strength that were not expressly condemnatory or even indicative of inferiority. Considering that there were certain tropes of heroism and masculinity connected with soldiers and sailors in the budding Victorian culture,<sup>167</sup> such views of Māori can be viewed as somewhat consistent with British attitudes at the time.

The same appearance of strength and masculinity is evident in Wakefield and Ward's quotation from Craik. Since this passage was a quote from Craik and not presented in Wakefield and Ward's voice, as with the earlier characterisations of Māori warfare, the slight difference in tone regarding the warlike character of Māori can be attributable to different authors or different contexts in which the matter was discussed. Nevertheless, this passage was selected by Wakefield and Ward to be used as a source of Māori character, indicating that there was ambivalence to the significance of martiality as a characterisation. The earlier characterisation from Wakefield and Ward suggested negative attitudes from a British perspective towards war among Māori. Nonetheless, the strength of Māori also appears to have placed them above certain indigenous peoples, such as Australian aborigines and Tahitians accordingly with contemporary British evaluations of different indigenous peoples.

<sup>166</sup> Ballantyne 2011, 245.

<sup>167</sup> Brown 2010, 594.

It is however necessary to keep in mind that even this comparison of Māori with other indigenous peoples, which painted Māori in a more positive light, still formed a part of the claimed knowledge of their alleged savagery. While presented as having been superior to Australian Aborigines or Tahitians in some ways, this was still seen as constitutive of their savagery. In Moon's words, for example, Māori were seen as wild, evil and barbarian. A further indication to this effect is the reference to Māori cannibalism in the quoted passage. Cannibalism had been a common trope attributed to 'Others' by Europeans since the 15<sup>th</sup> century, even attributed to peoples among whom the real-life existence of cannibalism has been questioned by modern historiography. As a trope it has been used by European writers and colonial rulers to justify colonial action since many non-Europeans were labelled as 'bad' in terms of their customs and as having been contrary to European morality. Depictions of indigenous cannibalism in European discourse have generally been seen as reducing these people to a state inferior to Europeans, since matters such as cannibalism, incest and sodomy were recurring signifiers of something that seen as having been contrary to nature.<sup>168</sup> The appearance of inferiority was an implicit yet sweeping tone in both *The British Colonization* and the Aborigines Committee's report in presenting claims of supposed Māori savagery.

In addition to the quote from *The New Zealanders*, another extensive quotation appeared in the same section of *The British Colonization* also presenting general characterisations of Māori and noting equally on their warlike character. This was extracted from James Busby's *A Brief Memoir relative to the Islands of New Zealand*, which was a document he had addressed to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Busby travelled from Britain to the Bay of Islands in the northern New Zealand in 1833 after he was appointed British Resident to New Zealand. Busby had secured his appointment after presenting to the British colonial administration the state of European-Māori interactions in New Zealand, including descriptions of conflicts between European settlers and Māori. Among his communications with the government was *A Brief Memoir* in which he suggested the appointment of a Resident to ensure security in commercial dealings between Europeans and Māori. His appointment to the post of Resident was intended to be a means to prevent conflicts between Europeans and Māori as well as violent acts that European settlers and sailors committed against Māori.<sup>169</sup> *A Brief Memoir* was later printed and published in 1832 as a part of a selection of his papers on Australian colonies and

<sup>168</sup> See e.g. Motohashi 1999; Jahoda 1999, 97–112; Pocock 2005, 159; Abulafia 2008, 126–127 & 191–192.

<sup>169</sup> Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 60; Attwood 2020, 111–113.

New Zealand that was entitled *Authentic Information relative to New South Wales and New Zealand*.<sup>170</sup>

Similarly to Craik in *The New Zealanders*, in the quote from *A Brief Memoir* Busby did give a relatively positive appraisal of Māori, despite also outlining matters related to their savagery. He noted that Māori ‘are remarkable for a vigour in mind, and a *forecast*, which distinguishes them, perhaps, from all other savages [...]’. Yet, Busby also described Māori as ‘chiefly remarkable for the ferocity with which they engage in the perpetual wars that the different tribes wage with each other’ and ‘that contempt of human life, which is the natural result of a warfare that aims at the extermination or captivity of the hostile tribe’.<sup>171</sup> This description further re-enforced the knowledge claim that was formed by Wakefield and Ward of Māori as ferocious warriors whose warlike character, despite having had expressions of apparent nobility, also included actions that would have appeared unthinkable to 19<sup>th</sup>-century Britons.

While the quote from Busby was similar to that from Craik in presenting Māori in general terms, Busby’s supposed credibility as a source was indicated by Wakefield and Ward in more concrete terms. His authority on New Zealand was given as arising from his status as the Resident in New Zealand. In a footnote in *The British Colonization* after Wakefield and Ward introduced *A Brief Memoir*, they presented Busby seemingly as an eyewitness from New Zealand: ‘This gentleman has for some years been resident in New Zealand, attempting to exercise a British authority, without means of enforcing it. This sketch of the New Zealand character was written several years ago.’<sup>172</sup> As the British Resident, Busby was thus presented as enjoying a certain authority and credibility that arose from his post. Such a personal status was also significant in ascertaining the credibility of travel writing in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries more generally, although the historical geographers Innes M. Keighren, Charles W. J. Withers and Bill Bell also point out that it did not fully constitute an explanatory or evaluative mechanism for credibility.<sup>173</sup>

However, the introduction to Busby’s account, which indicated his authority stemmed from his role as the British Resident, warrants further attention. This was a somewhat misleading allusion as it promoted Busby’s authority as a first-hand source. *A Brief Memoir* was written in 1831, which was indeed ‘several years’ before the publication of *The British Colonization*, as was stated in Wakefield and Ward’s

<sup>170</sup> Busby 1832a. Busby first wrote *A Brief Memoir* in June 1831. See fl. 183–199, CO 209/1, TNA.

<sup>171</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 174–175; For the original see Busby 1832a, 60. Italicisation in both texts.

<sup>172</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 174.

<sup>173</sup> Keighren, Withers & Bell 2015, 73–74.

presentation of Busby's document. Yet, at this time Busby was not yet the British Resident and had not lived in New Zealand, having lived in New South Wales prior to returning to England. The cause for this misstatement by Wakefield and Ward could be traced to Busby's *Authentic Information* in which the printed version of *A Brief Memoir* was published. This was most likely the version used by Wakefield and Ward since *Authentic Information* was included in a list of publications on New Zealand that was appended to the end of *The British Colonization*.<sup>174</sup> Many of the sources quoted by Wakefield and Ward were included in this list. On the cover of *Authentic Information* Busby was introduced as 'formerly [the] collector of the internal revenue and member of the land board of New South Wales; now British Resident at New Zealand'.<sup>175</sup> By the time of the publication of the printed version of *A Brief Memoir*, Busby had secured his appointment as Resident, of which he himself was informed in March 1832. In the printed *A Brief Memoir* it is stated that in addition to having been published for sale the print was submitted to the Secretary of State for the Colonies in July 1832.<sup>176</sup> But at this time he had not yet visited New Zealand. With these considerations in mind, it is possible that Wakefield and Ward mistakenly misrepresented Busby's status as a first-hand observer of New Zealand, unless they had further knowledge of Busby's movements other than what was published in print. Archival material on this is, however, inconclusive.

Nevertheless, it is clear that Busby enjoyed generally some credibility in British colonial politics even before his appointment as Resident. In a memorandum to the Colonial Office dated February 18<sup>th</sup> 1832 by Lord Haddington,<sup>177</sup> Haddington stated that Busby, to whom he was a patron, viewed himself the primary candidate for becoming the Resident. This was because, among other reasons, he was 'the first to bring the subject [of the need for British action in New Zealand] under the notice of the Government'.<sup>178</sup> Moreover, Busby had provided the Colonial Office with papers on the jury system, treatment of convicts and the disposal of Crown lands in Australia as well as papers on New Zealand during his time in New South Wales. Furthermore, Peter Adams has suggested that Busby possessed three significant credentials for receiving a government post at the time: first, an influential patron in Haddington; second, he had held two civil service posts in New South Wales without tenure; and third, his father was in the employ of the New South Wales government.<sup>179</sup> These social factors could have made him an attractive and suitable applicant for the post

<sup>174</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 423.

<sup>175</sup> Busby 1832a.

<sup>176</sup> See Moon 2020, chapter 5; Busby 1832b.

<sup>177</sup> Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 41.

<sup>178</sup> Memorandum from Earl of Haddington, 8 February 1832, fl. 173, CO 209/1, TNA.

<sup>179</sup> Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 41.

of British Resident from the perspective of the British colonial government at the time.

On the other hand, from the perspective of Wakefield and Ward, who were outside the colonial administration, Busby could have been considered an authoritative source as an individual with connections to the Colonial Office and thus suitable for Wakefield and Ward's use. Being touted as the Resident in New Zealand and seemingly an eyewitness was misleading from an objective perspective. It is likely, however, that a discrepancy of a few years between Busby having written *A Brief Memoir* and his subsequent arrival in New Zealand could have been missed by many readers of *The British Colonization*, unless they were closely associated with the British colonial administration.

Thus, the inconsistency in the timing of the publication of *A Brief Memoir* and Busby's arrival in New Zealand can be seen as not having had much impact on the use of Busby's text as a source for *The British Colonization*. In fact, Ann Laura Stoler's study on reading colonial archives and uncovering how imperial rule was '(mis)managed, how attentions were trained, and selectively cast' through writerly forms shows that knowing was not simple nor clearly and unproblematically shared. She argues that perceptions and practices of colonial officials were often 'fashioned from piecemeal and uncertain knowledge' and a historian attempting to place them in one coherent context of organised colonial rule loses sight of the realities of colonialism. She further argues that discrepancies in colonial knowledge offer views into these realities: 'To smooth out incompatible versions would be to ignore the different frames in which events were understood, reported, and played out. To imagine a specific set of stories intentionally crafted to obscure "what really happened" would be to miss the frenzied scramble to know what happened and the conditions that sabotaged those efforts again and again.'<sup>180</sup> Discrepancies, such as the timing of Busby's authority, could then offer a glimpse into the colonial realities and the scramble to know about New Zealand. It exposes the arguably shaky ground upon which British knowledge of colonial areas rested. However, this does not alter the possible influence introducing Busby as a reliable source could have had for the argumentation in *The British Colonization*. Stoler concludes her examination of 19<sup>th</sup>-century Dutch colonial reports of Sumatra by noting that they were 'fashioned cultural accounts *with political effects*'. She adds that it is necessary to explore 'what made some more relevant to and reasonable to their authors and audiences' in a world that moved with uneven and different paces'.<sup>181</sup> Equally, the use and introduction of Busby's account was carried out by Wakefield and Ward for political effect and it would have appeared to them as 'relevant and reasonable to use', even though

<sup>180</sup> Stoler 2012, 35–38.

<sup>181</sup> Stoler 2012, 62, italicisation in the original.

retrospective spectators can see that there was a temporal discrepancy in quoting this account. Thus, the introduction of Busby as an authoritative source by Wakefield and Ward is very indicative of the strategy used for building authority for this source in their book. It likely arose to a large degree from the appearance of Busby as an eyewitness in New Zealand with high social status.

Busby appearing in *The British Colonization* as an eyewitness present in New Zealand is significant. Wakefield and Ward also made prolific use of other similar ‘eyewitness’ sources. The section in Wakefield and Ward’s ‘General Character of New Zealanders’ on supposedly past Māori character was relatively brief in contrast to the following section on alleged Māori improvement. Possibly due to this, quotes from *The New Zealanders* and Busby’s *A Brief Memoir* constituted the majority of the text in that former part. Yet, similarly to Craik’s *The New Zealanders*, travellers and travel accounts received plenty of attention from Wakefield and Ward and their texts were frequently quoted in other parts of *The British Colonization*. These were used to describe Māori in relation to various aspects of their character and their supposed willingness to engage in contact with Europeans.<sup>182</sup> Missionaries were also often cited, as they were sources similar to travellers in the sense that they were present in and wrote from New Zealand.

These references to missionaries were occasionally related to Māori warfare in the context of the attempts of the missionaries to prevent war in New Zealand, but there were also casual references to war as part of Māori customs. In one part of *The British Colonization*, the CMS missionary William White was quoted as stating that in a meeting between two ‘tribes’ a breach of protocol could have resulted in war. Another passage was quoted from the *Missionary Register* relating to the account of the missionary William Williams of a feast after which ‘it has been the custom for the chiefs to speak in council, when their object has been generally to excite one another to war’.<sup>183</sup> In the context of missionary writing, these references to Māori warfare were typical. Missionaries viewed ‘pacifying’ indigenous peoples as a path that led them to civilisation.<sup>184</sup>

The lack of references to travel writing in the part of *The British Colonization* on Māori savagery was certainly not, however, due to a lack of such information in

<sup>182</sup> See e.g. references to travel accounts by John Liddiard Nicholas, Lieutenant Breton, Baron Hügel, Captain Cruise, John Savage, Major Cruise and Augustus Earle in *The British Colonization of New Zealand 1837*, 277–300.

<sup>183</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand 1837*, 236 & 239. For the source, see *The Missionary Register 1836*, 555–556.

<sup>184</sup> On missionary endeavours to end warfare among indigenous peoples in Polynesia, southern Africa and Australia in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries see e.g. Woolmington 1986, 92–93; Thorne 1999, 9–10; Elbourne 2002, 120–121 & 138; Cox 2008, 142; Ganter 2018, 4–5.

travellers' accounts. Describing Māori in terms of masculinity and warfare were common tropes in early 19<sup>th</sup> century travel writing, of which John Liddiard Nicholas's *Narrative of a voyage to New Zealand, performed in the years 1814 and 1815* is a good example.<sup>185</sup> Nicholas was an iron founder who had applied for permission to settle in New South Wales. Having developed a friendship with the CMS's Samuel Marsden in Australia, Nicholas accompanied Marsden on a journey to New Zealand, and put to paper close observations concerning New Zealand and Māori.<sup>186</sup> Nicholas's travel account was published in London in two parts in 1817, and it was presented in *The British Colonization* in the list of publications relating to New Zealand and quoted in other parts of Wakefield and Ward's book.<sup>187</sup>

In his travel account, Nicholas described meeting the *ariki*, or principal chief of an *iwi*,<sup>188</sup> whom he named Shoupah, when the ship he was travelling on sailed up the River Thames in the Coromandel Peninsula. His description of Shoupah, most likely meaning Te Haupa of Ngāti Pāoa,<sup>189</sup> framed the *ariki* mainly as a warrior whose authority, in Nicholas's account, was derived from his capabilities as a warrior and a leader:

Shoupah, from what we could discover from our warriors [Māori who travelled with the ship], was by far the most considerable chief we had yet met with [...]. Contrary to the usual practice of the areekes [*ariki*], he always commanded his warriors in person, and was accounted, not withstanding his advanced age, one of the bravest men in New Zealand.<sup>190</sup>

Equally, in describing Shoupah's exploits as a warrior Nicholas used similar language in describing those whom he led in battle. According to Nicholas another *rangatira*<sup>191</sup> Duaterra, or Ruatara of Ngāpuhi, had informed him that these men led by Shoupah were 'a warlike and ferocious race'.<sup>192</sup> Again the idea of masculine nobility denoted by strength is apparent in Nicholas's account, as it was reflected in Wakefield and Ward's quoting of Craik's description of Māori. And in a further similarity to Wakefield and Ward's claims on Māori, this nobility was not the only

<sup>185</sup> Ballantyne 2016.

<sup>186</sup> Moon 2014, 71–72.

<sup>187</sup> See *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 423.

<sup>188</sup> On ranks and status in Māori society see e.g. Keane 2011b.

<sup>189</sup> See Mackay, J. 1949, 72–73.

<sup>190</sup> Nicholas 1817a, 391–394.

<sup>191</sup> *Rangatira* is a *te reo Māori* word signifying part of the Māori societal structure and is commonly translated as chief. I will henceforth use the *te reo Māori* term when it is clearly accurate in relation to the person in question, unless citing or referencing historical sources in which the word 'chief' was specifically used.

<sup>192</sup> Nicholas 1817a, 391–394.

aspect of Māori that Nicholas raised. Moon has noted that Nicholas balances the idea of Māori strength and savage nobility, whilst also denouncing them as ignorant, slaves to their impulses and, on closer contact, as having been ‘dirty’ and ‘truly disgusting’.<sup>193</sup> These typical discourses of indigenous peoples were thus repeated over and over again in different texts and contexts.

While Nicholas’s travel account was not quoted in *The British Colonization* it is notable that he was a member of the NZA and took part in its meetings in 1837 and 1838.<sup>194</sup> Thus, he had personal contacts with Wakefield and Ward in addition to his travel account having been mentioned among a list of publications on New Zealand. Therefore, while Nicholas was not specifically quoted in relation to Māori warfare, his writings and person were familiar to Wakefield and Ward and could have influenced their work. This connection and the similarity of the knowledge claims on Māori in *The British Colonization* and contemporary discourses on Māori, such as their warlike character, is a clear reminder that in writing *The British Colonization* Wakefield and Ward were intertwined with typical narratives and representations of indigenous people in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. In gathering and quoting earlier texts on Māori, they carried over some of the inferences and meanings that were written in them by the original authors. Yet, they also reproduced these texts in new contexts and gave them new meanings. After all Wakefield and Ward compiled these sources with the intention of arguing for the NZA’s colonisation plans.

Having now raised these prominent sources and their main contents in presenting the warlike character of Māori in *The British Colonization*, it is worth asking what possible contemporary criteria made these sources useful for Wakefield and Ward. The empiricist nature of exploration and travel writing has often been discussed as having had an impact on how indigenous peoples around the world and human history more widely were seen by 18<sup>th</sup>- and 19<sup>th</sup>-century Britons and other Europeans. Observation and the systematic analysis of lands and peoples that were encountered on voyages have been discussed as having created objectivity and

<sup>193</sup> Moon 2014, 73.

<sup>194</sup> See ‘At a meeting held at the rooms of the New Zealand Association’, 31 May 1837, fr. 306–308, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Minutes etc 1837, ATL; ‘Meeting of the Committee & Members of the Association’, 29 November 1837, fr. 322–323, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Minutes etc 1837, ATL; ‘Meeting of the Committee & Members of the Association’, 13 December 1837, fr. 324–325, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Minutes etc 1837, ATL; ‘Meeting of the Committee and Members of the Association’, 28 December 1837, fr. 327–332, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Minutes etc 1837, ATL; ‘Meeting of the Committee and Members of the New Zealand Association, 13 February 1838, fr 333–335, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Minutes etc 1837, ATL.

credibility for knowledge of distant places. This has been particularly connected to scientific exploration.<sup>195</sup>

Much scholarly work has also been undertaken on examining knowledge as being socially constructed. These studies have pointed to matters such as credibility, evidence and proof as historical phenomena, signifying their changing nature in different contexts in Western history.<sup>196</sup> Related to the British understanding of natural history and the authorities on which this understanding was based, Sarah Irving-Stonebraker has argued that from the 17<sup>th</sup> to the early 19<sup>th</sup> century there was a discursive shift from more theologically-inclined views of natural history towards natural history having been tied to the demands of colonial governance. This also signified a change in the authorities and sources on which the conceptions of natural and human history were based. There was an incremental increase in the emphasis on the empirical nature of travellers' and explorers' narratives and practical encounters between colonisers and the colonised over classical texts and theological conceptions.<sup>197</sup> However, this does not imply that religious or classical sources had lost all their significance in the formation of knowledge in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Even in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, citations to classical authorities like Herodotus and Pliny were used to show the traveller's intellectual credentials.<sup>198</sup> Similarly, of the travellers who visited New Zealand in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, for example, William Barrett Marshall, an assistant surgeon aboard a British navy ship in the South Pacific tied his experiences of Māori and his perceptions of their character to his understanding of the Bible and his Christian faith.<sup>199</sup>

In addition to this kind of temporal shift in the basis of knowledge of the world, the historical geographers Charles W. J. Withers and David N. Livingstone also emphasise the 'local sites for the conduct of knowing' and the geographies of knowledge. Not only was knowledge formed locally and was reliant on circulation and the negotiation of knowledge to warrant credibility, but in order to understand the context-dependent formation of knowledge it is necessary to look at the mechanisms through which knowledge was attained.<sup>200</sup> From these perspectives, and considering the idea of different coexistent and competing knowledges, empiricism

<sup>195</sup> See e.g. Pagden 1993; Clayton 2000, 19; Iliffe 2003; Bleichmar 2011; Byrne 2013; Keighren, Withers & Bell 2015, 72–75; MacLean 2019, 65–76.

<sup>196</sup> For prominent examples of this problematisation see Shapin 1994; Daston & Galison 2007. See also Renn 2015, 38; Friedrich 2019, 1–2.

<sup>197</sup> Irving-Stonebraker 2019; Belich (1996) 2007, 124–125; Roque & Wagner 2012; 3–4. For a closer examination of exploration and its connections to Christian beliefs and scepticism towards Christian beliefs see Livingstone 1999.

<sup>198</sup> Keighren, Withers & Bell 2015, 76.

<sup>199</sup> See Marshall 1836. On Marshall and his travels see also Moon 2014, 42–50.

<sup>200</sup> Withers & Livingstone 1999, 15–16.

alone cannot be assumed to have acted as an all-encompassing explanation for creating credibility in different contexts of the 18<sup>th</sup>- or 19<sup>th</sup>-century Britain. This is despite typical contemporary criteria, such as empiricism, probably having played some role in the processes of ensuring credibility for knowledge claims.

Daniela Bleichmar also points out that even in the 18<sup>th</sup>-century scientific production of knowledge there was a tension between the epistemic values of moving to procure specimens, on the one hand, and staying put to intellectually produce the scientific knowledge, on the other.<sup>201</sup> Therefore, it is worthwhile asking where the credibility of sources and the supposed proof arose for *The British Colonization*, as well as the Aborigines Committee's report, and whether empiricism that was based on first-hand witnessing was a sufficient explanation as to how credible knowledge claims were formed. There were significant questions related to the use of witnesses as sources from geographically distant places. For example, there was the possibility of first-hand witnesses having been unreliable or untruthful, as well as the question of whether second-hand witnesses could have been used as credible evidence. But beyond looking at Wakefield and Ward's reliance on the appearance of empiricism of their sources for credibility, it is also possible to attempt to discern how they themselves viewed the sources they used from their contemporary perspective.

I have already suggested that Busby's presented status as the British Resident could have made him an attractive source to be used by Wakefield and Ward. Furthermore, in creating what was presented as certifiable and proven knowledge, the use of extensive quotations from sources such as Craik's *The New Zealanders* can be viewed as a strategy for establishing credibility. These kinds of direct or seemingly direct quotations from various sources were used extensively by Wakefield and Ward throughout *The British Colonization*. But how and why did the specific sources used by Wakefield, Ward, and by extension those used by Buxton's inner circle for the Aborigines Committee's report, appear effective or useful in establishing credibility for their knowledge claims and thus their argumentation?

This is a particularly pertinent question to be directed at *The New Zealanders*, since it received proportionally plenty of attention in *The British Colonization* when presenting Māori savagery. The first reference to Craik's *The New Zealanders* by Wakefield and Ward was in the section entitled 'Existing State of Colonization in New Zealand', which preceded 'The General Character of New Zealanders'. *The New Zealanders* was quoted as a source for indicating the effects and the 'existing state of colonization' that was allegedly underway in New Zealand. In the introduction to *The New Zealanders*, Wakefield and Ward lauded the book as 'the

<sup>201</sup> Bleichmar 2011, 386.

best informed compilation that has yet appeared, regarding New Zealand and its inhabitants'.<sup>202</sup> This accreditation was reinforced when it was later stated that the general account of Māori character before European contact was most graphic and correct. Yet, no more specific reasoning on the supposed authority given to Craik's volume was provided by Wakefield and Ward.

These valuations in fact place the credibility ascribed to *The New Zealanders* in a curious light in the context of the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. Travel writing in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries grappled with questions of credibility 'at a distance', since few individuals had the possibility of making observations that were similar to those that were presented in travel writing. This was especially pronounced in cases relating to areas that were very distant for a British audience, such as the South Pacific. Travellers had the capacity to distort the truth, amplify their observations and to claim to have witnessed something they had never seen. Questions centred on how writers could be trusted or even evaluated vis-à-vis the value and reliability of the information they provided, given there was little possibility of substantiating their claims from other sources. Keighren, Withers and Bell note that such questions were further accentuated when the information a traveller provided originated from second-hand testimony or hearsay, rather than from their own experiences. Even sedentary scholarship was largely dependent on first-hand testimony.<sup>203</sup> Beyond the genre of travel writing, similar questions of credibility could be expanded to *The British Colonization* and *The New Zealanders*. Not only was Wakefield and Ward's book a compilation of sources aimed at providing knowledge claims on Māori, but in quoting *The New Zealanders* as a source for proving these claims they cited another compilation of travel accounts on New Zealand and Māori. This could be seen as a definite challenge to the credibility of what was claimed by Wakefield and Ward, but despite this they specifically highlighted *The New Zealanders* as a particularly accurate source on Māori.

There were other similar contemporary questions related to the credibility of reporting about distant places. Questions of how second-hand reporting affected the credibility of knowledge about distant lands and peoples were also related to John Hawkesworth's official narrative of Captain James Cook's first journey, which was published in 1773. All journals and diaries from Cook's first expedition on the *Endeavour* were provided to the publisher Murray in order that Hawkesworth, as a professional author, could compile them into a single narrative. Keighren, Withers and Bell note that as a compiled and edited work, Hawkesworth's text 'flouted many

<sup>202</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 135.

<sup>203</sup> Keighren, Withers & Bell 2015, 72–73 & 82; Carey, D. 2016. See also Clark 1999, 1–2. For a discussion of problems of hearsay or second-hand reporting in travel writing see also Adams, P. G. 1962, 134, 229, *passim*.

of the conventions of eighteenth-century travel writing'. This dented its credibility.<sup>204</sup> Equivalent requirements for first-hand testimony were linked to other forms of communication from areas that were also geographically distant to the reader. In the 1830s, for example, the British Anti-Slavery Society struggled with their pamphlets that were intended to influence public opinion on the state of slave trade in the Caribbean colonies, as they lacked first-hand accounts and interviews. This resulted in the Society advertising for and requesting first-hand witnesses and manuscripts.<sup>205</sup>

The same bases for credibility cannot be directly transferred from the genre of travel literature to *The British Colonization* and *The New Zealanders*. Wakefield and Ward did not suggest that they presented eye-witnessing or first-hand reporting that could have been expected from a travel narrative. And *The British Colonization* and *The New Zealanders* were of rather a different genre than travel accounts, such as the one edited by Hawkesworth. But this does not mean that first-hand witnessing would not have been valuable in the context of colonial action. Many examples of the value of empirical and first-hand information can be found in previous scholarly work. Catherine Hall suggests that Edward John Eyre, the resident magistrate of Murray River in southern Australia, hoped to convince the readers of his publicised journals of his success in pacifying violence that had taken place between settlers and Aborigines through his personal first-hand accounts of the events.<sup>206</sup> The appearance of credible first-hand sources also helped give colonial planning the air of viability. The late-18<sup>th</sup>-century colonisation plans of the Sierra Leone Company were intended to be distinguishable from previous colonisation attempts. They presented these earlier attempts as having been unorganised, unprepared and ill-conceived, in contrast to the intelligence that was afforded to the Sierra Leone Company from its agents who had visited Sierra Leone.<sup>207</sup>

The planning of South Australian colonisation also provides another such example. The South Australian Colonisation Commission, with which Wakefield was closely involved and that also based its plans on Wakefield's colonisation theories, attempted to assuage the concerns of the Colonial Office of the impact of the proposed colonisation of South Australia on the local Aborigines. To this end, in early 1836 they suggested founding the office of the protector of Aborigines in the colony. The protector would have ascertained whether lands belonged to the Aborigines before they were sold. In cases where Aborigines occupied such lands the protector would have secured the enjoyment of those lands for them. The

<sup>204</sup> Keighren, Withers & Bell 2015, 30–31.

<sup>205</sup> Wood 2000, 81.

<sup>206</sup> Hall, C. 2002, 40–41.

<sup>207</sup> Caulker 2009, 59–60.

historian Bain Attwood has indicated that this suggestion was made with the belief that Australian Aborigines did not occupy, enjoy or possess lands and thus such property rights would never have had to be recognised.<sup>208</sup> Nevertheless, these examples show how gathering first-hand information was seen as a necessary part of a viable colonisation plan. Altogether, such typical uses of empirical knowledge, as well as the case of the Anti-Slavery Society and their lack of first-hand sources, provide clues as to why Wakefield and Ward used sources like Busby and travellers from New Zealand. These pieces of evidence that appeared as first-hand sources would have given the NZA's knowledge claims the credibility that the Anti-Slavery Society sought.

Such an empirical approach has also been linked specifically to use of details and observations in creating humanitarian narratives of pain and death from the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. This approach has its basis in what Thomas W. Laqueur calls the 'empiricist revolution of the seventeenth century', which reflects Irving-Stonebraker's analysis. According to Laqueur, in humanitarian narratives the empiricist literary technique entailed using close details and minute observations as signs of truth. These details were intended to represent the experiences of portrayed others as real, which Laqueur calls the 'reality effect'. The role of these types of details was to bring matters that would otherwise seem distant and detached closer so as to be understood. Furthermore, in narratives of suffering they helped to foster a sense of compassion. This kind of literary strategy was common with evangelical writers and has been linked to humanitarian language.<sup>209</sup> Thus, the use of a similar strategy by Wakefield and Ward appears consistent with their seemingly humanitarian concern of allegedly endeavouring to help Māori, even though the specific knowledge claims about their savagery were not based exactly on the kind of humanitarian narratives of suffering that Laqueur has examined. Yet, in quoting travellers and missionaries, the first-hand eye witnessing and all detail presented through them appear as an evident basis for credibility in Wakefield and Ward's use. This was boosted by introducing these sources as particularly credible and authentic. Daniel Carey points out that even travellers did not confine themselves only to matters that they observed, but also reported other events purportedly witnessed by others. The credibility of reporting such events was emphasised by reassuring the readers about the reliability of the sources used by them, with slight circularity.<sup>210</sup> This similar assurance of sources having been authoritative first-hand witnesses,

<sup>208</sup> Attwood 2013, 73–75. For more on Wakefield and South Australian colonisation, see Lester & Dussart 2014, 180–183.

<sup>209</sup> Laqueur 1989, 177–180 & 184–185; see also Hall, C. 2002, 304; Ballantyne 2011, 240; Carey, D. 2016; Johnston 2016.

<sup>210</sup> Carey, D. 2016, 4.

along with also introducing Busby as the Resident, indicated a reliance on similar criteria for credibility.

Yet, this appearance of credibility that arose from eye-witnessing does not explain upon what basis Wakefield and Ward claimed that their second-hand source, *The New Zealanders*, was a credible source of information. Here, the question of why Wakefield and Ward cited *The New Zealanders* prominently can also be looked at from another perspective. It can be pondered why Wakefield and Ward themselves considered Craik's work a suitable source for their use. The processes of reception of information or knowledge are, after all, also significant in how and to what result knowledge was formed. In history of knowledge this kind of reception across time, distance or disciplinary or institutional boundaries has been theorised generally as a part of circulation of knowledge, for example.<sup>211</sup> Livingstone's concept of geographies of reading provides further perspective for this. This notion emphasises that 'reading literally *takes place*'. Livingstone underlines the moment of textual encounter and notes that '[t]he meaning that any new work has for an individual reader is shaped by the other texts and theories and practices they have engaged'. As an example, Livingstone cites the study by Fa-ti Fan, who finds that the textual practices and interpretative tactics of British naturalists presumed their own superiority over other cultures. This influenced their reading of Chinese works of natural history. In this view the expectations and predispositions of the reader constitute a significant consideration.<sup>212</sup> In a similar manner, the positioning of Wakefield and Ward as situated in London and working on their arguments for their colonial plans should be factored in to how they read, received and used their sources. Their own perceptions of credibility and the pragmatic utility of sources can be seen as two possible factors in their reading and perception of sources.

Considering that neither Wakefield nor Ward had visited New Zealand before they wrote *The British Colonization*, they themselves relied on the apparent credibility of others to receive information and form their own understanding of what was appropriate knowledge about the islands and Māori. When it comes to their use of Craik and Busby's texts, the credibility of both authors were in fact entwined with each other in the complexities of circulation of print and the intertextuality of sources. With this in mind, I will also tie their use of Busby's *A Brief Memoir* to the use of *The New Zealanders*. Moon has observed that Busby's *A Brief Memoir* appeared as a compelling presentation of New Zealand due to its detailed accounting of issues in New Zealand as well as proposing an inexpensive solution to these issues

<sup>211</sup> See e.g. Keim 2014, 94–95.

<sup>212</sup> Livingstone 2005, 392–394. For Fa-ti Fan's study see Fan 2004. For a further similar theorisation of reading as a creative process see also Chartier 1989.

in the form of the Resident.<sup>213</sup> Moon examines the contents of Busby's writing closely but does not elaborate on Busby's apparent credibility beyond the text's detailed nature. The original edition of *A Brief Memoir* had been part of Busby's plan to secure an official post for himself. However, the print was also sold to the public. It was stated in the preface of the print that Busby's information ought to be disseminated to a wider audience due to its usefulness in matters relating to emigration from England.<sup>214</sup> As such it would have been desirable for the information to appear credible. Hence, it is safe to assume that for Wakefield and Ward the work did appear credible or at the very least useful.

Based on the presentation of information on New Zealand in *A Brief Memoir*, much of Busby's information was alluded to as having been based on observations and empirical evidence. Busby described British trade with Māori with references to ships dispatched to New Zealand together with statistical figures on the extent of the trade. He continued further with characterisations of Māori customs and some Māori individuals. In a footnote in the printed version of *A Brief Memoir* these pieces of information were described as having originated from 'what occurred under his own observation, when he had no object in view in giving his attention to the subject, and of what had been told to him by others, whose opportunities for observation had been greater'.<sup>215</sup> This remark concerning the origins of Busby's knowledge indicates how he himself was portrayed as a credible source of information when his text was printed. Based on this prominent footnote, Busby was presented as an impartial observer who had first-hand knowledge of matters that had taken place 'under his own observation'. The statement that he supposedly did not have any object in view for observing these matters further underlined his alleged objectivity on the matter. In addition, he was described as having received further information from other individuals, who had had better 'opportunities for observation' on some matters. This plays into the value of the eye-witnessing as discussed above. Yet, there was in fact an intertextual connection between Busby's *A Brief Memoir* and Craik's *The New Zealanders*.

In the footnote of *A Brief Memoir*, after Busby's own observations were presented as a source of information, there followed an acknowledgement of Craik's book and Busby's alleged independence and unconnectedness to it: '[Busby] had it not in his power to refer to any publication on New Zealand, and was unaware of the existence of the extremely interesting, and, as he believes, very correct account of the New Zealanders [...] forming the fifth volume of the Library of Entertaining

<sup>213</sup> Moon 2020, chapter 4.

<sup>214</sup> Busby 1832a, v.

<sup>215</sup> Busby 1832b, 60–63.

Knowledge.<sup>216</sup> Not only did this acknowledgement of Craik's book appear to reaffirm Busby's credibility as an impartial observer without prior knowledge of what others had written about New Zealand. For readers like Wakefield and Ward, this proclamation in Busby's work of *The New Zealanders* having been a 'very correct account of the New Zealanders' could have served to boost the credibility of Craik's book.

Without more detailed archival material that might describe the drafting of *The British Colonization* in greater detail, it is difficult to verify whether Busby's acknowledgement of *The New Zealanders* affected Wakefield and Ward's approval of the claimed veracity of Craik's claims concerning Māori. But considering Livingstone's theorisation of reading it is possible that Busby's reaffirmation of Craik's authority could have given Wakefield and Ward further reason to consider *The New Zealanders* as an appropriate source, even though this was not explicated in *The British Colonization*. After all, Wakefield and Ward's announcement of *The New Zealanders* as 'the best informed[sic] compilation' on Māori greatly resembles Busby's evaluation of *The New Zealanders*. Nevertheless, links such as this between various printed texts that circulated in Britain emphasise the interconnected and intertextual nature of narratives and claimed knowledges concerning Māori in the 1830s. They indicate how these texts were connected to each other in terms of claims they made of a distant subject, such as Māori, and how the accumulation of similar claims could reinforce the credibility of others.

Irrespective of questions concerning the credibility of *The New Zealanders* as a second-hand source, there could have been another reason for Wakefield and Ward's prominent use of the text. The tenor of *The New Zealanders* matched what Wakefield and Ward appear to have sought to achieve when forming knowledge about Māori in *The British Colonization*. The literary historian Geoffrey Sanborn has characterised Craik's *The New Zealanders* as 'imperialist propaganda', with a message that Māori were not the 'ferociously inhospitable cannibals' of the British imagination. Instead, Craik advocated that Māori desired to become a part of the British Empire.<sup>217</sup> Craik's volume and his presentations of Māori was definitely of a highly imperialistic nature and emphasised the perceived superiority of British civilisation. Craik also framed parts of his book as lessons for Britons to learn from the apparently awed impressions of Māori. He viewed that Britons had become indifferent to the benefits provided to them by their civilisation. This perspective

<sup>216</sup> Busby 1832b, 63.

<sup>217</sup> Sanborn 2005, 229–230.

reflected the view of indigenous peoples as juvenile in contrast to ‘civilised’ Europeans; a view strongly evident in *The New Zealanders*.<sup>218</sup>

The supposedly awed impressions Craik claimed Māori had when surrounded by British civilisation and the idea of Māori having been accepting of an expansion of the British Empire into New Zealand fit well with the argumentation put forward by Wakefield and Ward. Furthermore, the claims of Māori warfare and cannibalism that were quoted in *The British Colonization* from Craik appeared in *The New Zealanders* as emphases for the view of Māori inferiority when compared to British civilisation. Craik’s presentation of Māori also provided Wakefield and Ward with alleged evidence of the general past savagery of Māori. This was then contrasted with the improvement that had supposedly taken place in Māori. In terms of these books’ genres and styles of presentation, they also appeared to be very similar. Unlike individual travellers’ journals, which presented personal observations or generalisations based on the observations made of indigenous peoples, the level of presentation was quite general in the intertextually-connected sections of *The New Zealanders* and *The British Colonization*. The general characterisations of Māori that were quoted from *The New Zealanders* in *The British Colonization* seem to have served the purpose of expressing knowledge about Māori on a general level for Wakefield and Ward. In these aspects *The New Zealanders* appears to have been a source that was pragmatically useful and readily available for Wakefield and Ward.

Even in the relatively brief part of *The British Colonization* in which the claims of Māori savagery and warfare were presented, the ideal of empirical first-hand witnessing as a basis for credible knowledge claims and the complexity of movement of knowledge and intertextuality within networks are evident. But this does not give a full picture of the formation of knowledge by Wakefield and Ward since they also used the second-hand *The New Zealanders*. Thus, consideration of how Wakefield and Ward themselves possibly viewed the sources they used, either as credible or useful, provides a more complete picture of the formation of knowledge. Following Laqueur and Carey, it appears that Wakefield and Ward intended to boost the credibility of their knowledge claims by showing detailed and extensive quotations of Māori character, as well as emphasising the credibility of their sources. Altogether, the sources cited by Wakefield and Ward painted Māori as warlike and savage, albeit with a hint of nobility, in their ‘original’ character. Curiously, claims of the warlike character of Māori were also presented by the Aborigines Committee, but were based on significantly different sources.

<sup>218</sup> Craik 1830, 1–9, 13–14 & 288–289. On the view of indigenous peoples as juvenile see e.g. Moloney 2001, 158; Moon 2017, 5–6.

## Witnesses before the Committee and Māori as Reactive Actors

The Aborigines Committee's examination of Māori savagery, and Māori warfare as a part of this supposed savagery, in their report was very different in focus and origins than that found in the text by Wakefield and Ward. In stark contrast to Wakefield and Ward having used even a compiled second-hand text such as *The New Zealanders*, the witness testimonies gathered by the Committee appeared central to the formation and presentation of the Committee's claims of Māori. The Minutes of Evidence of the Committee's report were published appended to the report proper and references to the Minutes were carefully annotated. While apparent eyewitness accounts were also used by Wakefield and Ward, the dominant role of witness interviews in the Aborigines Committee's report stands out in contrast to *The British Colonization*. The impact of individual witnesses and pieces of evidence have been frequently brought up in the rather limited historiographical attention the report has received.<sup>219</sup> In considering formation of knowledge, two aspects are particularly striking in the Committee's use of their witnesses: the centrality of missionary networks as conveyors of information from New Zealand, which thereby provided access to sources, and the relatively passive role in which Māori appeared in this knowledge formation. In connection to the Committee's humanitarian bias, missionaries were a prominent source of information, and they were given as evidently credible sources for forming knowledge about Māori, including the claims of their apparent warlike character.

The value of first-hand witnessing in creating authority was evident in the way the Committee conducted their interviews. Yet it is curiously that this was not always expressly raised in the actual report. Many of the witness interviews began by determining their relationship to the place in question as well as their arrival at and the duration of stay in the different colonies. For example, the interview of the CMS missionary William Yate, whose evidence featured heavily in the report, began with the following assertion of his status:

1586. IN[sic] what situation have you been in the South Sea Islands? –As an ordained missionary of the Church Missionary Society.

1587. In what year did you go out? –In 1827.

1588. Have you been resident there from that time to this? –Yes, till within about a year and a half.

[...]

<sup>219</sup> See Olssen 1997, 213; Elbourne 2003a; Laidlaw 2004; Lester 2008; Lester & Dussart 2014, 86–104.

1590. In what island did you principally reside? –The Northern Island of New Zealand.<sup>220</sup>

Despite such determinations of the witnesses' status, in many cases the references in the report to the witnesses or their testimonies omitted these details concerning the places in question or the fact that the individuals had specifically been eyewitnesses. This would imply that first-hand witnessing was a factor in asserting the witnesses' apparent credibility. Yet this matter was not raised, or was not considered necessary to be raised, as a similar strategy for creating credibility for the actual report as the strategy Wakefield and Ward used for *The British Colonization*. Laqueur, in fact, argues that parliamentary inquiries in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century performed the same functions in practice as humanitarian narratives that were based on detailed narratives of suffering. Great detail in these narratives was outlined in order to prove their credibility. Thus, parliamentary inquiries, in a similar manner, were 'characterized by rich layers of detail' to prove their accuracy.<sup>221</sup> This could have been an effective strategy for select committees that sought to create credible knowledge, despite the fact that there was some contemporary criticism vis-à-vis the reports of the select committees only reflected the views of the chairmen. The historian of the British state and politics David Eastwood has noted that most late-18<sup>th</sup>- and early-19<sup>th</sup>-century committees were limited to calling on volunteers as witnesses. Yet, the committees did succeed in accumulating large quantities of material on diverse subjects that ranged from agricultural production to poor laws, which were thus brought into the public domain.<sup>222</sup>

Thus, the act of conducting witness interviews and presenting them in detail in the appended Minutes could have functioned as a basis for credibility for the Aborigines Committee. Furthermore, while witnesses were not introduced in the report as eyewitnesses, it could have been sufficient to merely ascertain that they had been present in the colonies and the frontiers to justify their inclusion as witnesses. This in turn would have provided an appearance of credibility, even though in the background of the Committee's work the witnesses were closely selected by Buxton to provide testimonies agreeable to his purposes. Evidently such a strategy was well-received by at least some favourable contemporary audiences. Buxton's daughter Priscilla Johnston wrote in a letter in February 1837, before the publication of the

<sup>220</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1836*, Minutes of Evidence, 188. For more on the testimonies see *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1836*, Minutes of Evidence, 1–685 & *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, Minutes of Evidence, 1–108.

<sup>221</sup> Laqueur 1989, 190.

<sup>222</sup> Eastwood 1989, 276–286.

report, that former Attorney-General of New South Wales Saxe Bannister read the draft of the report when visiting them. Johnston described that ‘[he keeps] muttering “such well arranged[sic] facts”, “very strong”, [...] “I thought I knew something about the Cape, but this”, “very powerful”’.<sup>223</sup> The use of such first-hand witnesses did not, however, completely shield the Committee from criticism. Settler press in British colonies criticised the Committee as prejudiced in favour of critics of colonialism. This was partly related to a view that knowledge concerning a place came only with dwelling there, and successively the Committee holding hearings in London was scorned by the settlers.<sup>224</sup>

Most witnesses referenced in the Aborigines Committee’s report, especially concerning New Zealand and islands in the Pacific, were missionaries. This is reflective of the Committee’s bias, which has been acknowledged in historical research. This bias was also apparent at least to the members of the Committee at the time, as well. As the Committee was strongly controlled by Buxton, a majority of the Committee’s members had strong connections to humanitarian, evangelical or Quaker circles. Gladstone and Donkin, however, attempted to ensure that settler voices were heard over the otherwise overtly humanitarian line of questioning from the Committee.<sup>225</sup> Despite these dissenting voices, humanitarian-inclined missionaries were the most prolific voices present in the report proper. Although additional settler witnesses were interviewed in 1837, these pieces of evidence were not included in the Committee’s findings.

In the interviews that were conducted, warfare was a recurring theme discussed regarding Māori. Similar generalisations of Māori belligerence were not presented in the report as were expressed in Wakefield and Ward’s quotations from *The New Zealanders* and *A Brief Memoir*. However, the Committee did present a concise quote from Rev. William Yate on his early notions of the Māori: ‘We found them decidedly a savage people, addicted to cannibalism, to murder and to everything which was evil’.<sup>226</sup> Ballantyne suggests that this testimony by Yate condensed sensational tropes of Māori and was not approved by other New Zealand missionaries who had been committed to evaluating and transforming Māori society.<sup>227</sup> However, for the Aborigines Committee this description seems to have

<sup>223</sup> Letter from Priscilla Johnston to the Cottage, 28 February 1837, fl. 197, MSS. Brit. Emp. s. 444 Papers of Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton 1st Baronet (1), Vol. 15 Extracts Relating to Abolition of Slavery, Vol. V Feb 1836–Aug 16th 1837, BLOU.

<sup>224</sup> Lambert & Lester 2004, 334.

<sup>225</sup> Lester & Dussart 2014, 88.

<sup>226</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 52; For Yate’s original quotation see *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence 188, question 1596.

<sup>227</sup> Ballantyne 2015, 147–148.

been a credible or an appropriate presentation of Māori in relation to the claimed knowledge the Committee presented. This quotation from Yate was presented in the section of the report entitled ‘Effects of fair dealing and Christian instruction’, and was mostly concerned with perceived improvements among Māori, which the Committee attributed to the work that had been undertaken by missionaries in New Zealand. In addition to this generalisation, matters of war and perceptions of the warlike character of Māori were intermittently raised throughout the report’s discussion of Māori. For example, in the beginning of the section entitled ‘Islands in the Pacific’, evidence was extracted from Samuel Marsden and Yate, who discussed wars that had either been ongoing or had been incited between Māori groups by European intervention in Māori affairs.<sup>228</sup> Furthermore, much attention was dedicated to the case of the *Elizabeth*, in which a British sea captain and his crew partook in a war between two Māori parties so as to gain advantageous trade relations with one. The Committee also discussed conflicts resulting from a series of events that followed the wreck of the British barque *Harriet*. In the section of the report entitled ‘Effects of fair dealing’, there were also detailed a number of cases related to warfare between Māori groups.<sup>229</sup> In all these cases testimonies from missionaries were central in the Committee’s presentation of the cases.

The prevalence of the use of missionaries as sources is important to note here. Missionaries occupied a unique position as sources and producers of knowledge. Not only were they in close contact with indigenous peoples and their own work and interests were closely tied to the indigenous peoples, but they also had distinctive religious perspectives from which they perceived indigenous peoples. Anna Johnston notes that missionaries with Enlightenment ideals long had firm monogenist ideas of the origin of different peoples, believing in the unity of humanity when many others denied it. This implied that since all humans were of the same origin, they all would also have possessed the same capacity for improvement. This also had implications vis-à-vis their knowledge production and the political appearance of the knowledge they produced. According to Johnston, missionaries in Australia and other places ‘provided concrete evidence of Indigenous intellect, capacity, and cultural sophistication at precisely the time when other settlers denied it’.<sup>230</sup> The missionary perspective on the indigenous peoples and their

<sup>228</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 15.

<sup>229</sup> These passages were presented respectively in *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 16–17 & 18–22.

<sup>230</sup> Johnston 2011, 66–67; see also Douglas 2013, 387–388. According to Sebastiani the terms monogenism and polygenism appeared for the first time in 1857, but they have longer histories. Monogenism has been linked to the influence of the Bible in the Western culture, whereas polygenist views were developed from the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup>

philosophical or ideological bases resulted in the former providing particular knowledge that had the potential to differ significantly from what other sources, for example settlers, might have provided.

Despite the more piecemeal approach to Māori warfare in comparison to Wakefield and Ward, the context in which these cases of war were presented and discussed by the Committee in the report is significant. As has been noted repeatedly by historians, the humanitarian perspective that was central in the Committee's report was very critical towards European settlers regarding nearly all the incidents, colonies and lands discussed in the report. Conversely, the Committee was supportive of missionary work among indigenous peoples.<sup>231</sup> In this vein, these cases were mainly framed as having been indicative of the alleged guilt of European settlers or the beneficial nature of missionary actions. Thus, warfare and armed conflict received much of the space in the report relating to New Zealand, but less so in terms of Māori character and more in terms of European actions towards them.

When considering alleged Māori savagery, it is pertinent to examine how the claimed knowledge of them as a people and their character were built into the argumentation of the report. While these claims to knowledge were not expressed in the Committee's report as directly in Wakefield and Ward's *The British Colonization* and while the report mainly depicted European settlers as the aggressors in conflicts between Europeans and Māori, Māori did appear as warlike and at the very least retaliatory in character. It was expressed in the report in the passive voice of the Committee that '[i]t is impossible but that such conduct [as was carried out by European aggressors] should bring retaliation; and unfortunately the natives do not always discriminate between the innocent and the guilty.'<sup>232</sup> This view was further justified by quoting Yate's statement in the interviews: '[T]he Europeans have been the aggressors [...] though I will say that the natives have not always punished the right, that is, the offending party.'<sup>233</sup> In this way, Māori were shown as having resorted to violence, despite not having been presented as the aggressors. The historian Jane Samson notes that this 'retaliation theory' was often used in relation to the Pacific region in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century particularly by humanitarians. This was intended to help promote the need to Christianise indigenous peoples in Polynesia and Melanesia so that they would reach a stage at which they were able to participate in interactions with Europeans as equals. An emphasis was placed on white agency

centuries as a response to Europeans coming in contact with so-called savages. See Sebastiani 2013, 9–10.

<sup>231</sup> Elbourne 2003a; Laidlaw 2004; Lester 2008, 64–65 & 70.

<sup>232</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 24.

<sup>233</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 24; See also Yate's testimony in *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 194, question 1693.

at the centre and indigenous people's actions were simplified to mere retaliations for which they were not fully responsible since they were not yet civilised.<sup>234</sup> This emphasis on white agency was particularly evident in the Committee's examination of Māori as they barely appeared as proactive actors. In light of Samson's examination of the 'retaliation theory', this examination suited the Committee's agenda of pushing for humanitarian improvement of Māori while presenting them as savage to a degree and in need of improvement.

Similar matters were raised in the Committee's report relating to Australian Aborigines. However, curiously the Committee enquired of witnesses the relationship between acts of vengeance and the people's general character in relation to Aborigines but not in relation to Māori. In the interview with Yate, after he had noted that there had been 'atrocities' committed by Aborigines against settlers in some outposts, he was questioned as to whether these acts could be attributed to 'a general vindictiveness of character, or to a desire for vengeance for injuries'. Yate asserted the latter was the case.<sup>235</sup> Such a specification was not asked of Yate vis-à-vis his view of Māori and their retaliations for European actions. Yet, the idea of revenge by Māori was emblematic of how the Committee presented their conduct.

Even the acknowledgement of some Māori guilt or aggressive character in their retaliatory actions, which arose from the Committee's questions, seemingly focused on European actions. Yate's answer about Europeans as the aggressors in conflicts and Māori successively retaliating was in references to the following question by the Committee: 'Did you ever know a case in which, when the facts were really shifted, the fault did not originate with the Europeans?'<sup>236</sup> This question was not included in the report proper, where Yate was quoted, but it is reflective of the Committee's main focus in their examination of the situation in New Zealand and British colonies. The Committee's main focus was on European actions, whether committed by settlers or missionaries. As Samson states, the retaliation theory placed other than white agency to the margins. Ballantyne has noted the same about Yate as a witness. In attempting to exonerate Māori from blame, in terms of conflicts with Europeans, he states that they merely reacted to European aggression. Yate thus minimised the capability of Māori to be active social agents. Ballantyne also notes that Yate presented a very different message in this instance than was communicated to London from New Zealand in missionary journals, including those from Yate. Such missionary writings often discussed Māori activity and proactivity in mission

<sup>234</sup> Samson 1998, 29, 83, 87–88 & 108.

<sup>235</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 204, questions 1830–1832.

<sup>236</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 194, question 1693.

stations and even their capability to contest or even dictate terms of relationships between themselves and missionaries.<sup>237</sup>

The only direct condemnation of Māori actions in these cases was in reference to incidents that followed the wreck of the *Harriet*. In April 1834, after the barque *Harriet* had been wrecked on the shore in Taranaki, a group of local Ngāti Ruanui Māori attacked those shipwrecked and Captain John Guard and his family were taken prisoner. Captain Guard was released to retrieve a ransom for the rest of the prisoners, but he returned with the man-of-war *Alligator*, which was sent by the governor of New South Wales. This resulted in further conflict.<sup>238</sup> In the Committee's examination of the case, they concluded that there were only 'two acts [that constituted] the whole that had been alleged against the natives'. According to the Committee, for one, a single musket was fired by the Māori without having been incited by European provocation when negotiating with an officer of the *Alligator*. But this acknowledgement was hedged by stating that it was not known whether this was carried out with intent to cause damage or was merely accidental or even a peaceful salutation. Secondly, the Committee also stated their opinion of how the Māori would have treated the prisoners: 'To Your Committee it does not appear probable that the natives should have abstained from slaughter while their victims were in their power, and should resort to violence when they had surrendered all but one of their prisoners.'<sup>239</sup> This was one of the more direct comments on aggressive and proactive actions by Māori in the Committee's report.

More generally, reactions to the *Harriet* incident were manifold. In August 1834 *The Sydney Herald* reported the incident as 'the committal of fresh atrocities by the Natives [...] upon the defenceless Settlers and Traders'. The paper also referred to Māori as cannibals and extensively cited Guard's narrative of the incident.<sup>240</sup> The historian Vincent O'Malley has remarked that when Guard's wife Elizabeth was released, she became the target of rumours that she had engaged in a sexual relationship with one of the Māori. In reaction to this, she played the role of the victim who was horrified by the savage scenes she had witnessed.<sup>241</sup> In the Committee's examination, on the other hand, the later actions of John Guard in the progress of the incident received far more attention. His attacks against the Māori were raised as an example of European atrocities against Māori to a greater degree than the actions of the Māori themselves were discussed.<sup>242</sup> Also, the Committee's

<sup>237</sup> Ballantyne 2011, 252.

<sup>238</sup> See e.g. Grady 1990; Belich (1996) 2007, 169–170; Moon 2020, chapter 7.

<sup>239</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 21.

<sup>240</sup> *The Sydney Herald*, 21 August 1834. See also Moon 2020, chapter 7.

<sup>241</sup> O'Malley 2012, 160–161.

<sup>242</sup> Also see Ballantyne's discussion relating to this case and the Committee's focus on Māori suffering, Ballantyne 2011, 252–253.

interview with William Barrett Marshall, the assistant naval surgeon on the *Alligator*, provided a more nuanced perception of Māori. He stated that Māori did plunder stranded ships and even attacked their crews, but he added that they did not act in such a manner with Europeans who had settled in New Zealand. Instead, Marshall viewed that Māori conducted themselves to some extent in a conciliatory manner towards Europeans even though they could have had the power to ‘destroy’ all Europeans living in New Zealand.<sup>243</sup> Samson indicates that the Aborigines Committee’s report reflected Marshall’s testimony. She regarded Marshall’s testimony as having been humanitarian in nature and also that the Committee placed more blame on Europeans than Māori, similarly to Marshall.<sup>244</sup> But while Marshall’s testimony might have influenced the Committee’s views, Marshall was not cited in their report and his level of detail and nuance did not reach the actual report. The Committee’s general stance was that in most cases Māori were presented as aggressive and retaliatory, but beyond that they were not the aggressors.

The focus of the Committee on cases in which Europeans had had significant influence and could be ascribed as having been guilty is also evident in the line of questioning by the Committee as it appears in the Minutes of Evidence. As Laidlaw points out, Buxton chaired the Committee and managed it and the witnesses carefully.<sup>245</sup> Thus, the Committee’s main line of questioning can be easily attributed to him and his inner circle’s interests in the matters at hand. Conflicts among Māori as well as between them and Europeans were of relatively high interest to the Committee in their line of questioning. Nonetheless, European guilt appears to have been the main interest of the Committee. For example, after Yate was asked about the general character of Māori and he answered with the evaluation that they were ‘decidedly a savage people’, the following questioning turned to British conduct towards Māori including whether the indigenous people had been ‘cheated’ by them and what the consequences of this conduct were.<sup>246</sup>

Māori warfare more generally was addressed briefly in the questioning of Yate. He was asked about the prevalence of hostilities between Māori parties, to which he answered that they did occur. He was also asked whether such wars took place between the main islands, to which he answered in the negative.<sup>247</sup> In her examination of Māori warfare in the early decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the historian

<sup>243</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 447, questions 3776–3780.

<sup>244</sup> Samson 1998, 18.

<sup>245</sup> Laidlaw 2004, 4.

<sup>246</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 188, questions 1596–1600.

<sup>247</sup> See *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 198, questions 1733–1735.

Angela Ballara has characterised them as having often originated because of social, religious, political and economic reasons and noted that land often changed hands. Hence, displaced groups needed to clear new lands for cultivation even long distances away. The waging of these wars was also connected to complex kinship relationships and alliances.<sup>248</sup> This kind of complexity and nuance, however, were not of interest to the Aborigines Committee. Yate's evidence regarding the nature of Māori warfare was not referenced in the report proper. Māori warfare generally received relatively little attention from the Committee in comparison to actions by individuals like Guard. Thus, it is evident that it was most interested in European actions as the primary matter, rather than in Māori generally. This is further emphasised by the fact that most of the cases in which wars among Māori were brought up in Yate's interview were related to questions regarding missionary influence and attempts to prevent warfare among Māori.<sup>249</sup> Hence, the focus of the Committee was again on European actions, although from the perspective of the purportedly positive effects of British missionaries.

Certain missionaries appear to have been particularly useful for the Committee as sources of information and bases for the formation of knowledge. Snippets of Yate's testimony were often cited in the report. As a witness Yate also offered testimony directly from New Zealand as someone who had not only witnessed events first-hand, but had also conversed with Māori and other missionaries in New Zealand. When interviewed by the Committee he expressed that therefore he could 'confidently state that [he knew] the facts' of even such cases that he had not personally witnessed.<sup>250</sup> Besides Yate, the Committee received significant testimonies on New Zealand and Māori from the secretaries of the three missionary societies active in Australia and the South Pacific: Dandeson Coates of the CMS, John Beecham of the WMS and William Ellis of the London Missionary Society (LMS). The significance of these interviews, especially regarding Australian colonies but also concerning New Zealand, has been emphasised in historiographical examinations of the report. This is particularly true in regard to narratives received by Coates from Australia. The secretaries referenced evidence from missionaries, such as William Watson of the CMS who was stationed in New South Wales, which described instances in which Europeans were guilty of 'illicit intercourse' with indigenous peoples.<sup>251</sup> When it comes to these three secretaries as sources, it is

<sup>248</sup> Ballara 2003, 17–20.

<sup>249</sup> See *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 189–191, questions 1615–1620 & 1627–1631.

<sup>250</sup> See *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 190, questions 1627–1628.

<sup>251</sup> See Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 64; Elbourne 2003a; Lester 2008, 72–73; Lester & Dussart 2014, 93.

notable that Ellis had worked as a missionary in Tahiti and Hawai'i between 1816 and 1825 and thus had personal experience of some of the matters at hand.<sup>252</sup>

Such a role of relaying information on distant colonies to the British government was not new to the secretaries. Coates served as a link between New Zealand and the British Government more generally. In 1835, for example, he was supportive of Busby as Resident. Peter Adams suggests Coates could have influenced the decision of the Colonial Office when Busby's continuation as the Resident was under consideration. Adams further argues that Coates and the CMS made representations to the Colonial Office about European outrages and even persuaded Thomas Fowell Buxton to 'expose the iniquitous transaction' of the *Alligator*, which had been sent to deal with the fallout of the wreck of the *Harriet*. According to Adams the influence of missionaries, and particularly Coates and the CMS, on branches of the British Government has been viewed by some contemporaries and historians as an example of how the CMS's influence over the Colonial Office was 'dangerous'. It made it difficult for the governmental officials to remain objective in cases such as New Zealand and the NZA's plans for colonisation and led to negative views of the NZA within the Colonial Office.<sup>253</sup>

The interviews of the secretaries provided snippets of information that exposed corruption by European settlers in New Zealand. This was similar to the testimonies of the negative effects of Europeans on indigenous peoples in Australia.<sup>254</sup> The secretaries were central in communicating information that originated from the missionaries in the field to the Committee, since they were most often the recipients of the missionaries' letters and other missives. This is also evident in the Minutes of Evidence of the Aborigines Committee's report as the secretaries provided and read to the Committee a great deal of textual material that derived from missionaries in the field.<sup>255</sup> The content of the secretaries' testimonies was consistent with the Committee's interests and focus. The Committee focused its enquiries on the effects Europeans had on Māori. The very first question presented the secretaries by the Committee was directed at Coates who was asked: 'Have any acts of cruelty and oppression, committed by Europeans on the natives, been reported to you by persons upon whom you can place reliance?'<sup>256</sup> This set the stage for the interview of the three secretaries in which the most emphatic focus was on European actions towards Māori, rather than on Māori themselves. This is not to say that other information

<sup>252</sup> See Etherington 2004; Gascoigne 2014, 134–135.

<sup>253</sup> Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 62–64.

<sup>254</sup> Lester & Dussart 2014, 93.

<sup>255</sup> See the Minutes from the secretaries' interview in *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 481–549.

<sup>256</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 481, question 4269.

would not have been available from the networked connections of the three secretaries. Various missives from missionaries in New Zealand contained a variety of topics, such as their visits to surrounding villages and the Māori reception of their teaching there, instruction of Māori in the mission stations, as well as Māori customs. The missionaries also flagged issues with their interactions with Māori including Māori stealing Europeans items and doubts about the success of their work among Māori.<sup>257</sup> Therefore, if missionary knowledge concerning Māori more generally had been of interest to the Committee, such pieces of evidence would most probably have been made available.

The final report of the Aborigines Committee generally reflected its line of questioning as well as the evidence provided to them by missionary sources that often viewed Europeans as having been culpable for Māori aggression. However, in the correspondence and journals that missionaries sent to their parent societies from New Zealand they did not always play down views of Māori as warlike in their general disposition. While it was crucial for the principles of mission among Māori, as well as among other indigenous people, to argue that those people could be civilised, images of Māori savagery were common in British evangelical journals. Such imagery was empowered by missionary correspondence from the field. Ballantyne notes that signifiers of savagery, such as slavery, suicides, war and cannibalism were used in journals as examples of the corrupt nature of uncivilised people and ‘evidence of Satan’s hold on Māori’.<sup>258</sup> The omission of the more overtly negative information or narratives of Māori is noteworthy in reference to the Committee’s production of knowledge about New Zealand. More stringent perceptions of the supposedly warlike Māori character could have been requested by the Committee and presented when the secretaries of the missionary societies and individual missionaries were interviewed. But these matters were not enquired after by Buxton as the chairman in the interviews, or by his allies, or by Donkin and Gladstone who were also in attendance.

<sup>257</sup> For examples of correspondence between missionaries and the secretaries see Diary of William White, 18 May 1823, 22 May 1823, 30 May 1823, 11 June 1823 & 20 September 1824, Micro-MS-0612-17 Diary of Rev William White 1823-1835, ATL; Letters from George Clarke to the Secretaries of the CMS, 7 January 1825, 26 March 1825, 2 January 1826 & 1 March 1826, qMS-0463 Clarke, George, 1798-1875: Letters and Journals, ATL; Journal of Henry Williams 13 January 1827, 15 January 1827, 29 March 1827 & 31 May 1828, Williams, H 85-049-2/10 Journal of Henry Williams Dec 1826-Jan 1833, ATL; Journal of Charles Baker, 16 March 1828, 20 April 1828, 6 January 1829, 3 August 1829 & 22–25 January 1831, Baker, C qMS-0109 Journal of Charles Baker, Vol. 1–2 1827–1833; 1833–[1834], ATL; Journal of William Colenso, 4 January 1834, 11 January 1834, 28 January 1834, 9–11 February 1836 & 22 February 1836, Colenso, W 88-103-1/16 Journal 1833-1838, ATL.

<sup>258</sup> Ballantyne 2015, 226–227. See also Jenz & Acke 2013, 369.

The Committee's inferences of the warlike character of Māori were, nevertheless, in accordance with many typical missionary views of Māori. For example, in 1826 the CMS missionary George Clarke, who was stationed in Kerikeri, wrote to his parent society about the constant threat of war among Māori. Clarke described Māori having had 'as strong a thirst for war as ever and indeed nothing but the powerful grace of God will ever subdue it [...]'.<sup>259</sup> In these general accounts, war appears to have been tied very closely to Clarke's view of Māori character. From these accounts it could have been read that warfare between Māori groups was not only seen as part of their customs, but it was also connected to their general character. In the early days of planning missions in New Zealand, such impressions of constant warfare were to some degree validated in the eyes of the missionaries by the burning of the *Boyd* in 1809. The *Boyd* was a British ship that was attacked in Whangaroa Harbour by local Māori as a response to a chief having been taken captive on board the ship for stealing an axe. The story of the *Boyd* became a part of the early discourse on Māori and an essential part of the view of them as savages.<sup>260</sup> Equally, warfare appeared in both missionary narratives and the Aborigines Committee's report as a part of Māori character. This similarity is understandable considering the close connections between missionary and humanitarian views to the Committee. Yet, in focusing on European actions the Committee's report offered little detail or discussion on wars and conflicts that took place solely between Māori parties without European influence or incitement.

Furthermore, when contrasting the Committee's reporting on Māori character to contemporary missionary correspondence, a more specific omission of sorts can be seen in how Māori aggressiveness was also directed at missionaries. In the Committee's report, Māori retaliations were presented as directed at European settlers or traders. No instance of Māori aggression towards missionaries was cited. This can be contrasted, for example, with the distress expressed by William White of the WMS in his diary that he sent to the parent society. When some Māori individuals were confronted about the theft of a piece of print and a mat, they allegedly became 'quite enraged'. White described them getting naked, 'raving' with their weapons and threatening one of the missionaries, until he and a Māori woman de-escalated the situation.<sup>261</sup> Such accounts by missionaries from New Zealand appear in stark contrast to what was presented in the Aborigines Committee's report, as well as what

<sup>259</sup> See e.g. Letter from George Clarke to the Secretaries of the Church Missionary Society, 10 November 1826, 21 August 1827, qMS-0463 Clarke, George, 1798-1875: Letters and Journals, ATL.

<sup>260</sup> Salmond (1997) 2018, 380–394 & 417.

<sup>261</sup> Journal entry by William Yate dated 26 June 1823, Micro-MS-Coll-04-64 William Yate letters 1827–1834, Journals, Reports, Papers 1828–34, ATL.

was discussed in witness testimonies that highlighted the harmful effects by settlers and traders, which caused Māori to retaliate.

Naturally, the objectivity and truthfulness of these missionary accounts are questionable. Missionary writing, as with most other colonial archival material, can and should be viewed as biased. Yet, this does not alter the perspective that to British readers and the British missionary societies that received these writings, the narratives from the missionaries were real accounts. This follows along the lines, as Taussig, Roque and Wagner have expressed it, that colonial knowledge was real to the writers and readers, even if it was not objectively true. Thus, dismissing such accounts now as biased runs the same risk, which Ballantyne points out in his criticism of an overt emphasis on so-called colonial boosterism. This can disregard 'the importance of familial and affective networks which disseminated information about colonies'.<sup>262</sup> The focus on European actions against Māori appear then to have either arisen from Buxton's Committee's or the Committee and the secretaries' mutual interests. In fact, Elbourne suggests that the testimonies provided by the secretaries to the Committee were almost certainly discussed before the interview.<sup>263</sup> The Committee's line of inquiry, as printed in the Minutes of Evidence, also suggests that the intimation of the ill effects of European actions were the aspect of New Zealand's situation that was the best suited for both Buxton and the mission societies in furthering their humanitarian and pro-mission agendas. This left more detailed examination of Māori themselves to the side and evidently outside the Committee's interests. The claims formed of Māori that are apparent in the Aborigines Committee's report did not repudiate the contemporary image of the warlike character of Māori in any way. Instead, in a sense they sidestepped the issue and focused on the apparent guilt of European settlers in New Zealand.

This focus can be viewed as a side product of what has often been viewed as a form of the British evangelical movement's relationship to imperialism. Historians like Susan Thorne have argued that missionary encounters and their narratives contributed to forging racial, class and gender identities which were part of creating images of the 'self', not only of the 'other'. They also positioned the British in relation to their intimate and remote communities. Thorne has framed this idea as 'imperial and racial allusions [permeating] the languages through which Victorians imagined their place'.<sup>264</sup> Johnston has further argued that in trying to remake colonial projects to suit their views of religious conversion, missionaries and missionary commentators also remade British domestic identities.<sup>265</sup> In the case of the

<sup>262</sup> See Ballantyne 2012, 241.

<sup>263</sup> Elbourne 2003a.

<sup>264</sup> Thorne 1999, 21–22.

<sup>265</sup> Johnston 2011, 23.

Aborigines Committee's report, which was heavily politicised in an attempt to set the direction for colonial projects in New Zealand, the remaking of identities appears to such a great effect that the portrayal of British actions far outweighed the presentation of Māori or their character. Such a focus was perfectly in line with the Committee's entire presentation of their general concern for indigenous peoples. The Committee's findings were framed from the outset in the report as 'the obligations of common honesty' for the British, who were 'at least bound to do to the inhabitants of other lands, whether enlightened or not, as we should in similar circumstances desire to be done by'.<sup>266</sup> This framed British obligation and morality as an equal, if not greater, reason for their concern than the actual state of various indigenous peoples.

The examination of sources that were used by Wakefield and Ward, on the one hand, and the Aborigines Committee, on the other, shows that their respective literary genres and processes for forming knowledge claims allowed for differing strategies regarding the credibility of their claims and their differing use of sources. This, along with the different interests that the two sides had in arguing for colonial action in New Zealand, led to differing emphases in how the supposedly warlike character of Māori was presented. Yet, both texts appear to have striven for credibility. The attempt to provide empirical evidence 'at a distance' was at the centre of both works, in spite of the differences in how this was to be achieved. Most obvious differences having been the Committee's emphasis on missionary sources in contrast to Wakefield and Ward's references to pragmatic and available texts, even to second-hand sources like *The New Zealanders*. In light of the multifaceted nature of British colonialism, it is apparent that there were numerous strategies to achieve credibility, but convergences like the prominence of empiricism can be found in the formation of knowledge claims. Also, despite their different approaches to supposed Māori belligerence, both Wakefield and Ward's and the Aborigines Committee's report imply certain qualifications and concessions to their presentations of Māori character. The Committee put European guilt at the forefront, whilst Wakefield and Ward emphasised the passing historical nature of Māori savagery.

The appearance of Māori as reactionary or proactive actors is an important matter to note considering the focus in this study on European knowledge production that took place mainly in London, albeit from sources that spanned the globe. The knowledge claims that were formed for the Aborigines Committee's report and *The British Colonization* were to a large degree produced in London by British individuals, who compiled a variety of source material. Nonetheless, it is necessary not to lose sight of Māori activity that took place within the networks of

<sup>266</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 3.

communication that facilitated the creation of these sources and their communication to Britain. Jane Carey and Jane Lydon note that indigenous peoples have often been viewed in research as local and bounded while Europeans were considered cosmopolitan. They point out that indigenous participation in global networks and mobility has been important in constructing the world as we know it.<sup>267</sup> Proactive Māori participation in the movement of knowledge was hidden and buried by European sources and activity. Indeed, indigenous knowledge formation and activity can often be difficult to uncover thoroughly from various European sources. Yet, even with this study's focus on European knowledge production it is necessary to be mindful of the existence of Māori agency that was present in New Zealand and beyond. Furthermore, it is important not to leave them in the margins as mere subjects of European action. To this end, it is necessary here to briefly look at how Māori activity and voices were present in the background of this European knowledge formation concerning Māori savagery and their martiality.

### Mediated and Faded Māori Voices

There was a stark difference between *The British Colonization* and the Aborigines Committee's report when it comes to the presentation of Māori as proactive participants in their interactions with Europeans and in the networks of communication spanning the antipodes. Alongside the Committee's focus on European actions, Māori voices or perspectives were barely visible in the Committee's examination of New Zealand. Conversely, individual Māori were in fact introduced in *The British Colonization's* presentation of the supposed past, savage character of Māori. The visibility of indigenous voices and activity in the two works point to distinct ways in which they were or were not acknowledged. On the one hand, Māori activity and voices in *The British Colonization* were used to further emphasise the general themes of the NZA's colonisation, civilising and their perception of European superiority, but from a different angle. On the other hand, Māori voices in the Aborigines Committee's report were notably faded away, especially in contrast to how traces of Māori voices are perceivable in the processes of communication that led to the Committee's report.

The part of *The British Colonization* on Māori character at the time of their early contact with Europeans was further rounded out with a different empirical-leaning approach to Māori. Following the long extracts from Craik's *The New Zealanders* and Busby's *A Brief Memoir*, the claims of Māori character that were based on the general descriptions from these two works were illustrated in greater detail with

<sup>267</sup> Carey, J. & Lydon 2014, 1–2.

references to further pieces of evidence. These pieces of evidence constituted a long passage of what Wakefield and Ward termed anecdotes about individual Māori, who had visited Britain in the early decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. These anecdotes were about Ngāpuhi *rangatira* Hongi Hika, Tuai of Ngare Raumati, Te Pehi Kupe of Ngāti Toa, ‘Nayti’ meaning Te Whaiti of Ngāti Toa and two Māori called Henry White and Thomas Wood who had travelled to England with Rev. William White and were still residing with him in 1837.<sup>268</sup> The timeframe of the visits of these individuals spanned from 1818 to the publication of *The British Colonization* in 1837. Many of these Māori visited Britain with missionaries they had become acquainted with in New Zealand.<sup>269</sup> Te Whaiti, in turn, was recruited as a member of the crew on a French whaling ship. He travelled to France and was afterwards taken in to live with Edward Gibbon Wakefield for two years. With Wakefield’s colonisation plans under way at that time, Te Whaiti appeared in London’s *Saturday Magazine* as an example of a Māori who had improved in his level of civilisation after arriving to Britain. He also appeared as a witness for the 1837–1838 Lords’ Committee on New Zealand.<sup>270</sup>

These anecdotes of individual Māori were presented by Wakefield and Ward as illustrations that depicted more general traits. They mainly followed the same tone in presenting Māori as the claims drawn from *The New Zealanders* and *A Brief Memoir*. Hongi was presented as a chief with a ‘savage love of strife and bloodshed’ and ‘whose wars were more celebrated in the Northern Islands, more destructive and exterminating, than any other wars ever heard of by the natives’. There were, however, also indications in these anecdotes of a capacity for improvement among those individuals. Te Whaiti was stated as having been ‘little better, if not worse, than a complete savage’ when he arrived in England, but he and the others were described as having picked up English manners and ‘refinement’ when in England. Hongi was also noted for his bravery and intellectual powers, as well as his wars.<sup>271</sup> This kind of attribution of intelligence, which 18<sup>th</sup>- and 19<sup>th</sup>-century European writers often viewed as remarkable for ‘savages’, was quite common in the racialised and generalised European presentations of Polynesian peoples compared to other indigenous peoples.<sup>272</sup> But there were constant nods to typical ways in which Māori were seen by the early-19<sup>th</sup>-century British. Te Pehi Kupe, for all the refinement that

<sup>268</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 177–197.

<sup>269</sup> In addition to Henry and Thomas accompanying William White, Hongi visited England with CMS missionary Thomas Kendall in 1820 and Tuai with Samuel Marsden in 1818. On these visitors see O’Malley 2015, 28–36.

<sup>270</sup> O’Malley 2015, 39–41. O’Malley notes that ‘Nayti’ has previously been assumed to have meant a Māori by the name of Ngati or Ngaiti, but has later been identified as Te Whaiti.

<sup>271</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 177–196.

<sup>272</sup> See e.g. Douglas 2015, 117–120.

he supposedly learned in Britain, was still noted as a savage. It was also pointed out that of all the things he saw in Britain, the thing which he was allegedly particularly interested in was a bow and arrows. He was described as having marvelled at the strength of the impact of arrows on a target, which was in part explained by a statement that Māori were ‘addicted’ to fighting.<sup>273</sup> From a European perspective of indigenous peoples, which was reflected in *The British Colonization*, these descriptions underlined, on the one hand, the supposed savagery and warlike character of Māori that was a comprehensive theme in Wakefield and Ward’s formation of knowledge claims on Māori. On the other hand, these descriptions highlighted the perceived superiority of English life in contrast to Māori customs.

If one looks beyond this British lens at the perspective of these Māori, the travellers had their own reasons for visiting England. The historian Bronwen Douglas notes that European agendas were not the only perspectives that existed in these imperial representations of indigenous peoples. Instead, interactions with indigenous peoples were ‘located encounters with particular people, who had their own cultural and strategic agendas’. Douglas adds that this aspect is often stifled in European texts.<sup>274</sup> Many of the Māori travellers to England desired to meet the King because they wished to foster more trade between the British and Māori. They particularly wanted to secure the trade of metal tools and materials that they did not possess in New Zealand. Many Māori also tried to emulate Ruatara, a young *rangatira* from the Bay of Islands. His visits to New South Wales in the 1810s and his interactions with British missionaries, like Samuel Marsden, had resulted in the first mission station having been founded in his lands in Rangihoua. As Belich remarks, this secured him a ‘monopoly over the first European settlement in New Zealand’. In this early period of contact between Europeans and Māori, many *rangatira* subsequently wished to receive the advantages of guns, tools and other trade from Europeans in the wake of Ruatara. Ballantyne also argues that Māori recognised the power of literacy, which was taught to them by missionaries, for their own economic, social and political activity.<sup>275</sup> This Māori interest in visiting England, however, became warped when presented through British eyes. In a similar way, Douglas has identified that the French voyager Jules Dumont d’Urville’s condemnation of the ‘insolent greed’ of Vanikoran men was actually a reflection of indigenous determination to control prices and the terms of trade as seen by European eyes.<sup>276</sup> In turn, Te Pahi Kupe’s interest in weapons, which arose from the

<sup>273</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 177–196.

<sup>274</sup> Douglas 1999, 189.

<sup>275</sup> Belich (1996) 2007, 141–145 & 148–150; Ballantyne 2015, 3–4. See also Binney 1969, 146.

<sup>276</sup> Douglas 1999, 190.

contemporary needs and interests of Māori, was transformed in European texts into indications of their supposed savagery. Thus, Māori perspectives as to why they wished to visit Britain were outweighed in British texts by the supposed superiority of British civilisation.

These passages on individual Māori appear to have been suitable empirical sources for Wakefield and Ward and were in line with the literary technique of detailed narration for showing credibility as discussed by Laqueur. These passages' true nature was somewhat clouded by the rather flexible and opaque manner of citing sources that was typical of Wakefield and Ward. The passage on Hongi Hika was cited by Wakefield and Ward as having been a quote from Craik's *The New Zealanders*. The successive passages on Tuai and Te Pehi Kupe, on the other hand, appeared in the book in quotation marks, but no source was provided. The text in these passages mentions observations by Richard Cruise, whose travel account on New Zealand was published in 1823, as well as descriptions by Captain Reynolds and Dr Traill, who interacted with Te Pehi Kupe in England. These could have been read, therefore, as more empiricist in nature than some other sources used by Wakefield and Ward. However, a closer intertextual examination of these passages shows that they were in fact further verbatim quotations from *The New Zealanders*.<sup>277</sup> Thus, while they could have appeared to have provided more compounding evidence on the subject of Māori character, they were not too different in terms of sources used by Wakefield and Ward. This might not have been apparent to a contemporary reader and might not, thus, have practically affected the impact of those passages in Wakefield and Ward's formation of knowledge.

The details given of Te Whaiti and the two domestics of Rev. White, on the other hand, appear quite different as cases and a closer presence of a Māori voice and participation can be read from them. Details about Te Whaiti in the text of *The British Colonization* did not appear as quotes from other sources and were, instead, presented in the text in the general narrational voice of Wakefield and Ward as the anonymous authors of the book.<sup>278</sup> In fact, some quotations from Te Whaiti himself were included in the passages. In a similar manner, the descriptions of Henry White and Thomas Wood also appear to differ in nature from those passages that were quoted from Craik, as they appear to have been given directly by William White himself.<sup>279</sup> White was a CMS missionary and had been stationed in Hokianga from 1827 to 1836. In 1837 when in Britain, he was in correspondence with the NZA and

<sup>277</sup> See Craik 1830, 305–307 & 317–334.

<sup>278</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 191–192.

<sup>279</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 193.

for a time was supportive of Wakefield's plans for New Zealand.<sup>280</sup> His information about the two Māori would have also appeared useful to Wakefield and Ward as first-hand observations of Māori. Furthermore, information from and about Te Whaiti, Henry White and Thomas Wood would have been directly available to Wakefield and Ward, rather than having been read and compiled from published texts.

The short quotations of Te Whaiti's views were mainly about how he viewed missionaries and other English people as a good influence on Māori. He was quoted as approving of a sermon he had heard in England by saying: 'Missionary very good man.' From a more general perspective, his approbation of contact with British people was given as having been characterised by the following statement: 'English people very good, –speak good for New Zealand man [...] to teach New Zealand man no fight, – me tell my people, English people very good, – me learn missionary book.'<sup>281</sup> This was in line with the general idea of *The British Colonization*, which argued for a form of colonisation that was intended to civilise Māori. As such, and despite appearing as seemingly indigenous voice indeed, in the context of *The British Colonization* Te Whaiti's opinions appear as further support for the colonial ideas they were pushing. But as the historian Penelope Edmonds emphasises, indigenous peoples should not be posited as static or passive recipients of moral concern, as has been done in much traditional research.<sup>282</sup> While Te Whaiti was portrayed as approving of the general gist of the NZA's colonising and civilising plans, it is nearly impossible to know how accurately these quotes reflected his views regarding the possibility of colonising New Zealand, or how closely Te Whaiti's wish for contact with Europeans corresponded with the proposals of the NZA. After all, soon after the signing of the Treaty Māori there appeared concern among Māori for their future and treatment by colonial authorities, and the New Zealand Wars of 1845–1872 arose to a large extent out of Māori resistance to the practical colonisation that took place after the Treaty of Waitangi.<sup>283</sup> Thus, Māori understanding of further contact and trade with Europeans did not ultimately coincide with British views of colonisation. The quotations from Te Whaiti were also given as having been representative of the views of all Māori. According to these quotations from Te Whaiti, he did appear to wish for further contact between the British and Māori, but there could well have

<sup>280</sup> On William White see Gittos 1990. For correspondence between the NZA and White see e.g. Letter from Robert Roy to Rev. William White, 1 September 1837, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Letter book 1837, ATL.

<sup>281</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 192.

<sup>282</sup> Edmonds 2018, 6–7.

<sup>283</sup> See Belich (1986) 2015, 15–30; Standfield 2018, 74–75.

been a divide between what he and other Māori envisaged, in regard to issues such as trade and literacy.

The presence of indigenous voices in European narratives, particularly in those of explorers, has received much scholarly attention in the past few decades. Indigenous voices have most often been buried under the sheer volume of European narration. However, recent scholarship has been interested in uncovering what can be discerned of indigenous roles in networks and interactions with Europeans from colonial archives. This has also placed an emphasis on the reliance of European explorers on indigenous cooperation. However, often the voices of the indigenous peoples were drowned out in European texts.<sup>284</sup> Relating to exploration in Australia, Felix Driver contextualises the idea that indigenous activity was not acknowledged by explorers. He notes that while indigenous guides were brought up in travellers' narratives, this was mostly by pointing them out as 'exceptional or eccentric characters', and not giving them much agency. Instead, they were presented as instruments for gathering knowledge by European scientific explorers.<sup>285</sup> On the other hand, indigenous activity was occasionally noted, but their participation was not necessarily fully acknowledged or discussed. For example, Wevers notes that in the travel account of the missionary and printer William Colenso, he acknowledged the Māori from whom he received information about plants or locations, but they were left unnamed and mentioned only as 'the natives' or 'my natives'.<sup>286</sup> It is, however, congruent with reality that such traces of indigenous activity can be seen in European texts. Edmonds points out that taking testimony, listening, talking and communicating through physical signs that took place in many interactions between Europeans and indigenous peoples, particularly with a European humanitarian interest, 'ran counter to usually accepted routes and byways of power'.<sup>287</sup> Despite the colonial power relations in a larger scale, in real world interactions indigenous individuals possessed much influence and significant roles.

Considering from these perspectives the nature of interactions between indigenous peoples and European reporting of it, it is not altogether unexpected that a Māori individual like Te Whaiti would have been acknowledged by Wakefield and Ward. The voice he was seemingly given is still notable. Yet, Te Whaiti appears to have been used in an instrumental fashion by Wakefield and Ward in order to support their colonial agenda. This is akin to Driver's view that European travellers

<sup>284</sup> See Schaffer et al. 2009; Carey, J. & Lydon 2014; Keighren, Withers & Bell 2015, 82–92; Konishi, Nugent & Shellam 2015; Shellam et al. 2016. The same observation about the reliance of European travellers in New Zealand on Māori has also been pointed out by Robert Grant. See Grant 2003, 32.

<sup>285</sup> Driver 2015, 12–13.

<sup>286</sup> Wevers 2013, chapter 2.

<sup>287</sup> Edmonds 2018, 5.

considered indigenous peoples to have been instruments to provide empirical evidence. This is reinforced by the extent to which Te Whaiti's alleged views corresponded with the more general tone and argumentation of *The British Colonization*. This could have been intentional by Wakefield and Ward, or even merely influenced by the way they, from their own perspective and expectations, received and understood Te Whaiti's views. The argumentative impact of how Te Whaiti's views were used, however, remained the same.

This contextualisation of the individual accounts of Māori that seemed more empirical in nature appear to point to a clear reason why they were discussed in detail. Not only do they appear as more contemporary individuals, who were presented in a positive light showing improvement from the more 'savage' general characterisations that were presented by Wakefield and Ward as 'a matter rather of history'. The accounts of these Māori individuals were also likely to have been readily available to Wakefield and Ward. Craik's *The New Zealanders*, from which many of these accounts were extracted, was used as a source for *The British Colonization* on a number of matters, including the past state of Māori. Moreover, Te Whaiti, Henry White and Thomas Wood were in Britain at the time when Wakefield and Ward wrote their book and were connected to Wakefield through personal contacts. The use of what seems to have been first-hand information on these three Māori, alongside the texts discussed earlier that were previously published second-hand sources, would indicate the importance of personal networks in this kind of knowledge creation. When first-hand sources were available, they were in all likelihood used, but in cases where such contacts were not available it is possible that Wakefield and Ward relied on already published material.

While some of this Māori activity and interest in visiting Britain and gaining access to British goods can be seen shining through in Wakefield and Ward's presentation of Māori in *The British Colonization*, in the Aborigines Committee's report Māori and other indigenous voices were just about completely drowned out. Lester and Dussart have noted that while indigenous character was central to the Committee's deliberations, only two witnesses called on by the Committee were colonised subjects or indigenous individuals, both of whom were from the Cape Colony. The two witnesses were Khoesan Andries Stoffels and a minor Xhosa chief Dyani Tshatshu, both of whom were Christian converts.<sup>288</sup> As with other indigenous individuals, the voices of Stoffels and Tshatshu were communicated to the

<sup>288</sup> The Committee did also cite, for example, a statement from Chippeway chief Kahkewaquonāby, but from Minutes it becomes clear this was from a letter to Rev. Beecham, and the chief was not interviewed by the Committee. See *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 47; *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1836*, Minutes of Evidence, 529.

Committee by translations carried out by missionaries. The translations were made not only in language but also in the ways they expressed themselves to be affective to British metropolitan sensibilities. They were presented, for example, as having had ‘beautiful simplicity [and] touching pathos’.<sup>289</sup> This manner of conducting the interviews with Stoffels and Tshathsu as the only indigenous witnesses is reflective of the Committee’s work more generally. On the whole Māori as a people were central for the Committee’s deliberation on New Zealand. But in stark contrast to Wakefield and Ward’s, albeit filtered, use of Māori voices, acknowledgements of Māori as participants in networks of communication between New Zealand and Britain were barely visible in the Committee’s report. From a 21<sup>st</sup>-century view of colonialism, this would appear as somewhat paradoxical, given that the humanitarian anti-colonist actors of the Aborigines Committee appear less concerned with Māori as actors than the colonialists of the NZA.

The case in which some Māori participation was most explicitly discussed by the Aborigines Committee is the case of the *Elizabeth*. In 1830, John Stewart, captain of the merchant brig *Elizabeth*, agreed to a deal with Ngāti Toa *rangatira* Te Rauparaha, in which in exchange for a cargo of flax the former agreed to conceal 100 of Te Rauparaha’s warriors in his brig and sail them from Kāpiti to Akaroa in the South Island so that these men could attack their enemy Ngāi Tahu. In addition to ferrying Te Rauparaha’s men, Stewart also lured the Ngāi Tahu *rangatira* Te Maiharanui aboard the *Elizabeth* where he and his wife and daughter were taken captive.<sup>290</sup> The Committee focused on Stewart’s actions as condemnable, which was consistent with the Committee’s approach to other such cases. It even noted that while Te Rauparaha was the aggressor in the conflict, he ‘may according to his notions, have supposed that he had sufficient cause for acting as he did’.<sup>291</sup> This conclusion did give Te Rauparaha some semblance of proactivity, but by focusing on Stewart as the main actor in the affair, European actions were again raised to the fore. This was also evident in the sources that the Committee used to present the case, even though European voices were not the only ones to which they were exposed.

There were a few indications of Māori activity in the material that was used to communicate information of the *Elizabeth* incident to Britain. The missionary Samuel Marsden was active in communicating details about the incident to the British colonial administration. He, for example, wrote a letter to Ralph Darling, the

<sup>289</sup> Lester & Dussart 2014, 98–99; see also Elbourne 2002, 288.

<sup>290</sup> See e.g. Sanborn 2005, 253; Ballantyne 2016.

<sup>291</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 16; see also Dispatch from Governor Ralph Darling to Viscount Goderich, 13 April 1831, fl. 28–34, CO 209/1, TNA.

Governor of New South Wales at the time, in which he detailed the case. A copy of this letter was provided to the Committee by the three missionary secretaries, along with other pieces of information about the case.<sup>292</sup> In the Committee's report it was stated that Darling in turn forwarded information of the case to the Colonial Secretary Lord Goderich, along with depositions from two seamen of the *Elizabeth* and the merchants J. B. Montefiore and A. Kennis, who had been on board the brig. This dispatch, as well as Marsden's letter, were cited by the Committee. However, the Committee also noted in accordance with Marsden's letter, that the case was originally reported to Marsden by 'two New Zealand chiefs' and the account of the *Elizabeth* incident that was given in the Committee's report was based on this narrative. One of the two Māori chiefs was named as Ahu and presented as 'the brother, or nephew' of the *rangatira* that was attacked and he was stated as having been the narrator of the account given to Marsden.<sup>293</sup> The other was not named by the Committee. However, in Marsden's letter to Darling, which was provided to the Committee, he was named as Ware, a chief from the Bay of Islands.<sup>294</sup> This communication is an example of the many nodes, actors and strands within networks that existed in communication between New Zealand and Britain.

However, the processes of communication across great distances did have an impact on the appearance of sources of information. As with how European explorers have been noted as having been dependent on indigenous cooperation when gathering information, Ahu and Ware played central roles in the communication of information regarding the *Elizabeth* incident to Britain. However, while the Committee indicated that Marsden's narrative of the incident was derived from Ahu and Ware, it was relayed to the Committee and further published by the Committee in their report evidently in Marsden's voice. This is comparable to how it has been noted that in adopting and incorporating indigenous knowledge to European knowledge systems indigenous contributions became more and more invisible over time as the adopted knowledge was universalised to fit European knowledge systems and texts circulated beyond place and time.<sup>295</sup> Similar processes in which the networks of communication became in a way 'flattened' as they were reported further also appear in the Aborigines Committee's use of sources. While there were multiple actors and nodes through which information passed before being communicated to the Committee, in the Committee's reporting the sources of

<sup>292</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 482–484.

<sup>293</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 16.

<sup>294</sup> See *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, 482. Attwood names Ware as Wharepoaka, a young *rangatira*. See Attwood 2020, 109.

<sup>295</sup> See e.g. Konishi, Nugent & Shellam 2015, 7; Douglas 2015; Gascoigne 2015.

information become ‘flattened’ to the degree that only one or few sources that were close to the Committee were noted as the cited sources. These processes also covered and made mostly invisible the interactions that ran counter to typical routes of power that Edmonds underlines. They left very little trace in the final report of such interactions that took place, for example, between missionaries and Māori.

This kind of fading of voices is evident in other ways in other European texts as well. Keighren, Withers and Bell indicate that indigenous sources and facilitators of travel were silenced in European travel writing, so as to emphasise the author’s feats. Yet, even this varied among authors.<sup>296</sup> This form of travel writing, however, appears as a somewhat different process than that which took place in communication that ended up in the Committee’s report. Indigenous voices were largely hidden, but even other sources a little further back in the networks of communication to the Committee were flattened out due to citing only sources that were closer in the networks. This is also evident in the reporting of the *Elizabeth* incident, as the original information supplied by Ahu and Ware became part of Marsden’s voice. This is, however, even more evident in parts of the Committee’s report in which Coates, Ellis or Beecham were presented as sources even though the Minutes of Evidence show that the information originated from missionaries in the field in New Zealand. For example, in the Committee’s report Coates was presented as a source for the reported number of Māori who took part in communion in mission stations. Yet, while in the Minutes of Evidence that exact passage of text was provided to the Committee by Coates, it was in fact extracted by Coates from a letter from the lay missionary Richard Davis from Waimate.<sup>297</sup> It is also very likely that much of what the missionaries communicated to their parent societies and the secretaries further provided to the Committee were originally derived from Māori sources, but these remain even more hidden by the processes of communication. The acknowledgement of Ahu as a source in the Committee’s report was thus a rarity in the extent to which Māori were credited as having been active participants in the networks between New Zealand and Britain, and even his involvement was mediated to the Committee’s report through Marsden’s narration.

It is also curious that Ahu was named in the Committee’s report proper, but Ware was not. This could have been a result of further flattening of sources. Marsden had sent Coates a copy of his letter to Darling. In this, Marsden introduced Ahu to Coates as ‘the young chief mentioned in this letter’ and described him further. Both this

<sup>296</sup> Keighren, Withers & Bell 2015, 82–83.

<sup>297</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 54; for the original Minutes see ‘Extract of a Letter from Mr. R. Davis, dated Waimate, 14 December 1835, *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 524. On Davis as a missionary see Ballantyne 2018, 130.

introduction by Marsden to Coates as well as the letter to Darling, in which both Ahu and Ware were clearly indicated as sources of information, were printed one after another in the Committee's Minutes.<sup>298</sup> It is possible that since Ahu was introduced in these texts more clearly, he became the one raised into the report proper and Ware was left out as more of a side note. Altogether, this shows the contingent ways in which sources were cited, and there appears to have been little clear or well-founded reasoning as to why, for example, Ahu was named in the report but Ware was not.

The use of sources and apparent evidence in the Committee's report and in *The British Colonization* offers a clear look into how Māori character and alleged savagery was presented in martial terms. This also illustrates different strategies in terms of compiling evidence for this claimed knowledge and for presenting it in these works. This was, however, only one side of presenting knowledge claims of Māori that fitted within European narratives of indigenous savagery. Other matters were also discussed, although to a lesser extent, and in *The British Colonization* these details were mostly not in the part of the book that explicitly detailed Māori character before European contact. Rather, these small snippets were spread out among various subjects throughout the book. A brief look at some of these other themes of 'savagery' serves to give a slightly fuller picture of how Māori were presented as uncivilised in the works. It also helps to indicate why this supposed Māori savagery was presented in the context of the Aborigines Committee's and Wakefield and Ward's formation of knowledge and argumentation.

## 2.1.2 An Argumentative Basis for Improvement

It is evident that the perception and presentation of Māori as savage in British views played a part in the whole argumentation on New Zealand by Wakefield and Ward and the Aborigines Committee. Their use of textual and argumentative strategies, such as the empiricist-leaning use of sources and the detailed presentation of claimed knowledge, underlines that it was the intention of both sides to present credible knowledge claims of such Māori savagery. Both Wakefield and Ward, as the unnamed spokesmen for the NZA, and the Aborigines Committee were driven in their argumentation by the basic premisses that their plans were allegedly intended to improve and civilise Māori. This perspective to arguing for action in New Zealand and regarding the formation of knowledge claims on Māori, however, begs the question as to why any focus on Māori savagery specifically was necessary for them or considered worth discussing in their works? It was, after all, a typical view from

<sup>298</sup> See *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 482.

both a British perspective, and wider European perspectives, that indigenous peoples were considered savage to some degree.

Ballantyne's notion of 'ethnographic assessment' provides a useful way to view the formation of knowledge claims on the supposed Māori savagery. It provides an approach to exploring the significance of Wakefield and Ward's and the Aborigines Committee's claims on the subject for the two sides' respective argumentation. From a more general perspective on New Zealand's colonial past, Ballantyne has identified ethnographic assessment as one mode of writing that was closely connected with processes of colonisation. Relating to New Zealand's colonisation, he expresses ethnographic assessment as colonial ethnography that has been discussed by historians, anthropologists and Māori Studies scholars as production of cultural difference that 'enabled and authorised colonialism'.<sup>299</sup> An example of processes that can be viewed as ethnographic assessment can be found relating to slavery in the West Indies. Alan Lester, Kate Boehme and Peter Mitchell point to how popularising narratives of irredeemable racial difference between enslaved Africans and the majority of white slave owners were mobilised in the late 1830s to defend and rationalise the enslavement of human beings.<sup>300</sup> While these themes have been much explored, Ballantyne views that the role of the state in producing and harnessing such knowledge traditions still needs to be understood more broadly.<sup>301</sup> The presentation of knowledge claims on Māori character made by Wakefield and Ward and the Aborigines Committee can be understood specifically as such ethnographic assessment, which was intended for the state's use. Thus, exploring here the role of ethnographic assessment regarding the supposed Māori savagery in the argumentation by Wakefield and Ward and the Aborigines Committee also points to its role more concretely in colonisation schemes, rather than being limited to isolated texts that simply indicate attitudes towards indigenous peoples.

As noted earlier, Wakefield and Ward introduced the presentation of Māori savagery nearly as a curiosity; a matter that was becoming a thing of the past. Moreover, the Aborigines Committee referred to matters of Māori savagery alongside other themes such as the impact of European action on Māori. Yet, in order to understand the utility these two sides had in forming knowledge claims of Māori, from the perspective of history of knowledge, it is necessary to undertake an in-depth examination of the role and significance of these claims of Māori savagery as parts of the whole argumentation on New Zealand. To this end, I will now examine further presentations of Māori savagery in these two works. First, I will dwell more deeply on the concept and significance of savagery and how the claims presented of Māori

<sup>299</sup> Ballantyne 2012, 240–242.

<sup>300</sup> Lester, Boehme & Mitchell, P. 2021, 37–38.

<sup>301</sup> Ballantyne 2012, 242.

were related to contemporary thinking. I will then examine the connections of these claims of Māori savagery to the claimed objectives of both the NZA and the Aborigines Committee to help Māori improve and how the claims of Māori savagery played into this argumentation.

As noted, British characterisations of Māori savagery in the 19<sup>th</sup> century often included themes of slavery, taking heads as trophies, warfare and cannibalism.<sup>302</sup> Now I will take a closer look at these views of perceived savagery and assess their significance. Not only have the words ‘savage’ and ‘savagery’ had complicated and changing significances in European use in the past, but the way in which these words and their wider concepts have been used have been more complex still. The word savagery, while used frequently as a designation for indigenous peoples by the British in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, was not a clear-cut concept with any certain definition. Commonalities can be identified with various descriptions of savagery in European thinking from the 17<sup>th</sup> century onwards. In addition to the above-mentioned cannibalism and warfare, tropes that were seen as ‘savage’ often also included nakedness, presumed lack of laws, property and religion, and a general lack of features identifiable to Europeans as having been vital to civilisation and proper human society.<sup>303</sup>

Furthermore, Pat Moloney has noted that early-19th-century British thought on indigenous peoples rested significantly on Scottish Enlightenment thinking. This placed all human societies on the same line of development, on which different peoples were at different stages of development. Furthermore, societies could progress or degenerate along these stages. These stadial views, which were elaborated by the likes of Adam Smith and Adam Ferguson, posited that humans could be placed in different stages of development as defined by their mode of subsistence. For example, Adam Smith viewed that there were four stages of human development beginning with hunting and gathering, and advancing through pastoralism to agriculture and leading up to commerce and foreign trade. The historian Silvia Sebastiani suggests that this progressive view of history was a crucial contribution by the Scottish Enlightenment to the study of human diversity. This kind of progressive view was also strongly reflected in the Aborigines Committee’s and Wakefield and Ward’s ideals for civilising and ‘improving’ Māori. Irving-Stonebraker further illustrates savagery was an explanatory principle in this thinking, which located human societies on a universal trajectory of historical development.<sup>304</sup>

<sup>302</sup> Johnston 2003; Ballantyne 2015, 226–227.

<sup>303</sup> Ellingson 2001, 25–26.

<sup>304</sup> Olssen 1997, 200–215; Moloney 2001, 153–154; see also Buchan 2005, 8–11; Sebastiani 2013, 6–8; Moon 2017; Irving-Stonebraker 2019, 71.

Māori cultivation of land raised them up in the stadial qualifications in the eyes of many European travellers and placed them above most other indigenous peoples.<sup>305</sup> Other contemporary European classifications were based on, for example, the darkness of people's skin.<sup>306</sup> Thus, there were considered to have been gradients in levels of civilisation and savagery. Furthermore, this Enlightenment philosophy placed the moral obligation on supposedly more civilised people, such as the British, to help others achieve further improvement. According to these theories, such improvement was possible for all peoples. Nonetheless, the more improved had a moral responsibility to help others.<sup>307</sup> This stadial theory provides a significant backdrop to British views of indigenous peoples in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century generally, but particularly relating to *The British Colonization* and Edward Gibbon Wakefield. Erik Olssen relates Wakefield's view of civilising Māori to the influence that Enlightenment philosophy and his studies of Adam Smith had on him.<sup>308</sup> This frames Wakefield and Ward's discussion of Māori in particular in the light of the stadial views of civilisation. Thus, his view had some nuance to how people like Māori could appear as 'savage' or 'civilised'.

British views of Māori savagery were not absolutely condemning and dismissive of Māori and the views did not preclude the possibility of fruitful interaction with them generally, despite Māori having been viewed as savage. While the patronising view of European superiority, in contrast to the perceived Māori savagery, was reflected in some form in most texts on New Zealand in the early decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, there were also rather positive views expressed of interactions with Māori individuals by British travellers. For example, in 1803 Captain Joseph Oliphant of the *Endeavour*, who had returned from New Zealand having procured seal skins, proclaimed in the *Sydney Gazette* that Māori were 'very friendly, and ready to render every assistance[...]'.<sup>309</sup> Also in comparison to other indigenous peoples, Māori were regarded in a good light. In many cases when Māori were contrasted to Australian Aborigines the contemporary British commentators readily emphasised the perceived superior abilities and mental acuity of Māori.<sup>310</sup> Such a positive view of Māori was not, though, shared by all. For example, Charles Darwin, having visited New Zealand in 1835, compared them to Tahitians in quite a negative manner. He barely ranked them above the indigenous people of Tierra del Fuego, who were

<sup>305</sup> See e.g. Moloney 2001, 157 & 161–162.

<sup>306</sup> Classification of people's intelligence based on their skin colour was presented for example by French naturalist Julien-Joseph Virey. See Jennings 2013, 116–117.

<sup>307</sup> Olssen 1997, 200–215; Moloney 2001, 153–154; see also Buchan 2005, 8–11; Moon 2017.

<sup>308</sup> Olssen 1997, 200–215; see also Moloney 2001, 153.

<sup>309</sup> Ballantyne 2012, 131.

<sup>310</sup> See. e.g. Ballantyne 2015, 50.

considered to have been at the bottom rung of the ladder of humanity.<sup>311</sup> It is necessary to note that views of Māori were not static, as there were differing perceptions in different contexts. By the end of the 1830s, ideas of the wild, warlike and savage Māori started to give way to an otherwise denigrating view of the people; they were often presented as feeble and weakened by disease and conflict.<sup>312</sup>

Such gradients of savagery are evident in *The British Colonization* and the Aborigines Committee's report, as Māori were compared to and lifted above Australian Aborigines and Tahitians. Yet, there also appears to have been a strong argumentative contrast between savagery and civilisation as polar opposites. This is highlighted particularly by Wakefield and Ward's presentation of Māori savagery, where their character is described according to how 'they originally' were before contact with Europeans.<sup>313</sup> Savagery appeared in *The British Colonization*, as well as in the Aborigines Committee's report, as having been the original stage of being for Māori, which needed in some way to be turned into civilisation. The Committee's report and *The British Colonization* were rife with descriptions and narratives that presented Māori either implicitly or explicitly as savage and in contrast to the British ideals of civilisation. Considering the two sides' prescribed goals of improving and civilising Māori, the presented Māori savagery appeared as an opposite of the civilisation that was intended for them. Wakefield and Ward noted that while this savagery was increasingly a thing of the past among Māori,

a retrospective view still serves the useful purposes of ascertaining, with precision, the primitive elements forming the character of any natives [...] and also of appreciating justly the mixed qualities which, in their present state of transition from savage to civilised life, distinguish the modern New Zealanders.<sup>314</sup>

What Wakefield and Ward referred to as a retrospective view to supposed Māori savagery was thus indicated as a preamble to Māori becoming civilised. This was to be achieved through the NZA's civilising colonisation. In this way, as Paul Moon's article and its title 'Shades of the Savage in Colonial New Zealand' illustrate, there were shades to how savagery was perceived.<sup>315</sup> But at the same time savagery was also argumentatively a direct dichotomic opposite to the goal of civilisation.

<sup>311</sup> Moloney 2001, 159.

<sup>312</sup> Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 30; Ballantyne 2015, 23.

<sup>313</sup> See *The British Colonization of New Zealand 1837*, 170.

<sup>314</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand 1837*, 170.

<sup>315</sup> Moon 2017.

Civilisation and the Eurocentric concept of improvement in civilising and Christianising Māori were central to the plans of both the NZA and the Aborigines Committee. Hence, descriptions and narratives of savagery appear as the original bases and the foundations on which the claimed need for action and ‘improvement’ were constructed. Moon also indicates that one use for the concept of savagery in European discourse on other peoples had been to serve as a dialectic antithesis to what was seen as civilisation.<sup>316</sup> This can be equivalated to how Ter Ellingson has borrowed the dichotomy of the stereotypes of the ‘good Indian’ and ‘bad Indian’ from the literary scholar Louise Barnett. He follows Barnett in arguing that the idea of the ‘good Indian’ was to create an opposite to the ‘bad Indian’ in order to display the superiority of ‘white heroes and their way of life’. Thus, in Ellingson’s view of American and European literature, by definition savage meant that indigenous peoples were ignoble in contrast to civilised peoples.<sup>317</sup>

Equivalently to these so-called ‘good Indians’ acting as opposites to boost the appearance of the ‘bad Indians’, this boosting effect can be seen in inverse form in the argumentation by Wakefield and Ward and the Aborigines Committee in relation to New Zealand. Supposed Māori savagery was highlighted to boost the prospect of Māori civilisation. In a similar manner, Catherine Hall argues that the tropes of *before* and *after* were particularly used by missions to show improvement and civilisation that had developed in colonies like Jamaica after the abolition of slavery and the potential for further progress. Missionary societies constituted the image of a black subject freed from slavery in order to illustrate the positive effects the advocated action could instil on the presented objects of that action.<sup>318</sup> In the same manner, for Wakefield and Ward and the Aborigines Committee the creation of supposedly credible and source-driven knowledge claims of Māori savagery appears to have functioned as a foil against which was presented the later ascribed improvements in Māori. This provided an argumentative basis for showing how desired civilisation could have been achieved through the respective lines of action the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward argued for.

This contrasting of savagery and civilisation is evident in how these two aspects of how Māori were perceived were discussed alongside each other. In the concise early chapters of *The British Colonization*, directly after having stated that Māori were ‘thoroughly savage’, Wakefield and Ward continued by adding that they also had ‘a remarkable capacity for becoming civilized—a peculiar aptitude for being

<sup>316</sup> Moon 2017, 1 & 3–4; See also Motohashi 1999, 90.

<sup>317</sup> Ellingson 2001, 194–196. For Barnett’s analysis of the ‘good Indian’ and ‘bad Indian’ tropes in American literature see Barnett, L. 1975.

<sup>318</sup> Hall, C. 2002, 116–117 & 174–176.

improved by intercourse and civilisation'.<sup>319</sup> This indicated that their state of so-called savagery did not need to prevail. Equally, in the Aborigines Committee's report Yate's statement, according to which missionaries found Māori 'decidedly a savage people', was pointed out specifically in the section entitled 'Effects of fair dealing and Christian instruction'. In this section, this early impression of Māori as savage people was contrasted to various improvements that had supposedly been achieved in Māori by British missionaries.<sup>320</sup> Thus, the apparent savagery and views of the Māori's capability to improve, according to British views, appear in direct contrast to each other. Moreover, the savagery formed a basis on which Wakefield and Ward and the Aborigines Committee could build their argumentation for civilising action.

This ties the presentation of Māori savagery closely together with another of Ballantyne's modes of writing related to colonisation: so-called improvement writing. He views that improvement, which was ubiquitous in colonial, political and institutional life, and improvement writing were used to 'isolate problems, identify remedies, and catalyse action'.<sup>321</sup> In connection to this improvement writing, the knowledge claims relating to supposedly savage customs and qualities in Māori character appear as concrete examples of identifying problems that were viewed as in need of remedying. Thus, they aimed to use their knowledge claims of Māori to provide an argumentative basis for the improvement that the two sides argued could be achieved in Māori through their lines of action. This savagery was, after all, perceived by definition as something inferior and unwanted in human society from an early-19<sup>th</sup>-century British point of view. To explore this idea of knowledge claims of Māori savagery as a preliminary basis for Wakefield and Ward's and the Aborigines Committee's arguments about how Māori had supposedly improved due to contact with Europeans, I will next examine some of the key indicators of what were given as Māori savagery in addition to their warfare and the appearance of their warlike character. I will examine views of cannibalism, slavery, superstitions and use of land among Māori as such indicators that arose from *The British Colonization* and the Aborigines Committee's report.

### Aspects of Savagery in Contrast to Civilisation

In their pondering of how colonial knowledge could be 'engaged' in a manner that is more than a simple expression of biased European views of their own perceived

<sup>319</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 29.

<sup>320</sup> See *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 44–58.

<sup>321</sup> Ballantyne 2012, 242–243.

superiority, Roque and Wagner question whether ‘colonial accounts of noble and ignoble savages, assassins, cannibals, Thugs[sic], headhunters, pirates, scheming eunuchs, and debauched sultans’ carry any meaning beyond the biased Western ideologies.<sup>322</sup> Along the same lines, I endeavour to demonstrate how some of the unquestionably biased characterisations of Māori by Wakefield and Ward and the Aborigines Committee can be seen as having impacted their formation of knowledge as a part of their concrete argumentation regarding action in New Zealand.

Thus, returning to European views of cannibalism, it is necessary to note here that it was a pervasive attribution of Māori by Europeans in the late 18<sup>th</sup> and early 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. What is more, it was even unrelated to the earlier discussed connections to Māori warfare. Yet, as a topic for historical research cannibalism is complicated, due to biases inherent in European sources of indigenous people. This has led the anthropologist Gananath Obeyesekere, for example, to question the ‘pronounced cannibalism’ among Polynesian peoples quite generally in the era before their contact with Europeans. Instead, he suggests that it was more strictly confined to the context of human sacrifice to which was related some anthropophagy.<sup>323</sup> Along similar lines a debate between Peter Hulme and Myra Jehlen about cannibalism and its existence points to subtle intricacies in how such questions are approached. For example, Hulme argues that anthropophagy<sup>324</sup> and its existence constitute a different question than the existence of cannibalism as a term within European colonial discourse, which was used to demean non-European peoples. Thus, in Hulme’s view cannibalism was historically real in the sense that it existed as an idea in European thinking of other peoples, whether the people in question consumed human flesh or not; a distinction reminiscent of the later characterisation by Roque and Wagner of colonial knowledge as real. Jehlen responded by advocating the necessity to take into account the material reality, which a term like cannibalism evokes.<sup>325</sup> Arising from the background of these discussions, Moon has parsed together various types of sources on Māori cannibalism in an attempt to achieve some objective understanding of it. He notes that contemporary European accounts, oral histories from Europeans and Māori communities and archaeological data point to the eating of human flesh, or *kai tangata* in *te reo*

<sup>322</sup> Roque & Wagner 2012, 10.

<sup>323</sup> See Obeyesekere 1992.

<sup>324</sup> Hulme prefers the term anthropophagy as a more neutral term for eating human flesh than cannibalism. See Hulme 1993.

<sup>325</sup> See Hulme 1993; Jehlen 1993.

*Māori*<sup>326</sup>, having been present in Māori communities, but as a socialised cultural practice.<sup>327</sup>

For many 18<sup>th</sup>- and 19<sup>th</sup>-century Europeans, Māori were nearly synonymous with cannibals. Ideas of Māori cannibalism were propagated by widely publicised narratives, such as the case of the *Boyd*. This incident exemplified Māori brutality in many European minds, and assumptions of Māori cannibalism became common knowledge in Britain from such accounts. For example, Reverends Daniel Tyerman and George Bennet, deputies of the LMS, were caught up in a conflict aboard their ship with local Ngāti Pou Māori in Whangaroa in 1824. Later, in a journal published of their travels it was noted that during the incident they were within sight of the place where the *Boyd* incident took place. Hence, whilst fearing that they were about to be eaten, their fears were heightened by the reminder provided by the *Boyd*. Moon argues that cannibalism as a trope was so deeply ingrained in popular views of Māori that references to it were even used by writers to make their tales relating to the Caribbean or South Pacific seem more credible.<sup>328</sup> Narratives of Māori cannibalism were also published in Hawkesworth's version of James Cook's travel accounts, which later circulated in British texts. For example, according to the New Zealand anthropologist and historian Anne Salmond, the traveller John Liddiard Nicholas was aware of these Cook's narratives on his journeys in New Zealand and reflected on the explorer's writings based on his own experiences.<sup>329</sup>

The 19<sup>th</sup>-century public discourse on Māori evidently also impacted how they were presented by Wakefield and Ward. Such narratives had connections to the presentation of Māori in *The British Colonization*. In an early chapter, Wakefield and Ward noted that 'there can be no doubt whatsoever of the cannibalism of the New Zealanders'.<sup>330</sup> Later in their book, Wakefield and Ward referenced accounts of cannibalism from Cook among other pieces of evidence that were interspersed in their discussion of various subjects in *The British Colonization*. Wakefield and Ward cited Cook on Māori cannibalism and noted that he 'accounted for the undoubted prevalence of cannibalism [and] supposed it was a dreadful manifestation of one of the physical instincts of man, – that it proceeded from a natural and irresistible desire

<sup>326</sup> *Te reo Māori* is the language spoken by Māori.

<sup>327</sup> Moon 2008, chapters 6–21. For further examination of anthropophagy in cultural contexts and wider historical European representations of cannibalism see Jennings 2011.

<sup>328</sup> Sanborn 2005, footnote 22; Moon 2008, section 1; Maxwell & Roberts 2014, 55. On European views of cannibalism in Polynesia more generally see e.g. Samson 1998, 7–23 & passim; Jennings 2013.

<sup>329</sup> Salmond (1997) 2018, 491.

<sup>330</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 29.

to taste animal food'.<sup>331</sup> In the discussion of the original state of Māori, Wakefield and Ward also quoted from Busby an appraisal that cannibalism was a 'revolting' and 'habitual' practice among Māori.<sup>332</sup>

Curiously, however, Wakefield and Ward appear nearly dismissive of this subject. They referenced Cook's views on Māori cannibalism in relation to their claims of the low Māori population in New Zealand relative to the amount of land in the islands. The claim of a small number of Māori in New Zealand was partly attributed by Wakefield and Ward to the lack of wild or domesticated animals there. Cook had stated that the lack of animals as a source of food, combined with a natural desire for animal meat supposedly led to cannibalism. This same reasoning led Wakefield and Ward to conclude this was also a reason for the low Māori population. They stated that there were only lizards, rats and dogs living in the islands, which did not in their opinion support population growth.<sup>333</sup> This explanation for Māori cannibalism has not been viewed as plausible by more modern analyses of their economy. There have been few indications of such shortages of food among Māori,<sup>334</sup> and neither were all contemporaries equally convinced of this. John Liddiard Nicholas, for example, having arrived in Kawakawa was not convinced by Cook's explanation since he noticed no distinct taste for human flesh among Māori and noted that they stored plenty of food. Thus, he viewed that shortages leading to the necessity of cannibalism were unlikely.<sup>335</sup> Yet, this critique of Cook's views by Nicholas was not noted by Wakefield and Ward, despite him having been a member of the NZA and his book having been quoted in other parts of *The British Colonization*.

But in contrast to typical European discourses on indigenous people's cannibalism, Wakefield and Ward's discussion of the subject appears as a rather laconic and pragmatic examination of the supposed cannibalism. In the European imagination of the late 18<sup>th</sup> century and the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, cannibalism appeared as morally damnable. It was perceived as a threat to Europeans, which even caused some apprehension to visit islands like New Zealand, Fiji or Samoa. Also, in missionary narratives cannibals appeared as forces of darkness against which it was necessary to fight, which also cast missionaries in heroic roles.<sup>336</sup> In his examination

<sup>331</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 272. The same view of Māori cannibalism was also expressed in the NZA's earlier statement of their objects. See *A Statement of the Objects of the New Zealand Association* 1837, 13.

<sup>332</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 175.

<sup>333</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 271–272.

<sup>334</sup> Moon 2008, chapter 25.

<sup>335</sup> See Salmond (1997) 2018, 490–491; For Nicholas's reasoning see Nicholas 1817b, 67–68.

<sup>336</sup> Samson 1998, 7–8 & 19–20; Moon 2008, chapter 3; Jennings 2011, 132.

of the discourses of cannibalism, Moon notes that even if it were a necessity for some groups to eat human flesh in order to avoid starvation, this does not make the practice less abhorrent. This can, however, make it explicable.<sup>337</sup> Wakefield and Ward, in turn, in referencing Cook, did not explicitly state that cannibalism among Māori was a means to avoid starvation. Yet, the reference to low Māori population, as a result of an alleged lack of food, could have served to explicate cannibalism in Wakefield and Ward's presentation to some degree as there appeared some consideration of a supposed necessity for more food. This approach by Wakefield and Ward thus appears as a far less damning view of the possible reasons for cannibalisms than some proposed by other late-18th-century travellers. For example, the Frenchman Antoine Bruni d'Entrecasteaux suggested that people of Balade, in what came to be known as New Caledonia, were cannibals because they were averse to agricultural labour.<sup>338</sup> This view also played into a European sense of indignation at laziness.

Wakefield and Ward also proceeded to compare Cook's account of Māori cannibalism to 'the ancestors of countries nearer home [who] shared, at one period of their history, the same disreputable distinction',<sup>339</sup> meaning early Britons. The comparison of contemporary Māori with early Britons was consistent with 19<sup>th</sup>-century views of indigenous people having been seen as comparable to ancient, less-progressed Europeans in the light of the stadial theory and the monogenist view of human origins.<sup>340</sup> It also appears to have suggested that while cannibalism was seen by 19<sup>th</sup>-century Europeans as a 'horror' and an 'aversion', this did not necessarily mean that improvement was not possible. Wakefield and Ward cited *Lardener's Cyclopaedia on Domestic Economy* and Edward Gibbon's *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* stating that up to the 5<sup>th</sup> century British tribes, such as Scots, Picts and Attacotti, had also had cannibalistic customs. They also quoted Gibbon in stating that while Scottish tribes had been cannibals in the past, the lands inhabited by them became 'the commercial and literary town of Glasgow'. Hence, they viewed that despite the contemporary perceptions of the state of Māori 'New Zealand may produce, in some future age, the Hume of the Southern Hemisphere'.<sup>341</sup>

This same comparison between Māori and 'the Hume of the Southern Hemisphere' was in fact already made in 1810 in a broadsheet, which has been briefly discussed by Lydia Wevers. This broadsheet, of which very little information is available, presented the *Boyd* incident, and Wevers notes that for all its

<sup>337</sup> Moon 2008, chapter 25.

<sup>338</sup> Gascoigne 2014, 384.

<sup>339</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 272.

<sup>340</sup> For an examination of how the newly encountered indigenous peoples were fitted into European conceptions of human past, see Sebastiani 2013, 10–12.

<sup>341</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 272–273; see also Gibbon (1782) 1845, Part XXV.

sensationalism the broadsheet ‘naturalises the prospect of civilisation in New Zealand, bringing it both into Western history and as close as the Scottish border’.<sup>342</sup> This kind of comparison of European past and indigenous present was a common way of thinking in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, influenced by the stadial view of human civilisation. Savagery and barbarism were markers of the past, to which many also connected the idea that Europe had also been ‘barbarous’ in the past. Therefore, according to this popular view of improvement, Māori were simply lagging behind the British in time.<sup>343</sup> Similar parallels were drawn between the supposed benefits of Roman expansion to Britain and British expansion to new colonies, such as the colonisation North America that took place in the 17<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>344</sup> Notably, there were at the time also some doubts about the practical possibility of all peoples progressing. There still existed a gap between indigenous peoples and Europeans, and some considered that Europeans had started out as herding people rather than as savages before their progress up the stages.<sup>345</sup> Nevertheless, the comparison of Māori to European past and improvement and the Scottish Enlightenment view of stadial progress provided Wakefield and Ward enough of an argument to suggest that Māori were not doomed to remain savages, looking from a European perspective, but they could improve as Europeans had.

Linda Andersson Burnett and Bruce Buchan point out that the somewhat teleological view along the lines of Scottish enlightenment philosophy also provided European thinkers with a way of investigating the ‘natural condition’ of mankind through observation, description, classification and taxonomy.<sup>346</sup> As the case of claimed knowledge having been presented about Māori shows, this kind of ethnographic assessment and the concept of the possibility of progress of all human societies through specific stages also, found uses outside scientific arenas as well. For Wakefield and Ward this provided a more forward-thinking approach to Māori and British colonial endeavours. In this way, Wakefield and Ward presented to the 19<sup>th</sup>-century reader the aversive idea of Māori cannibalism in a way that could be bypassed as not having had a noteworthy negative effect on the NZA’s plan for colonisation and for civilising Māori. This appeared so particularly since their

<sup>342</sup> The broadsheet discussed by Wevers is entitled ‘A Short Account of the most cruel and barbarous Murder of Thirty British Subjects, belonging to the ship Boyd, from Botany Bay, by Savages of New Zealand, who afterwards devoured them. See Wevers 2013, chapter 1.

<sup>343</sup> Hickford 2006, 126–130. On seeing indigenous peoples as reflections of Europeans’ own past see also Clayton 2000, 8.

<sup>344</sup> See Banner 2007, 17.

<sup>345</sup> Pocock 1999, 316–319; Sebastiani 2013, 8–9.

<sup>346</sup> Andersson Burnett & Buchan 2018, 161–163 & 171–173; Buchan & Andersson Burnett 2019, 4.

explanation of Māori cannibalism was followed by an outline of how agriculture and fisheries could have been expanded in New Zealand by European practices.<sup>347</sup>

Furthermore, there was also another way in which Wakefield and Ward seem to have downplayed claims of Māori cannibalism. They in all likelihood consciously omitted passages from Busby's account of Māori character related to cannibalism. The extract from Busby's *A Brief Memoir* in Wakefield and Ward's section on the 'General character of New Zealanders' was presented as a direct quote, but a comparison of the two texts shows that a passage from Busby was omitted. This omitted passage discussed, among other topics, Māori social structure, general diet and trade with Europeans. This passage also included something of an explanation for Māori cannibalism: 'It has been stated, in palliation of the character of the New Zealander, that this is a superstitious observance; but those who are best acquainted with them affirm, that it is *also* the result of a preference for that sort of food.'<sup>348</sup> This view of cannibalism as a preference to human meat was also given by a few travellers in the 1820s. While their objective veracity can be questioned or at least viewed as inconclusive,<sup>349</sup> this view still appears as a part of public discourse on Māori in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. Busby stated in his text that the idea that Māori cannibalism was only related to their 'superstitions' was a palliation of their character and the appearance of cannibalism. But in dismissing this view and stating that Māori supposedly also desired such food Busby denied such amelioration and appears to have more fully condemned this practice. As a clear omission from the quoted text, this idea was obviously not seen by Wakefield and Ward as suitable for their argumentation or formation of knowledge.

Wakefield and Ward also omitted a passage from Busby that stated that many Māori chiefs had herds of swine, although Busby pointed out that rather than eating them, many chiefs would rather trade them with Europeans.<sup>350</sup> Altogether Busby's explanation of Māori cannibalism was not compatible with Wakefield and Ward's citation of Hawkesworth's account from Cook. Equally, their omission of Nicholas's counterpoints to Cook's view of Māori cannibalism, as well as disregarding Nicholas's own view of Māori cannibalism having been 'a kind of superstitious revenge',<sup>351</sup> indicates that Wakefield and Ward preferred to present Māori cannibalism along Cook's lines. With these omissions the only apparent explanation for cannibalism in *The British Colonization* was the conclusion from Cook that to placate a natural desire to eat meat and due to the circumstances in New Zealand

<sup>347</sup> See *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 273–274.

<sup>348</sup> Busby 1832, 61.

<sup>349</sup> Moon 2008, chapter 25.

<sup>350</sup> Busby 1832, 60–61.

<sup>351</sup> Nicholas 1817b, 68.

cannibalism was seemingly the only possibility. Thus, the only rationalisation expressed in *The British Colonization* for cannibalism gives the idea of unavoidable human nature forcing the Māori into cannibalism. Based on these omissions in source material by Wakefield and Ward, this explanation appears to have been more preferable than the idea of such an aversive practice having arisen from Māori customs and thus possibly having been a choice rather than a necessity.

This evident selectiveness of sources and the downplaying of Māori cannibalism can be seen as related to the goals Wakefield and Ward had in presenting Māori savagery. Comparing this to the literary and colonial scholar William Jennings's examination of French Marist missionaries to New Zealand, there were different ways in which terms like savage and cannibal were used or relinquished. He notes that terms like 'cannibals' and 'anthropophages' were used to make a full contrast between converted and non-converted individuals. Moreover, this was related to an expectation that the missionaries had before arrival in New Zealand. However according to Jennings, after their arrival in New Zealand they grew to understand complexities of Māori society and rarely used terms like savage. This also led to marginalising the topic of cannibalism.<sup>352</sup> In this case the difference between expectation and experience could be seen as an explanation for such a change. Yet, considering that Wakefield and Ward had very limited experience with Māori it is worth wondering why they appear to have minimised the appearance of Māori cannibalism, contrary to some of their sources. Interactions with Te Whaiti could have influenced their views, but he was not referenced in relation to such matters and there is no textual evidence of Te Whaiti having had such influence on their thinking.

What would appear more likely is that cannibalism was a part of the British view of Māori savagery, but excessive emphasis on it would not have served Wakefield and Ward's interest in showing Māori as people that can be civilised in line with the NZA's colonisation plans. This is comparable to Jeffrey Cox's analysis of missionary ethnographers and their 'double vision'. Cox notes that missionary ethnographers simultaneously defended the societies they were studying since those peoples were part of the unified, monogenist humanity and could be turned into proper Christians. At the same time missionary ethnographers also defamed them in order to persuade the readers that these indigenous peoples had sunk into immorality due to their non-Christianity.<sup>353</sup> Yet, Moon notes that cannibalism as a concept was

<sup>352</sup> Jennings 2013, 121–126. The French Marist missionaries arrived in New Zealand in 1838 and thus would not have been available sources of information for Wakefield and Ward or the Aborigines Committee, should the two sides' have wished to use such sources.

<sup>353</sup> Cox 2008, 134–135.

useful to missionaries since it gave them a rallying point for support back home.<sup>354</sup> In this way, it provided Wakefield and Ward with an example of supposed Māori savagery. There was a need for Wakefield and Ward to show Māori as a people in need of civilising, but not too savage as to make their improvement appear unlikely to succeed. Thus, Wakefield and Ward's claims of Māori gave an impression of a people who had been savage, in contrast to British civilisation, but were civilisable. This same downplaying is also visible in the Aborigines Committee's discussion of cannibalism, despite them having little direct interest in indigenous character.

The Aborigines Committee did not emphasise Māori cannibalism either, but this appears to have been related to their general approach to New Zealand rather than any particular perception of Māori. In the Aborigines report cannibalism received far less attention than in *The British Colonization*. Instead of having discussed cannibalism in the same practical manner as in *The British Colonization*, the references to cannibalism appear as simple descriptors of Māori, or as shorthand for presenting them as uncivilised in a similar way as the word 'savage' often appeared. In addition to Yate having been quoted as calling Māori 'addicted to cannibalism',<sup>355</sup> the matter was used as a descriptor, for example, when discussing the effects of Europeans on Polynesian peoples in general: '[T]he moral effect of the intercourse of Europeans in general with these people, savages and cannibals as they were before we visited them[...].'<sup>356</sup> No practical or specific explanation or discussion of cannibalism was presented in the report. This implies that here cannibalism, like savagery, was a generally accepted matter regarding Polynesians or indigenous peoples more widely and therefore it did not necessitate further elucidation. In this way the concept of cannibalism was used in the report as a near synonym for 'savagery'. This is similar to how, according to Jennings, Polynesians were sweepingly discussed as cannibals in French missionary papers. This was a view that was widely enough accepted that it did not require further evidence.<sup>357</sup> This generality and vagueness is particularly significant in contrast to the Committee's otherwise heavy reliance on detailed references to sources in their discussion of matters at hand. Yet, cannibalism was not presented and authorised through sources and witnesses from New Zealand, indicating that it appeared almost as a rhetorical device. Moreover, no questions were raised in relation to views of Māori cannibalism that were presented to Yate or other witnesses. This also strengthens the view that the Committee had no real interest in examining indigenous peoples as they were. They were rather seen as objects of European action.

<sup>354</sup> Moon 2008, chapter 32.

<sup>355</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 52.

<sup>356</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 25.

<sup>357</sup> Jennings 2013, 117.

However, cannibalism was referenced by the Committee, in contrast to the humanitarian and evangelical ideas of improvement, with a very similar signification as in Wakefield and Ward's discussion. In the report's closing remarks on the state of Pacific islands, which included New Zealand, the Committee diminished the significance of cannibalism as a possible problem due to it having been a thing of the past:

[I]n Europe no other notion was entertained of these people than that they were idolaters and cannibals, and their country a rude and barbarous wilderness, without arts, without commerce, without civilization, and without the rudiments of Christianity. Such was the estimate, not inaccurately formed, of their state 20 years ago.<sup>358</sup>

In stating this, the Committee did not deny allegations of Polynesian cannibalism, but dismissed it as something that was no longer a problem, and, what is more, the change was attributed to the effects of missionary work alone. This was also a reflection of one aspect of European views of indigenous peoples at the time. Despite the appearance of savagery, cannibalism and violence among Polynesian and even Melanesian peoples, for some writers in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century even these peoples were considered 'redeemable' and civilisable by proper means. Similar views were shared by many missionaries, and also by travellers like Irish Royal Navy captain Francis Crozier who travelled in the Pacific in the 1830s.<sup>359</sup> In light of Roque and Wagner's call for connecting colonial discourses to more concrete effects and actions, the Committee's remark can be viewed as an aspect of their engagement with practical colonialism. In their attempt to argue for their humanitarian line of colonial action, they framed past Māori savagery and cannibalism as a contrast to the change that was achieved under European influence. They did not provide, or possibly view it as necessary to provide, any elucidation for the supposed cannibalism beyond a generalisation of 'idolaters and cannibals'. But it did provide a dichotomy between past and present in what Māori had supposedly been like and how they had and could be improved. Thus, knowledge claims of supposed past Māori savagery became part of concrete argumentation for practical colonial action.

This kind of formation of knowledge claims on a matter such as cannibalism and its apparent playing down in contrast to many other contemporary discourses can be paralleled to how Elizabeth Elbourne has analysed representations of indigenous peoples from a humanitarian perspective. Relating to Buxton and his inner circle's approach to the Cape Colony and African peoples, Elbourne argues that there was a

<sup>358</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 58.

<sup>359</sup> Samson 1998, 19–20.

need, from a humanitarian point of view to contest the popular idea of Africans as ‘irreclaimable savages’ as articulated by the Governor of the Cape Colony Benjamin D’Urban. To this end Andries Stoffels and Dyani Tshathsu, who testified before the Aborigines Committee, were presented in their visit to Britain as ‘tangible reincarnations of the remade Africans’. This also entailed denials of their African characteristics as they were pictured in missionary publications dressed in a regal military coat and a worker’s overcoat respectively. Elbourne also points to eye-witness accounts of a dinner party in London with Buxton and other people linked to the Committee, at which Stoffels and Tshatshu were guests. One guest wrote afterwards that she should not write much about Tshatshu’s characteristics, since the missionary John Philip, who had travelled with the two to London, and also testified before the Committee, protested that there was ‘nothing African in his countenance’.<sup>360</sup> The relative playing down of aspects of supposed Māori savagery in *The British Colonization* and the Aborigines Committee’s report appears related to similar distancing from metropolitan conceptions of indigenous peoples. In order to sustain the humanitarian language of the capacity of indigenous peoples for improvement through European action, which was at the forefront in both works, Māori could not appear too savage as to discourage any action. However, on the balance they were presented as savage and therefore in need of civilising.

Cannibalism appeared as a part of the contrast between past savagery and the improving civilisation of Māori, which both sides claimed. A common feature in both Wakefield and Ward’s as well as the Aborigines Committee’s formation of knowledge claims of Māori cannibalism was that these claims were based on very selectively collated sources. For example, Yate himself wrote a book on New Zealand and the missionary work there that was published in 1835, prior to having been interviewed by the Aborigines Committee. In the book Yate provided more in-depth descriptions of Māori customs. Contrasting these accounts to the Aborigines Committee’s report and *The British Colonization* underlines their selectivity. Yate pointed to cannibalism as having been particularly connected to customs related to warfare: ‘No doubt can for a moment be entertained, that these people are to be ranked among the Anthropophagi; as, with very few exceptions, they eat the bodies of the chiefs whom they have slain.’<sup>361</sup> But again, no such questions were presented to him by the Committee and this matter was not raised in the interview or the report proper. Also, Yate’s analysis of cannibalism was completely opposite to the one presented in *The British Colonization*, despite his book having been presented as a source for it and having been enclosed in the list of publications relating to New Zealand. Wakefield and Ward made no mention of Yate’s description or account of

<sup>360</sup> Elbourne 2002, 288–289; see also Lester & Dussart 2014, 101.

<sup>361</sup> Yate 1835, 129.

Māori cannibalism, even though cannibalism was mentioned as one subject in contents of the missionary's book. Yate specifically noted that he 'cannot, however, think that it is from any desire that the generality of them have to satisfy or to gratify their appetite for human flesh', instead pointing to 'the diabolical spirit of revenge'.<sup>362</sup> Thus Yate was in close agreement, for example, to Nicholas rather than Cook and Wakefield and Ward. Thus, despite Yate's testimonies and writings appearing as evidence of Māori in both the Committee's report and *The British Colonization*, there were significant differences between the original source material and the knowledge claims drawn from pieces of evidence attributed to Yate.

Other aspects of perceived Māori savagery, in addition to warfare and cannibalism, received far less space in *The British Colonization* and the Aborigines Committee's report. A brief survey of these aspects, however, further illustrates how savagery was presented as an opposite to the intended civilisation. These other aspects of savagery, which were discussed briefly and were scattered across the two works, appear as details that presented Māori to European readers as in some ways strange or inferior, in comparison to Europeans. A curious and probably striking matter for 19<sup>th</sup>-century humanitarian-minded or evangelical readers would have been the presented existence of slavery among Māori. Generally, the interest in the well-being of indigenous peoples in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century has been seen as a continuation from previous abolitionist campaigns after the abolition of the slave trade in 1807 and slavery in British settlements in 1833. Many of the actors in Buxton's inner circle and the Aborigines Committee, as well as Buxton himself, were closely connected to abolitionist circles.<sup>363</sup> It could therefore be expected that slavery among indigenous peoples would have been seen as abhorrent. However, slavery, or the existence of slaves among Māori, received only a few passing remarks in not only *The British Colonization* but also in the Aborigines Committee's report.<sup>364</sup> In the case of the Committee report, in particular, this does not mean that slavery was not seen as objectionable. Any customs resembling slavery were not viewed as acceptable, which was made evident in one of the general suggestions by the Committee for action by the British Government. It was noted that if European colonists in some British colonies were to hire Indigenous people, it was necessary to ensure that certain regulations on the duration and wages of this work were followed. Otherwise, it was viewed, it would have differed 'little from slavery'.<sup>365</sup> Also the amelioration of the condition of slaves among Māori was noted as an

<sup>362</sup> Yate 1835, 129.

<sup>363</sup> Edmonds & Johnston 2016.

<sup>364</sup> See *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 28, 153, 193, 363 & 413; *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 15 & 53.

<sup>365</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 78.

achievement by British missionaries.<sup>366</sup> The cursory attention devoted to slavery begs the question as to whether the Committee's emphasis on European action overruled their attention to slavery when it came to Māori.

Other passing remarks related to what was viewed as Māori 'superstition'; namely customs or practices that were a part of Māori culture but were sweepingly painted as superstitions. Yate was referenced in the Aborigines Committee's report characterising custom of *tapu*<sup>367</sup> as a superstition that was viewed as 'the greatest obstacles to improvement and civilization'.<sup>368</sup> Europeans commonly adopted the designation of indigenous superstitions when it came to their views of many indigenous customs. Elbourne notes that Aboriginal legal sovereignty was denied in 1836 in a New South Wales court case, partly because what could have been considered Aboriginal laws were instead determined to have been 'practices [...] consistent with a state of greatest darkness & irrational superstition'.<sup>369</sup> The idea of superstition as an impediment to civilisation also had its roots in 18<sup>th</sup>-century philosophy.<sup>370</sup> The Committee seems to have been of like mind about *tapu* and viewing it as a superstition since Yate was questioned about it. This is notable considering the lack of questioning on topics like cannibalism. The questioning began with a rather leading question: 'Have they not certain customs called *tapuing* which form a material obstacle to their civilization and improvement?'<sup>371</sup> The reason for the Committee's interest in this matter related more to Māori customs than other matters discussed by the Committee. This is most likely because they viewed *tapu* as having impacted Māori capacity to improve and become civilised due to it appearing to them as a so-called superstition. Here again the alleged 'superstitions' observed by Māori and their supposed impact on civilising highlights the contrast between the claimed savagery and desired civilisation in the Committee's examination.

<sup>366</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 54.

<sup>367</sup> In *Te Ara -The Encyclopedia of New Zealand* *tapu* is defined as such: 'Certain restrictions, disciplines and commitments have to take place if mana [extraordinary power, essence or presence] is to be expressed in physical form, such as in a person or object. The concepts of sacredness, restriction and disciplines fall under the term *tapu*. For example, mountains that were important to particular tribal groups were often *tapu*, and the activities that took place on these mountains were restricted.' See Royal 2007.

<sup>368</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 53.

<sup>369</sup> Elbourne 2003a.

<sup>370</sup> For example, in his later influential *New Science*, published in 1725, Giambattista Vico stated that 'it was a fanaticism of superstition which kept the first men of the gentiles, savage, proud, and most cruel as they were, in some sort of restraint by main terror of a divinity they had imagined'. See Ellingson 2001, 160.

<sup>371</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 191, question 1635.

So-called superstitions were also presented in *The British Colonization* and these also appeared as impediments for improvement, but in a more material and practical sense than the Committee's view of civilising. One such superstition that was raised, although without a clear indication of the source of information, was related to the alleged treatment of people with illnesses:

[N]o sick person is allowed to remain within their cabins. The accouchement of the most delicate females must take place out of doors; a patient seized with inflammation of the lungs, rheumatism, or any other disease, remains in the open air, day and night, even in rainy season.<sup>372</sup>

Such customs were alleged by Wakefield and Ward to have been a reason for disease preventing increase of the Māori population in New Zealand. This view was further substantiated with a quote from Augustus Earle, an artist who travelled to New Zealand in 1827 and spent six months in Hokianga and Bay of Islands and whose travel account was published in 1832.<sup>373</sup> Earle wondered about the existence of disease, such as consumption, among Māori since he considered New Zealand in terms of climate and nature a very healthy place to live in. He proceeded to explain diseases among Māori by referring to an alleged custom that they sleep all night outdoors. He related that he had been laughed at when he raised to Māori his views of the dangers of exposure to the cold.<sup>374</sup> These kinds of descriptions of what were viewed as superstitions or more generally descriptions of customs of different peoples also played into how civilised or developed a people were seen as having been related to stadial views. Disease and the negative impact of customs to health would have appeared as an indication of lower civilisation in comparison to the British level of civilisation and medicine related to it.<sup>375</sup> Again, however, the supposed superstitiousness of Māori customs was curbed in contrast to other peoples. Wakefield and Ward noted that '[t]hey are not insensible to the arts of cultivated life, as the New Hollander is,— or wholly bound in the chains of superstition, which control the efforts of the docile Hindoo, and hold his mind in thralldom'.<sup>376</sup> Instead these kinds of 'superstitions', presented in this brief passage of *The British Colonization*, were most closely linked to Māori population. These 'superstitions'

<sup>372</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 274.

<sup>373</sup> See Earle 1832. Despite the name of Earle's travel narrative being *A Narrative of Nine Months' Residence in New Zealand in 1827*, he arrived in New Zealand late in October 1827 and departed in late April 1828. See also Moon 2014, 173–181.

<sup>374</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 274–275. For Earle's original text see Earle 1832, 241–242.

<sup>375</sup> See Irving-Stonebraker 2017, 98–99.

<sup>376</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 172.

and the alleged custom of polygamy were presented as having had the effect of diminishing Māori population. In the case of polygamy, it was allegedly also connected to women committing suicide out of jealousy.<sup>377</sup>

Also tied to these latter details from Wakefield and Ward's claims was the very significant matter of land and the supposed existence of what was viewed as 'waste land' in New Zealand. This so-called waste land was land that was considered to have been uncultivated, unowned or a wild piece of wilderness. Such lands were identified by the British, for example, in North America and Australia. In Australia, particularly, this concept of waste land has also been connected to the idea of *terra nullius*, or land without people. The notion was used to justify the colonisation of large tracts of land on the basis of Australian Aborigines supposedly not having made use of them and were consequently deemed to have been 'without people' and 'waste'. At the heart of the issue of *terra nullius* was whether the British or other Western people acknowledged and recognised indigenous use or ownership of land. For example, the South Australian Colonisation Act of 1834 proclaimed all land in South Australia 'waste and unoccupied'.<sup>378</sup> The legal historian Stuart Banner has pointed out that in the case of North America across the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries concepts such as indigenous people's property and the acceptability of Christians taking land in a continent settled by people were contentious issues without uniform practices. But he further argues that land was often bought from indigenous peoples, thus indicating some acknowledgement of ownership.<sup>379</sup>

Questions of land and its use also played a part in the argumentation on New Zealand in the 1830s. Māori were typically seen as having been more sedentary than many other indigenous peoples, for example in contrast to the European perception of Australian Aborigines, and it was considered that they had some ownership of their land.<sup>380</sup> The question of waste land in New Zealand rested on what land Māori were considered to need. This was unlike in the 17<sup>th</sup> century in North America where

<sup>377</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand 1837*, 275–276.

<sup>378</sup> Mitchell, J. 2011, 88; Salesa 2013, 30. The concept of *terra nullius* and its role in justifying colonialism has been the subject of much scholarly attention. Some scholars have challenged the idea that *terra nullius* was a significant justification during colonisation. Instead, they posit it was rather used as a retrospective justification that began to be used later from the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. Hence, alternative explanations for dispossessing indigenous lands have been sought. See Buchan 2005, 2; Fitzmaurice 2007. Stuart Banner has also questioned the extent to which *terra nullius* impacted questions of land in North America and has seen it as having been anomalous in the wider context of the British Empire. See Banner 2005; Banner 2007, 10–47. For further historical examination of *terra nullius* see e.g. Reynolds 1992; Boisen 2013; Kercher 2015; Attwood 2020, 14–25.

<sup>379</sup> Banner 2007, 10–47.

<sup>380</sup> Salesa 2013, 30; Attwood 2020, 118–119.

much of the coastal areas were often viewed as inhabited, but other large tracts of land that were left uncultivated and unused were seen as having been there for the taking.<sup>381</sup> It was often acknowledged in the mid-to-late-19<sup>th</sup>-century British discussions relating to Māori ownership of land that they had had possession and ownership of the lands in New Zealand. Yet, after the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi questions of landownership became even more complicated, with the contesting rights of Māori, the NZC that had purchased lands and the Crown in owning ‘unoccupied’ land. In the 1830s, it was understood by the likes of Busby and many missionaries that Māori derived food not only from cultivation but from also other lands. Even in the planning of the Treaty of Waitangi it was considered by British officials that the supposed waste land was to be purchased from Māori, implying their ownership of it.<sup>382</sup> Wakefield’s colonial theories, in turn, rested significantly on the idea of waste land. The existence of this waste land enabled land to be acquired by Europeans to be sold at a sufficient price as per Wakefield’s theories in order to set up the colonisation.<sup>383</sup> It was noted in *The British Colonization* that land would be purchased from Māori for the use of the NZA, but the idea that waste land existed in New Zealand meant that there was sufficient land to be easily acquired from Māori since they supposedly had no use for it. In describing the concrete steps for colonisation, Wakefield and Ward stated that they would obtain land from ‘these tribes which are already disposed to part with their land’.<sup>384</sup>

While historians, including Mark Hickford and Bain Attwood have extensively analysed the legal aspects of land questions in New Zealand,<sup>385</sup> waste land and Māori character were significant and interconnected factors when bases for colonisation were presented also from the perspective of more practical approaches to colonialism in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. Wakefield and Ward emphasised the ‘proportions existing between the population and the cultivated land’. Related to supposed Māori superstitions, they noted that there was not sufficient Māori population for ‘so extensive and fertile a country’, which meant that there would have been a great deal of waste land to be taken into British cultivation.<sup>386</sup> When it comes to their argumentation, this meant that limited Māori use of land left plenty to waste and ready for European use.

<sup>381</sup> Banner 2007, 29–35.

<sup>382</sup> Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 138–140; Hickford 2006, 135–136.

<sup>383</sup> On the basic principles of Wakefieldian colonisation theory see Ballantyne 2012, chapter 6 footnote 2; Birchall 2021, 144–145. For Wakefield’s general characterisation of the need to take waste land into use see *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 6–10.

<sup>384</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 54 & 60.

<sup>385</sup> See e.g. Hickford 2006; Hickford 2010; Hickford 2012; Attwood 2020.

<sup>386</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 271–275.

There have been questions raised related to the connection between perceived Māori character and the NZA's plans in relation to land use. Attwood has noted that many intellectual historians view that the NZA approached Māori as independent and to some extent sovereigns of their own lands due to the stadial theories and Māori cultivation of earth. Yet, he argues that the stadial views might be overemphasised and this approach by the NZA derived mainly from the British government having viewed Māori as independent, while Māori themselves were presented as hunter-gatherers in the NZA's objectives.<sup>387</sup>

It is true that in the NZA's *A Statement of the Objects* it was stated that '[t]he quantity of land brought under cultivation is mere nothing'.<sup>388</sup> This even relates to questions concerning the sincerity of the NZA's humanitarian approach to Māori. It is possible that the impact of stadial ideas and their possible impact on the NZA's planning can be given too much weight, as Attwood argues. However, in *The British Colonization* and its more extensive examination of Māori, they were more clearly stated as having cultivated land and there were some descriptions of this cultivation.<sup>389</sup> In Wakefield and Ward's view this cultivation was undertaken to a relatively small extent in comparison to the land in New Zealand, though. In relation to Attwood's criticism of placing too much weight on stadial theories it can be noted that stadial views were evidently present in *The British Colonization*'s discussion of Māori to a significant extent. Māori appeared to have been given some credit in being somewhat more improved than other peoples, for example, due to factors such as their cultivation of land. But that stadial perspective was not necessarily the main driving factor in the NZA's plans and Wakefield and Ward's argumentation for them. Instead, in the context of their argumentation the characterisations of Māori savagery gained another aspect. On the one hand, they balanced their argumentation between the, at least seemingly, humanitarian idea of civilising Māori with their colonisation plans and the feasibility of the colonisation in general. For this argumentation, Māori savagery provided a backdrop against which they could be viewed as becoming civilised. But on the other hand, Māori savagery also provided supposed proof of the extensive waste lands in New Zealand. Wakefield and Ward connected cannibalism, superstitions and polygamy to the alleged low Māori population, whilst at the same time they also provided arguments and supposed proof that the Māori population was not high enough to require all the land in New Zealand. Hence, there was much left 'waste'. Thus, these aspects of what appeared as Māori savagery also functioned as indicators of the suitability of New Zealand as grounds

<sup>387</sup> Attwood 2020, 119–120.

<sup>388</sup> *A Statement of the Objects of the New Zealand Association* 1837, 13.

<sup>389</sup> See e.g. *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 88, 92–95, 106–107, 204 & 260–261.

for Wakefield's colonial theories. This illustrates how knowledge claims of a people like Māori could have many significances, even in practical terms. Even stadial views of indigenous peoples could provide ideological, but also quite concrete bases for how such peoples were viewed by Europeans.

While Māori could have been seen as savage in a general sense from an early-19<sup>th</sup>-century British perspective, these more detailed accounts and knowledge claims on the subject appear to have had their uses for Wakefield and Ward as well as the Aborigines Committee. They provided a backdrop against which Māori improvement could be presented and argued as possible, but they also played into the argumentation by the two sides that their respective lines of action appeared feasible. But a final question that remains, which here relates to forming claimed knowledge of supposed Māori savagery, is the role of empiricism. Was a detailed, seemingly empirical examination of Māori necessary for the two sides to make their points based on contemporary thinking and criteria for knowledge?

### The Utility of Empiricism?

Considering that in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century indigenous peoples were typically viewed as inferior to Europeans and European civilisation, it can be asked why Wakefield and Ward and the Aborigines Committee formed these kinds of knowledge claims of Māori savagery with such a heavy focus on the use of empiricism and evidence as I have demonstrated so far. If there were such strong ideas of a need to help other peoples improve and these peoples were generally viewed as less civilised than Europeans, what role did the empirical evidence on Māori play? What was the need for extensive evidence for presenting Māori as savage, capable of improvement or in need of civilisation, if these concepts were already generally baked into the underlying Enlightenment philosophy?

The influence of exploration and travel writing on views of human difference and classification have been much discussed. Exploration provided new material and detailed ethnographic accounts for theorising new understandings of human societies and their nature. For example, Andersson Burnett and Buchan note that Linnaeus sub-divided people into four varieties based on their colour and geography, the knowledge of which was based on scientific travel.<sup>390</sup> Beyond perspectives more heavily focused on the history of science, this question needs to be pondered in the context of argumentation employed by Wakefield and Ward and the Aborigines Committee in a political and colonial frame.

<sup>390</sup> See e.g. Douglas 1999; Iliffe 2003; Pratt 2008, 37–105; Gascoigne 2014; Andersson Burnett & Buchan 2018.

The role of Māori in the argumentation concerning New Zealand is significant here. Olssen has noted that in the historiography of New Zealand's colonisation in the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century Edward Gibbon Wakefield was considered as not having been interested in Māori, other than when forced to prevent and respond to evangelical criticism. Olssen has responded to such views by pointing to the second chapter of *The British Colonization* and how the NZA committed to 'a deliberate and systematic plan for preserving and civilising the native race' and thus paid attention to Māori.<sup>391</sup> Olssen's rebuttal against Wakefield allegedly ignoring Māori can be expanded a lot further. Not only did Wakefield and Ward propose in *The British Colonization* 'a deliberate and systematic plan for preserving and civilising' Māori, but this civilising was specifically presented as having been central to their plans as the NZA's plan was not 'one of mere Colonization' but also civilising.<sup>392</sup> In presenting these proposed measures, the perceived and claimed savagery of Māori and their possibility of civilising were in fact very central to *The British Colonization*. Māori were not indeed overlooked by Wakefield and Ward, but rather the descriptions and narratives forming what I consider claimed knowledge about Māori, their state and character received plenty of attention in *The British Colonization*, although mediated through a European gaze.

Māori were, in fact, also prominent in the NZA's formulation of their plans from the founding of the Association. In the first meeting of the NZA on May 22<sup>nd</sup> 1837, chaired by Wakefield, in which the Association was set up, the minutes stated that the objects of the Association were presented at the printed paper entitled *A Statement of the Objects of the New Zealand Association*.<sup>393</sup> In the *Statement*, in turn, it was declared that the NZA was founded 'for the purpose of promoting the settlement of British subjects in New Zealand'. This plan was further elaborated upon with the specific model of colonisation that was considered preferable by the Association as well as detailed descriptions of New Zealand's geographical location, rivers, harbours, climate, natural products and native inhabitants.<sup>394</sup> While Wakefield's colonial theories, which served as the basis for the colonisation plans, did not generally take into account the possibility of indigenous populations in the areas to be colonised, Māori did feature prominently in the NZA's *A Statement* and successively in *The British Colonization*. From the outset of the *Statement* it was noted that New Zealand was inhabited by Māori, who had 'so far advanced beyond

<sup>391</sup> Olssen 1997, 212.

<sup>392</sup> See *The British Colonization of New Zealand 1837*, 27.

<sup>393</sup> See minutes of the meeting in 'Minutes of the meeting held at No 20, Adam Street, Adelphi', 22 May 1837, fr. 305–306, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Minutes etc 1837, ATL.

<sup>394</sup> *A Statement of the Objects of the New Zealand Association 1837*.

the savage state as to recognise property in land' and that by appointing a Resident to New Zealand the British Government had virtually acknowledged their independence.<sup>395</sup> Thus, Māori did not appear to the members of the NZA as simply a people to such a degree inferior to Europeans due to their character or level of civilisation that they could be dismissed or disregarded in planning the colonisation of New Zealand. This indicates that in general much attention was paid to them in the NZA's argumentation for their colonial plans.

In the case of the Aborigines Committee, the prominence of empirical sources on indigenous peoples in their report is less surprising, since the Committee was specifically set up to investigate the state and well-being of indigenous peoples in and near British colonies. There was generally much humanitarian lobbying through personal connections towards the British colonial administration and particularly the Colonial Office. However, Alan Lester and Fae Dussart argue that the official evidence gathered by the Aborigines Committee was even more effective in bringing forth a humanitarian perspective visible in the British administration, not only from the Cape Colony, which was the main focus of the committee, but from other lands as well.<sup>396</sup> New Zealand was not a major focus of the Committee and the space considerations of Māori received in the report was less than the significant focus Māori received in *The British Colonization*. Also, as a seeming paradox, indigenous peoples that were the main topic of the Committee's examination received far less direct attention than European actions towards them. But this approach was also indicated in Thomas Fowell Buxton's personal ponderings on the subject of indigenous peoples as they were presented in his memoir compiled and edited by his son Charles Buxton. In January of 1834, before Buxton began his campaign to have his committee organised, he wrote personal 'meditations' on European contact with indigenous peoples:

My attention has been drawn of late to the wickedness of our proceedings as a nation, towards the ignorant and barbarous natives of countries on which we seize. What have we Christians done for them? We have usurped their lands, kidnapped, enslaved, and murdered themselves. [...] Shame on Christianity! My object is to inquire into past proceedings, for the purpose of instituting certain rules and laws, on principles of justice, for the future treatment of the aborigines of those countries where we make settlements.<sup>397</sup>

<sup>395</sup> *A Statement of the Objects of the New Zealand Association* 1837, 3–4.

<sup>396</sup> Lester & Dussart 2014, 86–87.

<sup>397</sup> *Memoirs of Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton, Baronet* 1848, 359–360.

Buxton's reflections display his humanitarian concern for the ill-treatment of indigenous peoples by Europeans, but also raised European actions to the fore as having been at fault. He also indicated his personal focus was on European actions towards indigenous peoples, rather than the peoples themselves.

This shows a difference in the approach by Buxton and his committee in terms of how they viewed savagery of indigenous peoples in comparison to the above context, in which Wakefield and Ward and the NZA approached Māori. Similarly to *The British Colonization*, Māori customs and savagery were contrasted in order to emphasise the impact this civilisation had. But in addition to this, the supposed inferiority of indigenous peoples impacted how they were approached from a humanitarian perspective. As was noted earlier, the perceived 'uncivilised' nature of indigenous peoples that is outlined at the beginning of the Aborigines Committee's report had two significant implications. Firstly, Europeans were obliged to help them improve and, secondly, Europeans were needed to protect such peoples as they were not capable of it themselves.<sup>398</sup> In the Committee's report there, however, appears a relative lack of direct characterisations of indigenous peoples' indigenous customs, or what 19<sup>th</sup>-century Europeans could have called savagery, in contrast to *The British Colonization*. As Buxton wrote in his own papers, the indigenous peoples were viewed as 'ignorant and barbarous'. In this regard they appear to have been viewed nearly *a priori* as savage, a synonym of indigenous peoples as expressed by Paul Moon. This provides clue to why indigenous character might have been to a great degree bypassed in the Committee's report. If indigenous peoples in general were perceived as savage *a priori*, Buxton and his inner circle might not have perceived a great need to detail their character through the use of extensive evidence. Conversely, it is possible that either the different strategies of creating credibility or less defined views of indigenous peoples as *a priori* savage by Wakefield and Ward led them to discuss the 'original' character of Māori in greater detail and in an empirical manner. Furthermore, in relation to the Committee's focus, it is notable that while the supposed Māori savagery received less attention from the Committee, evidence of improvement in various indigenous peoples, including the perceived improvement of Māori, did feature in the report. This appears to have been in order to emphasise their capability to improve and to show the utility of the suggestion for helping these peoples improve, which will become evident in the following chapter of this thesis.

What then do these contexts mean in terms of the significance of the use of empirical evidence in forming knowledge claims of Māori savagery by Wakefield and Ward and the Aborigines Committee more generally? Was Enlightenment

<sup>398</sup> See *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 3.

philosophy, which proposed stages of improvement in human societies, not enough to convince intended audiences of the bases for the justification and feasibility of colonial action? For one, as Roque and Wagner argue, there was more to colonial knowledge than just applying preconceived notions of colonial subjects. Such notions were instead adapted into different bodily encounters and effected, for example, by different literary genres carrying the colonial knowledge. The evaluation of the authority or truthfulness of evidence or testimony was dependent on literary conventions or ideals for knowledge.<sup>399</sup> Similarly, Daniel W. Clayton has examined how ideas about British Columbia were constructed in late-18<sup>th</sup>- and early-19<sup>th</sup>-century Britain, and notes that Western ideas about new lands, indigenous people and contact with them were not mechanically applied to specific cases. Instead, there were complex two-way interactions at play between Europeans and indigenous peoples resulting in adaptation and negotiation of Western ideas with local facts or observations.<sup>400</sup> These perspectives highlight the necessity to examine closely what constituted knowledge in their specific contexts.

With these considerations in mind, the role of empirical evidence in *The British Colonization* and the Aborigines Committee's report, as opposed to the use of classical texts in medieval and early modern contexts, for example,<sup>401</sup> is further emphasised. The extent to which seemingly and allegedly empirical evidence from New Zealand was not only included, but put on a pedestal in the texts shows that the contemporary European ideas about indigenous peoples and their capabilities were to a large degree adapted to New Zealand. In the case of the Aborigines Committee's report, it was also adapted to other indigenous peoples, specifically through the use these seemingly empirical sources. Irving-Stonebraker views theories based on Scottish Enlightenment philosophy as ways to render non-European societies and their 'natural' state intelligible to Europeans as European expansion around the world brought with it information of human difference.<sup>402</sup> But in addition to this, the thinking about savagery and improvement also provided a basis for improvement and thus for further colonial action. The empirical evidence presented by Wakefield and Ward and the Aborigines Committee placed Māori into that frame of viewing improvement and allowed adapting the contemporary views to colonial argumentation. The extent of the two sides' use of sources, however, also appears to have been dependent on their approaches and focus when it came to indigenous peoples.

<sup>399</sup> Roque & Wagner 2012, 3.

<sup>400</sup> Clayton 2000, xiii.

<sup>401</sup> See Roque & Wagner 2012, 3.

<sup>402</sup> Irving-Stonebraker 2017, 94.

The use of such sources also appears as a central strategy for creating credibility for the claimed knowledge. Even Wakefield and Ward noted explicitly in their book's introduction that the information therein had been 'collected from every available source of information, concerning the islands which it is proposed to colonize'.<sup>403</sup> In the case of the Aborigines Committee's report, the significance of sources and their use in expressing the Committee's findings was even more pronounced. The report that was published with over 600 pages of minutes from witness testimonies and further appended documentation, the references to which were annotated into the report proper.

Thus, looking at the general role of the seemingly empirical evidence given in *The British Colonization* and the Aborigines Committee's report it becomes evident that the expressed knowledge claims of indigenous peoples, and here specifically of Māori, did reflect in many ways contemporary ideas and Enlightenment thinking on indigenous peoples. But despite this, Buxton through his committee's report and Wakefield and Ward in their book relied heavily on empirical evidence to construct their argumentation. This can be viewed as a way in which the *a priori* perceptions of indigenous characters, whether they were perceived in terms of savagery or civilisation, were adapted and translated to fit local situations and encounters as Clayton and Roque and Wagner propose. Furthermore, the selective nature of gathering and using the sources underlines how such formation of knowledge was influenced by factors such as the interests, goals and preconceptions of the authors.

<sup>403</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, xi.

## 2.2 Evidence and the Possibility of Civilising

### 2.2.1 Missionaries as Sources of Improvement

Turning over to the flipside of the so-called savagery, I will now turn to a concept even more explicitly central to the 1830s debates on New Zealand's colonisation and one that was also central to Enlightenment views of indigenous peoples: civilisation. In both the Aborigines Committee's report and Wakefield and Ward's *The British Colonization*, civilisation and more generally improvement of Māori from their alleged state of savagery were themes that were even more explicitly addressed than themes of savagery. The supposed savagery of Māori appeared strongly influenced by contemporary paternalistic and Eurocentric views of European superiority, and thus savagery in indigenous peoples often appeared as something of a given. In the two works in focus here, the views of perceived Māori savagery were illustrated and supposedly proven, from a contemporary perspective, with evidence and examples. Along the same lines, but to greater extent, views of so-called improvement from this savagery towards civilisation received even more attention from the Committee and Wakefield and Ward. Indeed, further sources were given to show improvement and civilising among Māori. This emphasis was in line with the interests of both sides to argue for action that was intended to help civilise Māori. In this way, savagery and civilisation were discussed as two connected aspects of a dichotomy that emphasised a supposed need to help improve Māori, or indigenous peoples in general.

The presentation of civilisation and British views of improving Māori towards this goal by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward call for further examination. This is particularly in terms of how this arising civilisation among Māori was presented as claimed knowledge and how it related to the debate on colonising New Zealand. In the historiography relating to the Aborigines Committee and their report, the perspective of early-19<sup>th</sup>-century humanitarianism has directed scholarly gaze most pointedly at the Committee's narration of conflicts between Māori and Europeans and what were described as atrocities committed by the British also in other colonies. For example, so-called humanitarian narratives of Māori suffering, which were meant to solicit sympathy among Britons for the furthering of humanitarian agendas, have mostly been at the centre of the analysis of how Māori were presented in the debates on New Zealand. The improvement of indigenous peoples towards what was considered civilisation by Britons formed another perspective to this humanitarian movement and a specific part of the Committee's assignment. Laidlaw, for example, indicates that Buxton viewed civilisation as reparation for the suffering inflicted on indigenous peoples after coming into contact with Europeans. Yet, the Committee's judgement of European actions has generally

received the most attention in terms of how the Committee and its report have been addressed in scholarly work.<sup>404</sup> Pat Moloney and Robert Grant have examined the significance of European conceptions of civilisation and savagery vis-à-vis British colonial projects related to New Zealand.<sup>405</sup> I continue here along these lines to connect processes of formation of knowledge to how civilisation, as the supposedly desired antithesis to savagery, was used to present New Zealand and Māori as suitable objects for British colonial action. Tying these topics into the practices of early-19<sup>th</sup>-century British colonialism, I examine them here as a part of how the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward built their argumentation for colonial action in New Zealand. The use of sources to form claimed knowledge of Māori improvement and civilising were a part of building this argumentation.

Considering that there were different sources and actors at play in the processes of this formation of knowledge about the early-19<sup>th</sup>-century New Zealand, evangelicals and missionaries appear particularly prominent. I begin my examination here by looking at their specific roles in the formation of knowledge and the debates on New Zealand. Much of the improvement that was supposedly perceived in Māori and is discussed here is related to what was termed in both the Aborigines Committee's report and *The British Colonization* as 'moral improvement'. Here 'moral' signified human rational capacities.<sup>406</sup> This moral change in Māori was to a large degree presented via the use of missionary sources. Thus, missionaries also receive the majority of attention here. A particularly curious phenomenon here is how missionaries were used to present Māori improvement in the very different contexts of the Committee's report and *The British Colonization*. As sources of information the missionaries themselves were after all significantly biased towards their own agendas. The interests of missionaries, the Aborigines Committee and the NZA in presenting Māori improvement intersected in various ways that brought to the fore different emphases for each group. The examination of the use of these sources in the two works also reveals differing strategies in how individual sources were given as credible bases for forming knowledge about Māori. In the previous section of this chapter, I outlined the bases for credibility empirical of evidence and other strategies provided to the Committee and Wakefield and Ward in their formation of knowledge. Here, a closer examination of missionaries as sources highlights how individual sources were given authority or used as credible sources.

<sup>404</sup> See e.g. Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 64; Burns 1989, 70; Lester 2002b; Elbourne 2003a; Lester 2008; Ballantyne 2011; Ballantyne 2016. For Laidlaw's comment on reparation see Laidlaw 2004, 3–4.

<sup>405</sup> Moloney 2001; Grant 2003.

<sup>406</sup> For this definition of 'moral' in relation to language used by Europeans on indigenous peoples see Rubiés 2002, 1.

Later in this section, I will raise William Yate as a specific example of how missionaries were used as sources, since he was featured to a great extent in both the Aborigines Committee's report and *The British Colonization*. Yet, pieces of evidence from him were utilised to slightly differing ends and through different means. At the end of this chapter, I will also examine another aspect of civilising and improvement, namely material improvement. Material change was also presented as having taken place among Māori, although in very different ways and with very different significances in the two works. Especially in *The British Colonization* this aspect of material improvement also highlighted other sources than missionaries.

But first I examine missionaries as presenters of information about and supposed providers of civilisation. Missionaries and evangelicals were generally closely related to both forming views of indigenous peoples from a contemporary European perspective and the practical work that was undertaken with the intention of helping them improve. As Norman Etherington discusses in his introduction to the influential volume of *The Oxford History of the British Empire* on missions and Empire, missionaries had typically received very little attention in the older historiography of the British Empire.<sup>407</sup> Their roles in colonialism and the British Empire have, however, been increasingly seen as central since the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. For example, in his elaboration on the entanglements of evangelicals and missionaries with empires, Ballantyne views that missionary groups were significant in producing new images of non-white populations. This also took place concerning New Zealand, since missionaries in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century 'produced a variegated archive that described Maori[sic] social organization' and elements of this archive were circulated in print through crafted accounts of missionary endeavours.<sup>408</sup> Missionary activities with non-European peoples tied them closely to empires and colonialism. However, there have been different historiographical approaches to missions and missionaries since the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century, ranging from analyses of missionaries as benign agents of civilisation to imperialist oppressors and to missions as local projects with involvement from local peoples.<sup>409</sup>

Irrespective of these evaluations, it is clear that missionaries and missionary societies were profoundly tied up with concepts of civilisation and improvement of other peoples. In Felicity Jensz and Hanna Acke's words, missionary societies were bound up with what has been called 'imperial idealism', or the idea that in general

<sup>407</sup> Etherington 2005.

<sup>408</sup> Ballantyne 2011, 234–236. On missionaries as creators of 'imperial archives' see also Johnston 2003, 3.

<sup>409</sup> Mitchell, J. 2011, 9. On connections between missionaries and colonialism see also Comaroff & Comaroff 1991, 7–8; Hofmeyr 2005, 19–20; Jensz 2012a, 294–295; Ballantyne 2012, 139–140.

‘foreign missions were seen to manifest Britain’s moral and divine obligation for the providential gift of colonial rule’.<sup>410</sup> This same idea of missionaries having functioned as the implanters of change towards European ways of life and ‘civilisation’ among non-Europeans was also a leading theme in Jean and John Comaroff’s classic analysis of British protestant missionaries in southern Tswana region, particularly in the second volume of their *Of Revelation and Revolution*. This change, in the Comaroffs’ view, was epitomised by the contrast between the civil and the savage, which also signified a European perception that not only was it necessary for Christianity to be accepted, but also all marks of ‘degeneracy and primitivism’ needed to be discarded for this change to take place.<sup>411</sup>

Furthermore, it was crucial for missionaries to accumulate and disseminate knowledge concerning their work of evangelising other peoples in order to be able to persuade colonial authorities and other audiences that missionary work should be supported. The networks of communication between missionaries and their parent societies provided mechanisms for seeking this approbation. Missionary periodicals, which drew on the knowledge and experiences of missionaries in the field, as well as other forms of print were used to influence readers and excite missionary spirit at home.<sup>412</sup> This communication played into the creation of the imperial archives noted by Ballantyne, which meant that these missionary actions were also influential beyond missionary circles. These connections are also evident in the Aborigines Committee’s report and *The British Colonization*. Many of the above dynamics that were related to missionaries were notably paralleled in the presentation of Māori character and its relations to civilisation by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward. Claims of changes among Māori towards civilisation, which closely resembled and were entangled with missionary views, were evident in the works. Equally, and connectedly, missionary networks were crucial sources of information for the two sides.

Training my gaze on missionaries here, in relation to how Māori improvement was presented in the two works, gives clear indication of how and why the two sides presented the improvement as they did. There were clear connections between the general lines of how missionaries, the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward viewed improvement in indigenous peoples. This closely ties contemporary perceptions of indigenous peoples to arguments about colonial action and colonial intentions in more concrete ways. It also illustrates the intricacies of intertextuality and transfer of knowledge. These in turn allowed for different emphases in claiming

<sup>410</sup> Jenz & Acke 2013, 369. See also Ballantyne 2016.

<sup>411</sup> Comaroff & Comaroff 1997, 64, see also 12–13 & 32. For an in-depth analysis of Comaroffs’ analysis see Elbourne 2003b.

<sup>412</sup> Jenz & Acke 2013, 368–369. See also Nickel 2015, 123; Ballantyne 2016.

Māori improvement to arise from very similar source materials. With their explicit interests in presenting civilisation and improvement in Māori, but from their own perspectives, *The British Colonization* and the Aborigines Committee's report provide excellent examples of how missionaries and their work in supposedly improving and civilising Māori character played crucial roles in the argumentation for action in New Zealand. Hence, an examination of the knowledge claims of the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward regarding the improvement that had allegedly taken place among Māori and the alleged reasons for this improvement complements the earlier discussion of what was seen as the savage Māori character. This helps to build understanding of how it was claimed that civilisation was developing among Māori and what this entailed. These views were in turn used as a major basis for arguing for action in New Zealand, both in terms of the settler colonialism of the NZA and in support of missionary work by the Aborigines Committee.

## Improvement

Before a closer examination of the use of sources by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward, it is necessary to briefly look at the significance and meaning of civilisation and improvement in relation to the Committee's report and *The British Colonization*. Civilisation as a term is deeply connected to its antonym savagery. Since gaining traction in French use in the 1770s, civilisation connoted a condition that was specifically the antithesis of barbarism or savagery. For many European theorists in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, civilisation emphasised rationality and technology on the one hand, and was opposed by ignorance and superstition on the other. The concept and its use in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century came to intimate the notion of social and intellectual progress from one condition to a higher stage, as well as a strong valuation and hierarchical nature to how civilisation was seen. The stadial theories expressly pointed to civilisation as progressing from lower stages to what appeared as the epitome of contemporary Western civilisation. Civilisation was seen as a ladder, on which different peoples could climb to reach higher, and quite explicitly better, stages of civilisation.<sup>413</sup> Therefore, non-European peoples becoming civilised was at its core about them 'improving' from savagery to civilisation.

Improvement, along with other similar concepts, are complex matters that have had long histories in European thinking and as abstract concepts have been closely related to European philosophies.<sup>414</sup> Even beyond specific stadial theories, other

<sup>413</sup> See e.g. Boisen 2013, 339; Kuper 2019, 406–408.

<sup>414</sup> For a general discussion on civilisation and the connections of civilisation and 18<sup>th</sup>-century views of antiquity see e.g. Kuper 2019.

strands of Enlightenment philosophy also put an emphasis on civilisation and improvement. Improvement out of ‘immaturity’, or what could be called savagery, and progressing to civilisation were regarded as necessities for the proper development of the human condition, for example, in theories by Immanuel Kant and John Stuart Mill.<sup>415</sup> But views of improvement were also put to very concrete uses by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward. In the Committee’s report, a section was devoted to the claimed improvement of indigenous peoples under the heading ‘Effect of Fair Dealing, combined with Christian Instruction, on Aborigines’. Following the preceding section of the report, which presented an overarching review of the state of indigenous peoples in and near British colonies, this section focused on detailing claimed knowledge about how these same peoples had supposedly benefitted from European action that was viewed as ‘fair’. Namely, this meant missionary work. However, southern Africa was separated from this section, since the Committee noted that relating to that area ‘the copious evidence taken by Your Committee, has related rather to their [indigenous people’s] civil affairs than to their moral and religious condition’.<sup>416</sup> This separated the Committee’s approach to southern Africa from the examination of other areas, which focused specifically on their moral and religious state and improvement from the earlier discussed savagery.

Concerning these other areas examined by the Committee, the weight of evidence in the section on ‘fair dealing’ was explicated at the beginning of this section: ‘[I]n reviewing the evidence before us, we find proof that every tribe of mankind is accessible to this remedial process[...].’<sup>417</sup> Despite there having been contemporary stadial and monogenist views of the unity of humans, this evidence was thus given as providing empirical proof that improvement in indigenous peoples was possible. The Committee also stated in the beginning of the report that there was an obligation for the British as civilised people to ‘confer upon them [indigenous peoples] the most important benefits’.<sup>418</sup> This combination of the Committee’s determination of the possibility of improvement in indigenous peoples and the obligation to help them do this, resulted in what Elbourne has called the Committee’s call for the British to ‘live up to their civilising responsibilities’.<sup>419</sup> While this section of the report was not as extensive as the parts of the report in which the Committee presented the European atrocities that have been highlighted in the historiography on the report, it did run to fourteen pages. In it the Committee illustrated the alleged

<sup>415</sup> Boisen 2013, 345.

<sup>416</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 60.

<sup>417</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 44.

<sup>418</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 3.

<sup>419</sup> Elbourne 2003a.

improvement in indigenous peoples that was attributed to missionary work.<sup>420</sup> Similarly, the claims concerning Māori character at the time of early contact with Europeans in *The British Colonization* were followed by a far longer and more expansive section, which was entitled ‘the Progress of New Zealanders in Religion, Civilization, and Industry’. This section again consisted of extensive quotations from various sources, most significantly from missionaries, which provided seeming proof of this kind of change and improvement in Māori.<sup>421</sup>

The association between the stadial views of human improvement and the notably empirical nature of presenting Māori civilisation in the two works is curious, though. Again, general and theoretical preconceptions of the nature of mankind were adapted to the specificities of New Zealand, as was the case in relation to views of savagery. From a theoretical perspective, civilisation and particularly the possibility of improving from lower stages of advancement towards civilisation were ingrained in the stadial view of Enlightenment thinking. The early decades of the 19th century were marked by belief in the improvability of colonised others, whilst views of racial hierarchy grew increasingly prominent in the latter half of the century. This in turn led to a significant emphasis on humanitarian narratives portraying ‘any sign of Christianization or “civilization” on the part of those they sought to “save”’, as Lambert and Lester characterise colonial philanthropy. Despite this theoretical basis of the capacity of all peoples to improve, Lambert and Lester note that evidence of progress, such as evidence of people having been seen to be ‘orderly, clean, pious, serious, and respectable’, was still sought to vindicate the humanitarian concern for colonised peoples.<sup>422</sup> Theoretical views of human capacity to improve, however, were not always perceived equally in practice. Samuel Marsden, for example, was rather sceptical of the capacity of Australian Aborigines to improve.<sup>423</sup> Thus, the Aborigines Committee’s and Wakefield and Ward’s use of supposed evidence to present Māori improvement resembled Lambert and Lester’s observation of a custom to seek evidence for vindication.

While it was considered that various peoples could improve, it was also viewed that those who were considered to have already reached the higher stages of civilisation were capable of and even obliged to help the ‘less improved’ advance further.<sup>424</sup> Taking such views even further, it was even considered by some that such improvement specifically required help from those who were more civilised. The political economist and theologian Richard Whately criticised stadial views in 1832

<sup>420</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 44–58.

<sup>421</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 196–251.

<sup>422</sup> Lambert & Lester 2004, 332.

<sup>423</sup> Mitchell, J. 2011, 15; Ballantyne 2015, 101–102.

<sup>424</sup> Moloney 2001, 153; Lambert & Lester 2004, 332.

by stating that it was in fact necessary for the more civilised to help others improve. He argued that without such aid improvement could not happen. An example of this was seen in the improvement and rise out of barbarism of European peoples after conquest by the Romans.<sup>425</sup> Thus, the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward were evidently products of their time, as their presentation of Māori reflected many of these contemporary views. It is notable that Wakefield and Ward, for example, also brought up the influence of Romans on Britons to discuss the issue of civilising Māori. But adapting these contemporary ways of thinking to fit the respective argumentation of the two sides also brought with it some differences in the presented knowledge claims and their emphases.

Indicative of the contemporary flexibility of terminology, the words civilisation and improvement contained many nuances and differences in their use in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, as did the concept of savagery. Words like Christianisation, civilisation, progress and improvement were used nearly interchangeably by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward. The historian Michael Mann notes that concepts of ‘improvement’, ‘betterment’ and ‘moral and material progress’ were subsumed under the term ‘civilising mission’, which was typical for civilising projects by all European colonial powers.<sup>426</sup>

These words also appear to have had certain definite implications as used by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward. Christianisation of indigenous people, which was specifically mentioned as a goal in the Aborigines Committee’s assignment, was particularly emphasised by the Committee. This was consistent with their religious and evangelical background. Christianisation appeared as one aspect of the more wholesale notion of civilisation, the spreading of which the Committee was appointed to consider.<sup>427</sup> Civilisation was also stated as an objective by the NZA in their colonisation plans. As such it received more attention from Wakefield and Ward than Christianisation. Progress was bound in a complex tangle into these concepts in European colonial thinking in general, since, as Pramod K. Nayar notes: ‘[c]ivilisation, development, Enlightenment, progress, modernity, and “culture” were the characteristic and prerogative of those who resided at the centre’, that is, imperial metropolises in contrast the so-called margins.<sup>428</sup> In presentations by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward, progress appears to have had a stadial quality signifying indigenous peoples, who progressed from lower to higher stages. This was evident, for example, in the Committee’s discussion of ‘nations who have made some progress in civilization’ and in Wakefield and Ward’s presentation

<sup>425</sup> Moloney 2001, 156–157.

<sup>426</sup> Mann 2004, 4.

<sup>427</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 3.

<sup>428</sup> Nayar 2015, 28.

of ‘Progress of New Zealanders in Religion, Civilization, and Industry’.<sup>429</sup> Altogether, the repeated characterisation of change in indigenous peoples as ‘improvement’ by the two sides also underlines the valuations that were inherent in how indigenous ways of life and British customs were viewed. Indicative of their approach to presenting Māori as capable of this improvement and of the role played by improvement in their argumentation, Wakefield and Ward premised the feasibility of their plans on the capacity of Māori to improve: ‘The success of such an experiment [of the NZA’s colonial plans] must in a great measure depend on the natural capacity of the inferior race for improvement. It will be seen that, in this respect, the native inhabitants of New Zealand are superior to most, if not all thoroughly savage people.’<sup>430</sup> In light of this conceptual tangle, I will refer to the change and processes of civilising that were presented by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward in Māori as improvement. It encapsulates and illustrates the contemporary ideas inherent in the Committee’s report and *The British Colonization* regarding the supposed progress through the stages of civilisation and the evaluations of Western civilisation as superior to savagery. Notably, this concept also encapsulates how these aspects of civilisation were seen through a very paternalistic and Eurocentric lens. Furthermore, this improvement, as presented in the Committee’s report and *The British Colonization*, appeared both as having already taken place out of the earlier discussed savagery, but also as something that was seen as still taking place further towards British civilisation.

Presenting improvement that had supposedly already taken place and would develop further was indeed a central argumentative tool for action in New Zealand by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward. Relating to his category of improvement writing as a form of colonial writing, Ballantyne notes that it was ‘a powerful idea because it promised the ability to translate belief, aspiration, and the written word into action and outcomes’.<sup>431</sup> Equally, argumentation by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield as Ward was connected to contemporary theoretical views of civilisation and improvement, but in practice it was intended to enact very real action in New Zealand. I argue here that this use of improvement writing as an argumentative strategy also explains why claimed knowledge of Māori was used to such a degree by both the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward. Set in the context of contemporary thought on indigenous peoples, the presentation of claims of Māori savagery, then abandoning aspects of this savagery and further adopting more civilised manners all played into a supposedly empirical basis that

<sup>429</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 68; *The British Colonization of New Zealand 1837*, 196.

<sup>430</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand 1837*, 28.

<sup>431</sup> Ballantyne 2012, 243.

showed that improvement was possible and could be achieved by the action proposed by the two sides.

While the presentation of civilisation was central here for the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward, it was also significant that the improvement was demonstrated alongside or after the presentation of the perceived savagery. Similarly to Catherine Hall's discussion of the tropes of *before* and *after*, the strategy of emphasising the dichotomy of savagery and civilisation was evident in the presentation of Māori by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward. The role of presenting claims of Māori savagery as a foil to civilisation, as well as presenting claims of their improvement, is further underlined by Jean and John Comaroff's observation that civilisation required discarding all marks of 'degeneracy and primitivism'.<sup>432</sup> As such, an overall presentation of Māori character from perceived savagery to alleged improvement served to bring the more theoretical and philosophical views of the possibility or capacity of improvement closer to colonial practices. Following Ballantyne's analysis, the presentation of claims of Māori improvement held the promise of practical and achievable action. For a more concrete examination of this strategy, I now turn to examining how and why the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward utilised missionary information to form their knowledge about Māori improvement. Later, I will analyse what these knowledge claims drawn from such sources entailed.

### Missionary Sources for Arguing Improvement

A closer examination of the prevalence of missionaries as sources in the Aborigines Committee and *The British Colonization* illuminates two directions in early-19<sup>th</sup>-century networks of communication. On the one hand, missionaries appeared as crucial links in how the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward received information on New Zealand and Māori for their formation of knowledge. On the other hand, missionaries' messages were circulated even further than in missionary periodicals through the Aborigines Committee's and Wakefield and Ward's work, and they could have had influence on colonial policy making. It is significant to note, however, that as these messages were cited intertextually and further circulated, the original message or knowledge from the missionaries could have been, and often was, altered by the new textual and political contexts. Despite their markedly different backgrounds, both the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward made use of missionary sources. A connective factor in this were the professed goals of improving indigenous peoples, which drew all these sides close to each other.

<sup>432</sup> Comaroff & Comaroff 1997, 64.

The context within which missionaries functioned in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century is important to note. Humanitarian ideals of improvement and missionary networks were closely bound together. The civilising mission and missionary humanitarianism were personified in late-18<sup>th</sup>- and early-19<sup>th</sup>-century England in the emerging middle class and promulgated often in evangelical middle-class networks. As Alison Twells states, the ‘aim of missionary philanthropy was to produce men and women of Christian character; to infuse the English nation, its cultural life and polity, with Christian principles and moral systems’ and to extend these Christian systems all over the world. The interest of British Protestants in overseas mission, however, began only in the later decades of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, apart from occasional individual clergymen in some colonies. The outreach to overseas missions was also accompanied by work with ‘the heathen’ working class in Britain. But political obstacles in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century in relation to work at home and the prospect of salvageable souls abroad led to an increased focus on foreign mission. In contrast to earlier 18<sup>th</sup>-century views, missionaries became increasingly interested in the spiritual well-being of their subjects, rather than the salvation of the evangelical individual’s own soul.<sup>433</sup> From a wider perspective, Lambert and Lester connect the concern for others to political action. They characterise colonial philanthropists as people who believed that imperialism was about more than riches or military glory. Instead, they attempted to influence official policy for the benefit of others, but notably from their own particular perspective of what was seen as good, as in the anti-slavery campaigns and opening India up to Christian evangelisation.<sup>434</sup>

For understanding the role of missionaries in terms of how they were used as sources and how they were presented as conveyors of improvement and civilisation, it is also necessary to not only view them from the vantage point of London, where their texts and information were used. It is also necessary to examine them from the perspective of their own activity. Missionary activity in New Zealand in the early decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> century took on many forms. Their major objective was in Christianising and civilising Māori. In this new commitment to spreading mission to ‘heathens’ in foreign lands, islands in the Pacific provided British missions with a promising field. In 1795, Thomas Haweis, a founding member of the LMS argued in the *Evangelical Magazine* that these islands were ripe for harvest due to the temper of the people, the climate, the abundance of food and the people living closely together who were ready for instruction.<sup>435</sup> In practice, early missionary work in New Zealand included, most visibly, maintaining schools for educating Māori, the

<sup>433</sup> Thorne 1999, 23–27 & 44–47. On the political struggles of missions in Britain in comparison to foreign mission see 44–51. See also Twells 2009, 4–5.

<sup>434</sup> Lambert & Lester 2004, 323.

<sup>435</sup> Ballantyne 2015, 44–45.

translation of the Bible to *te reo Māori* and travelling out from the mission station to preach and communicate with locals in nearby communities. They were also active in their correspondence and in sending their journals to Britain to inform their parent societies of their actions as well as the progress and the general nature of their work.

Thus, missionaries were of great value as informants in colonial networks, especially in lands such as New Zealand, which was still on the outskirts of official British imperial governance. Laidlaw observes that humanitarian networks consisting of missionary societies and their missionaries, well-connected evangelical individuals and all their personal connections could be more efficient and far-reaching than official channels of information.<sup>436</sup> To the same effect, Elbourne argues that the Aborigines Committee, with their expansive connections, implicitly claimed that they had a comprehensive understanding of situations in the colonies of which the Colonial Office had insufficient knowledge.<sup>437</sup> In this way, missionaries were not only eyewitnesses but could have been perceived as indeed having provided information within their networks that might not have been available to all other colonial actors.

A look at the sources in the works of the NZA and Aborigines Committee reveals the prevalence of missionaries as sources of information as well as active participants working for what they viewed as the spiritual well-being of indigenous peoples. Their activity in the field and as a part of the networks that spanned the globe placed them in a position where they had significant influence in many directions in different spheres of British colonialism. For example, Anna Johnston's examination of the LMS mission in Lake Macquarie in New South Wales shows how missionaries could play significant roles as local actors and as parts of the networks of communication in the British Empire. In addition to their role at a local level, they had chances to present their opinions and provide recommendations to British humanitarians and politicians as well as other colonial figures. This was achieved through their contacts and the bodies of text they produced in their personal and official correspondence and diary entries. What makes these texts also curious is the combination of seemingly well-intentioned Christian sentiment together with Eurocentric rhetoric of the 19<sup>th</sup> century British Empire.<sup>438</sup> Equally, missionaries were at the forefront of taking an active part in trying to Christianise and civilise Māori. As such they communicated their views to Europe regarding how improvement in Māori could supposedly be achieved from a European perspective. This communication of information was carried out through the lens of their own interests and was filtered to the British public through the missionary societies. Yet, it also

<sup>436</sup> Laidlaw 2005, 28–30.

<sup>437</sup> See Elbourne 2003a.

<sup>438</sup> Johnston 2011, 19–20.

circulated further and was utilised from other perspectives through various processes of transfer of knowledge once in Britain.

What an examination of the missionaries' connections and their information's textual circulation can uncover is illustrated by the role missionaries connected to the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward played in comparison to how Peter Adams has articulated his view of missionary influence. Adams has claimed that missionaries in New Zealand did not have a direct impact on the Colonial Office and official British policy despite the fact that they actively conveyed information about New Zealand to Britain. He indicates that this was partly due to the missives from missionaries having passed through the respective missionary societies. Thus, they were filtered to support the societies' views. According to Adams, there were also suspicious attitudes towards missionaries within the Colonial Office because they were viewed as dramatic figures in nature and liable to distorting the truth.<sup>439</sup> There was indeed relatively little direct communication between individual missionaries in New Zealand and the Colonial Office. However, I argue here that a closer look at the networks of communication intimates more complex forms and routes of influence and impact missionaries had in the discussions and debates on New Zealand. The lack of direct communication between New Zealand-based missionaries and the Colonial Office did not completely diminish the impact of missionary sources in regards to the 1830s political views on New Zealand's colonisation. The information and evidence provided by missionaries was crucial for creating knowledge claims on New Zealand and Māori to be used for political argumentation, thus giving missionaries an impactful role. Adams's view can be given credit in the sense that due to these more complex forms of communication the impact missionaries had indirectly was not necessarily the exact impact the individual missionaries might have intended. Considering, for example, that missionary sources were utilised for both the opposing goals of both the NZA and the Aborigines Committee.

Missionaries and the Aborigines Committee had very direct lines of communication. Buxton was originally inspired to seek a parliamentary inquiry on indigenous peoples due to his connections to John Philip, a southern African superintendent of the LMS, with the intention of bringing information and politics of the Cape and its situation in the war with the Xhosa to public knowledge.<sup>440</sup> Eventually the perspective of the Committee reached beyond the Cape and across the British Empire. The testimonies of missionaries before the Committee brought the narratives of various colonies together into a common humanitarian narrative. Missionary sources have been noted as having been strongly reflected in the

<sup>439</sup> Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 55–56 & 61–62.

<sup>440</sup> Elbourne 2003a.

Committee's emphasis.<sup>441</sup> Equally, the Committee's use of missionary sources was in line with the view they expressed that 'there is but one effectual means of staying the evils we have occasioned, and of imparting the blessings of civilization, and that is the propagation of Civilization'.<sup>442</sup> This gave missionaries central roles in the Committee's views of how improvement was to be achieved.

The intersecting interests of the Aborigines Committee and missionary actors is evident in the Committee's use of sources on indigenous improvement. In general, the Committee appears to have been very interested in the ideas of civilisation and improvement. Indigenous peoples' improvement was often discussed in the Committee's witness interviews, which were related to different colonies under British rule. The Committee posed questions to various witnesses, not only missionaries, concerning the possibility of improvement in various indigenous peoples arising from the British colonial administration, missionary influence or other possible means.<sup>443</sup> The evidence that was actually used by the Committee in the report proper was however quite one-sided. In the report's section on 'the Effects of Fair Dealing', nearly all references were to missionary sources. The only exceptions were a few references on Native Americans to Elisha Bates, a Quaker and minister while not exactly a missionary, and a few references to official communications in parliamentary papers on indigenous peoples of North America.<sup>444</sup> Even Khoesan Andries Stoffels was asked: 'Has the character and condition of the Hottentots been improved since the missionaries came among them?'<sup>445</sup> Stoffels would seem like a suitable witness for the Committee, since after having converted to Christianity in 1809 he believed that this religion could 'revitalize black communities in Africa'. Hence, he travelled in southern Africa seeking to convert

<sup>441</sup> Elbourne 2003a; Lester 2008, 64; Porter 1999, 208.

<sup>442</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 45.

<sup>443</sup> See e.g. in *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence: interview of Archdeacon Broughton 3 August 1835, 14; interview of Thomas Philipps, 5 August 1835, 33; interview of Thomas Philipps, 17 August 1835, 78; interview of Major William B. Dundas, 26 August 1835, 129–130; interview of Captain Andries Stockenstrom 28 August 1835, 155; interview of Captain Andrew Stockenstrom 4 March 1836, 244–245; interview of Walter Gisborne 27 April 1836, 364; interview of Elisha Bates, 11 June 1836, 554; interview of Thomas Hodgkin, 11 July 1836, 639. See also interview of John Henry Pelly, 22 March 1837, *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, Minutes of Evidence, 71–72.

<sup>444</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 46–47; see *Papers relating to Aboriginal Tribes. (North America, New South Wales, Van Diemen's Land and British Guyana)* 1834.

<sup>445</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 584, question 4961.

other Africans.<sup>446</sup> But this question and Stoffels's response were not included in the report proper. The only reference to Stoffels's testimony was a very brief quote in which he stated that missionaries had done good, and others had done evil to Africans. Even here Stoffels was not referenced by name. His testimony was only cited in the margins.<sup>447</sup> Some non-missionary sources were cited in the Committee's further discussion of southern Africa, but as the Committee themselves noted, this discussion was more about the civil affairs in the area than the moral condition of local peoples.<sup>448</sup>

A large proportion of the witnesses interviewed by the Committee, especially concerning areas other than southern Africa, were missionaries, but this is not to say that missionaries would have been the only witnesses available for the Committee to interview. After all, the Committee interviewed the likes of William Barrett Marshall and Captain George Lambert, the latter of whom had been the captain of the ship *Alligator* in the incident related to the *Harriet*. Their interviews were uniformly related to the *Harriet* incident,<sup>449</sup> but there is little reason to assume that similar non-missionary witnesses could not have been interviewed by the Committee on the improvement of indigenous peoples if it had been so desired. There were numerous travellers that had visited New Zealand and made observations of Māori. But as David Eastwood notes, select committees relied on volunteer witnesses and there was no more formal regime to the select committee processes.<sup>450</sup> This system could be played by the chairmen of the committees to the effect of inviting only selected and preferred witnesses for testimony. On the other hand, Zoë Laidlaw points out that colonial lobbyists were often well-connected and could use their connections to promote their own agendas and, for example, to appear before select committees particularly in the 1820s and 1830s.<sup>451</sup> Thus, this system was beneficial for both sides, but not necessarily generative of much objectivity. With these considerations in mind, it appears clear that the intersecting goals and ideologies of missionaries and the majority of the Aborigines Committee made the former fitting and desirable sources of information on indigenous peoples' improvement, as they also were on indigenous savagery.

The use of missionary contacts by the Committee and in the report proper, written by Anna Gurney and Buxton's inner circle, is further emphasised by

<sup>446</sup> Lester, Boehme & Mitchell, P. 2021, 119–120.

<sup>447</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 60.

<sup>448</sup> See *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 60–74.

<sup>449</sup> See *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1836*, Minutes of Evidence, 436–454.

<sup>450</sup> Eastwood 1989, 277.

<sup>451</sup> Laidlaw 2005, 68.

Buxton's personal connections with missionaries. Laidlaw illustrates in detail how before and after the appointment of the Aborigines Committee, Buxton worked closely with John Philip to acquire information from the Cape Colony. This information allowed Buxton to put pressure on the Colonial Office. Philip himself could not make direct contact with the Colonial Office, because he was in conflict with the Cape Colony's Governor D'Urban. Yet, Buxton received Philip's information and passed it on to the Colonial Office.<sup>452</sup> Buxton's other similar connections provided him with extensive sources of information, including information on the improvement of indigenous and colonised peoples. For example, in his correspondence with John McCammon Trew, an Anglican clergyman in Jamaica, Buxton often discussed the Aborigines Committee and he clearly expressed the value of contacts like Trew as sources of information on matters relating to geographically distant places and goings on. This is particularly evident in a letter from Buxton, written in March 1836, in which he showed great interest in the schools set up in Jamaica as a way for improving the character of non-European peoples:

I shall be very desirous to hear from you I hope I may ask you from time to time to write to me especially whether you see the system liable to any particular abuse what may need guarding against [...] & whether you see a progressing improvement in the tonic of the Negro character, an increasing desire for instruction? As I write to you in confidence I may say that while your view of the state of things & of the good conduct of the Negroes is confirmed by other Testimony I fear there is reason to suspect a still existing strong Testimony towards the abuse of the power remaining in the Whites. [...] I shall depend on being informed by you if any thing strikes you which needs investigation.<sup>453</sup>

Buxton's interest here in the character of the enslaved people was in line with the early-19<sup>th</sup>-century abolitionist agenda. Whereas pro-slavery lobbyists framed enslaved Africans as irredeemably primitive, the morality of slavery as well as the possibility of improvement of these enslaved were raised by the anti-slavery side, with Quakers at the forefront. Quakers and evangelists, through their use of print engendered sympathy for enslaved people by presenting them as stereotypes of compliant and even fragile figures who were waiting to be led to civilisation and Christianity.<sup>454</sup> For these narratives, information from closer to the people in

<sup>452</sup> Laidlaw 2005, 146–151.

<sup>453</sup> Letter from Thomas Fowell Buxton to John McCammon Trew, 15 March 1836, MSS. Brit. Emp. s. 444 Papers of Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton 1st Baronet (1) Vol. 15 Extracts Relating to Abolition of Slavery, Vol. V Feb 1836–Aug 16th 1837, BLOU.

<sup>454</sup> Lester, Boehme & Mitchell 2021, 37.

question was needed and this passage from the letter to Trew clearly demonstrates Buxton's use of his personal connections to gain such information. Also, if one compares this letter on anti-slavery and the Aborigines Committee's approach to improving indigenous character, it is evident that the same concepts and strategies that were used in anti-slavery campaigning were also used in relation to indigenous peoples. Improvement was not the only focus, as it appeared alongside concerns about European conduct and 'abuse of power' relating to the humanitarian narrative that was also heavily highlighted in the report.

When it comes to improving Māori and the NZA, civilising in particular was at the forefront of Wakefield's plans as he was working to set up the NZA. He did not have equal missionary connections when writing *The British Colonization* as Buxton had and his colonisation plans were far less focused on religious aspects of supposedly improving Māori. Yet, Wakefield and Ward also made use of missionary sources and Wakefield's plans also included some religious considerations, which could partly explain their use of missionary sources. In May of 1837, ten days before the inaugural meeting of the NZA, Wakefield wrote to his brother-in-law, Rev. Charles Torlesse about the plans for colonising New Zealand. In this letter he opined that New Zealand was 'one of the finest countries in the world, if not the finest, for British settlement', in his opinion even better than South Australia.<sup>455</sup> Without further explanation Wakefield proceeded to note that a clergyman was needed for the proposed colony, since civilising Māori was possible and a main objective of the plan:

The colony [...] is already considerable, and comprises persons qualified for every occupation but one. We have no clergyman. The New Zealanders are not savages properly speaking, but a people capable of civilization. A main object will be to do all that can be done for inducing them to embrace the language, customs, religion, and social ties of the superior race.<sup>456</sup>

As noted earlier, the stadial views of civilisation, which had been influential in Wakefield's thinking, particularly indicated that all peoples were capable of improvement. Yet, the capacity of Māori for improvement was still discussed and supposedly proven by Wakefield and Ward, and the Aborigines Committee, as part of their argumentation which is also indicated in this letter. Here the meaning of Wakefield's intimation of Māori capacity to improve to Torlesse is also significant.

<sup>455</sup> Letter from Edward Gibbon Wakefield to Rev. Charles Torlesse, 12 May 1837, fl. 9, Micro-MS-Coll-20-1887 Wakefield family Papers 1815-1853, ATL.

<sup>456</sup> Letter from Edward Gibbon Wakefield to Rev. Charles Torlesse, 12 May 1837, fl. 9, Micro-MS-Coll-20-1887 Wakefield family Papers 1815-1853, ATL.

Alongside the view expressed in *The British Colonization* that Māori savagery was becoming a thing of the past as they were improving, this repeated discussion of Māori improvement shows that the perceived Māori capacity to improve was an important matter in Wakefield's view. It was deemed important enough that he brought it up in many different arenas, including his personal correspondence, internal communications of the NZA and the outward presentation of the NZA's plans, suggesting that improvement was crucial for Wakefield's argumentation relating to New Zealand.

Yet, Wakefield's embrace of religious aspects of colonial interactions with Māori appears somewhat surprising. Wakefieldian theories of colonisation did not generally include any specific role for missionary work or religion in general. South Australia and the adaptation of Wakefield's colonisation theories into that project were often given as examples of what was to be done with New Zealand. In the NZA's *A Statement of the Objects* and in Wakefield's letter to Torlesse, it was stated that the model had worked 'so well' and 'beneficially' for South Australia,<sup>457</sup> which appears rather optimistic considering the difficulties there had been in selling the necessary allotments of land in South Australia by 1835.<sup>458</sup> Even in the application of Wakefield's colonisation theories to South Australia, his plans were mostly concerned with the distribution of land and establishing the desired settler communities in a functional way. In Wakefield's book on colonising South Australia, which was very similar to *The British Colonization* and published only three years earlier, there was no recognition of a need for missionaries to teach or Christianise Australian Aborigines. Aborigines were generally neglected in the book on the whole. The only real acknowledgement of Christianity in that book were very brief mentions of the need for settlers to have Christian education and morals.<sup>459</sup>

This same neglect of indigenous peoples was also evident in the published plans of the South Australia Company, which outlined their intention to establish a colony in South Australia based on Wakefield's theories. In the anonymously published pamphlet *Plan of a Company to be Established for the Purpose of Founding a Colony in Southern Australia*, Aborigines were barely mentioned. This was the case even in a section on 'Population and Labour', in which Wakefield showed no interest in the effects of his colonial theories on Australian indigenous peoples. Aboriginal

<sup>457</sup> *A Statement of the Objects of the New Zealand Association* 1837, 5–6; Letter from Edward Gibbon Wakefield to Rev. Charles Torlesse, 12 May 1837, fl. 9, Micro-MS-Coll-20-1887 Wakefield family Papers 1815-1853, ATL.

<sup>458</sup> The parliament's support for colonising South Australia was conditional on sufficient land being sold, which was achieved only after George Fife Angas founded a joint stock company to purchase the remaining land. See Prest 2001, 214; State Library South Australia: South Australian Company 2014.

<sup>459</sup> *The New British Province of South Australia* 1834, 148 & 171.

settlements were mentioned in descriptions of the area planned for colonisation merely as an indication of the presence of a source of fresh water, not as a matter to be considered in the colonisation plans.<sup>460</sup> However, in the case of New Zealand, the missionary and evangelical perspective was incorporated into the expressed plans quite visibly. This was done specifically in order to include the NZA's plans for Māori in their more general plans of introducing British settlers into New Zealand. From his perspective of examining the ownership of land, Attwood has suggested that the acknowledgement of Māori was the result of the NZA's need to adapt to the Whig government's approach to Māori as sovereigns.<sup>461</sup> While this argument might have merit, I suggest that a more comprehensive view to presenting Māori uncovers also other factors that were also in play in Wakefield and Ward's incorporation of Māori into their plans.

The timing and nature of Wakefield's letter to Torlesse speaks of the consistency of how the idea of civilising Māori was carried along in the NZA's planning. Wakefield's letter indicating his views was written before the writing of *The British Colonization*. The letter also had a completely different context, since it was not a published text for arguing the NZA's case. Instead, it was written in the background of the founding of the NZA. It is possible to read *The British Colonization* and its tenor of improving Māori from their allegedly savage character critically as hyperbole and humanitarian rhetoric that was intended to fit its time. This could be compared to the different ways that Susan Thorne has argued that foreign missions have been viewed by historians. In her work late in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, she noted that while metropolitan historians have often viewed missions through the lens of missionary inspiration and theological developments, they have also been viewed as 'as expression of the exigencies of colonial rule, a theologically and politically undifferentiated agency of the British colonial state'.<sup>462</sup>

A similarly sceptical reading of the NZA's humanitarian language can arise from what seems like a paradox between colonial expansion and humanitarianism and humanitarian language, at least from a modern perspective. The combination of intending to help 'less improved' people and the idea of colonial expansion and founding settlements in these people's lands can seem paradoxical and inconsistent.<sup>463</sup> However, without any apologism or denial of the negative effects colonialism has had in history, European expansion to these lands, which were often

<sup>460</sup> *Plan of a Company to be Established for the Purpose of Founding a Colony in Southern Australia, purchasing land therein, and preparing the land so purchased for the reception of immigrants* 1832. For the reference to Aboriginal settlements see page 23. See also Ballantyne 2014, 40–42.

<sup>461</sup> Attwood 2020, 119.

<sup>462</sup> Thorne 1999, 25.

<sup>463</sup> On views of this paradox see e.g. Lester & Dussart 2014, 1.

viewed from a 19<sup>th</sup>-century European view as ‘waste’, could also be seen as having been connected to ideas about improvement and ‘helping’ these peoples in the minds of early-19<sup>th</sup>-century Europeans. Lambert and Lester identify that taking colonial philanthropy seriously can risk leading to ‘recuperative histories’, in which white figures come to stand against colonialism and provide a way for Western people to identify with those figures in an attempt to disown a shameful colonial past. Yet, they also note that they wish to examine colonial philanthropy not as recuperative history, but as differentiated from other colonial projects in order to provide a fuller understanding of different strands and connections of various colonial projects.<sup>464</sup> Similarly, Wakefield and Ward’s argumentation for improvement can be examined as a colonial project that could have had internal cohesion between colonial expansion and intention to improve indigenous peoples. In this manner it can be framed as a way to understand different strands of European colonialism, rather than being framed as recuperative.

In this light, expansion and the resulting contact could have been seen by Wakefield and Ward, who were products of their time, quite sincerely as tools for helping others improve. The NZA’s plan appears to have been an example of this. The ideas of improvement and the plans for founding colonies appeared consistently alongside each other in the NZA’s public and private texts, and the view of the importance of civilising Māori was also included in the NZA’s *A Statement of the Objects of the New Zealand Association* as an end with ‘the highest importance’.<sup>465</sup> Therefore, whilst it is easy with modern hindsight to see the harmful effects that resulted from European expansion, this phenomenon and the seemingly genuine humanitarian concern that often accompanied it did not necessarily appear inconsistent for Europeans in the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

Missionaries had their roles in the NZA’s colonial argumentation both as sources of information and as conveyors of civilisation in the same way as had been in the Aborigines Committee’s report, at least on the surface. The NZA’s plans of settler colonialism and the evangelical and humanitarian side of the Aborigines Committee, with its connections to missionary societies, are often noted as having been in opposition to each other. In many ways this is true, since many evangelicals and missionaries opposed the NZA’s plans.<sup>466</sup> After all, in their recommendations for action in New Zealand and the ensuing debates that followed, the sides took opposing stances. Yet, this does not entail that the NZA was inherently against missionaries and their work. Missionaries featured in *The British Colonization* as

<sup>464</sup> Lambert & Lester 2004, 321.

<sup>465</sup> *A Statement of the Objects of the New Zealand Association* 1837, 4.

<sup>466</sup> See e.g. Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 49 & 56; Belich (1996) 2007, 182–183; Hickford 2006, 130; Ballantyne 2015, 6 & 238–239.

people who had already to some extent civilised Māori and who continued to work to this end, as well as sources for showing how Māori had improved.

Wakefield, for example, acknowledged the impact of missionaries in their work with Māori in his letter to Torlesse. Herein he noted that ‘missionaries have already done something towards this object, more than could have been expected considering that they have always been thwarted by English settlers and visitors not under the restraint of any authority’. He further stated that for executing their colonisation plans the NZA was still lacking a clergyman and that ‘[w]e [the NZA] want a missionary at heart, to be placed at the head of a system for operating on the minds of the natives’.<sup>467</sup> In this and in *The British Colonization*, Wakefield did not specify that mission in the manner of the British missionary societies’ work was to be a part of the NZA’s colonisation plans and he did not specifically call for a missionary to be sent to the NZA’s proposed colony. But this does clearly indicate that Wakefield viewed some religious instruction necessary.

In sum, religious instruction was not as pronounced and central in the NZA’s planning and claims of improvement as it was with the Aborigines Committee. While *The British Colonization* included a chapter on ‘Religious Establishment’, it was only 5 pages long and Wakefield, Ward and the NZA also had other views for improving Māori besides missionary work. If one looks more closely at the content of this improvement writing in the Committee’s report, in contrast to *The British Colonization*, it brings to the fore some more differences between how these missionary sources were used.

### Different Emphases and Strategies within Networks of Communication

While missionaries appeared in central roles as sources in both the Aborigines Committee’s report and *The British Colonization*, the use of their accounts as evidence and the visibility given to them was markedly different in those two works. A deeper analysis of the intertextual transfer of knowledge and the referencing of sources shows that there were significant differences in the strategies for providing seemingly credible knowledge about Māori improvement. The main emphases in presenting Māori improvement in the two works were significantly differentiated by the amount of focus that was given to Christianising Māori, in contrast to other aspects of improvement. While the two sides’ respective perspectives explain a lot of this divergence, from the perspective of the history of knowledge, it is notable how the differences were to a large degree also achieved through different processes of transfer of knowledge.

<sup>467</sup> Letter from Edward Gibbon Wakefield to Rev. Charles Torlesse, 12 May 1837, fl. 9, Micro-MS-Coll-20-1887 Wakefield family Papers 1815-1853, ATL.

As noted in relation to sources on perceived Māori savagery, the missionary society secretaries Coates, Beecham and Ellis have been identified as central sources for the Aborigines Committee on Australia and New Zealand. On the matter of improvement and civilising in New Zealand and the South Sea islands, the only sources of information named in the report proper were the interview of the three secretaries, alongside evidence by Yate and Rev. John Williams, an LMS missionary who was stationed for example in Rarotonga, and a brief remark by Samuel Marsden. However, the more specific sources of the information were not made transparent in the report proper and many of the original sources became flattened in the processes of transfer of knowledge and the manner in which the Committee cited their sources. The same inaccurate citing, as when Coates was given as a source for information that originated from lay missionary Richard Davis, took place repeatedly and flattened out Māori voices equally as it did the voices of individual missionaries in the field. In contrast, Wakefield and Ward's flexible citing of sources gave them the appearance of having had a greater variety of sources in use than they actually had.

Coates, Ellis and Beecham were repeatedly referenced and quoted in the Committee's report proper as sources, with Coates and Ellis specifically relating information on New Zealand and other Polynesian islands.<sup>468</sup> Their authority and credibility as sources was emphasised in the report. For example, at the beginning of the report's section 'Conclusion', the testimonies from the secretaries were presented as the 'interrogation and responses of the secretaries of the three Missionary societies most conversant with the subject' of European contact with indigenous peoples.<sup>469</sup> This would appear to have bestowed certain credibility upon the Committee's use of the secretaries as sources. This was largely due to their station as persons informed on the subject and, at the very least, as having been involved in missionary endeavours, which were also the source of the improvement as viewed by the Committee.

However, the notes to the Minutes of Evidence in the report's marginalia give a more diverse picture of the multitude of sources that were in the background of the three secretaries' witness interviews. It has often been briefly noted how the secretaries provided the Committee with information they themselves had received from missionaries in the field.<sup>470</sup> As such, they were important nodes in the networks between New Zealand and Britain. In the Minutes of Evidence, it becomes very evident that the secretaries provided the Committee with reports, texts and other material from a number of missionaries, but those missionaries were not named as

<sup>468</sup> See e.g. *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 45, 50, 54 & 55.

<sup>469</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 74.

<sup>470</sup> Elbourne 2003a; Laidlaw 2004, 13; Lester 2008, 70, 73 & 77; Mitchell, J. 2011, 68.

sources in the report itself. This manner of referencing only the secretaries as sources differs significantly from Wakefield and Ward's style of citing sources in *The British Colonization*. The manner in which they quoted long passages from other texts was prominent in how they compiled *The British Colonization*. This was also done in the book's section on Māori improvement. This section even featured long quoted passages from the Aborigines Committee's Minutes of Evidence of the interview of the three secretaries. Unlike the Aborigines Committee's referencing of these sources, the passages in *The British Colonization* featured the names of the numerous missionaries stationed in New Zealand. This was due to the fact that they had been named by the secretaries in the Committee's interview as the sources from whom the information had been received.<sup>471</sup> Other texts and pieces of correspondence from missionaries in New Zealand were also include in *The British Colonization*, although the origins of these sources were not as clearly indicated by Wakefield and Ward. Thus, even on the surface level, the use of missionary sources by the two sides appears very different. The multitude of missionaries named in *The British Colonization* stands in stark contrast to the relative paucity of individuals mentioned in the Aborigines Committee's report.

An examination of the content and manner of referencing the missionary sources sheds some more light on the differences between how and to what effect this material was gathered into the two works and then used for showing perceived Māori improvement and civilisation. As a prime example, the Committee reported that Coates, had given 'a long list of improvements effected in New Zealand' by missionaries. This was the passage, in which were mentioned the number of Māori attending communion and which originated from the missionary Richard Davis, even though it was attributed by the Committee to Coates. It was also one of the most direct and concise citations of such perceived improvements in Māori presented in the report and it was given as a direct quote from Coates's testimony:

When we last met at the Lord's table we had 74 native communicants. The number of candidates for baptism is considerable, and their number is increasing. The scene in the Waimate and its vicinity is much changed, and we may truly be said to live in a civilized country. Our neighbours, those not in contact with the seaports, are civil, courteous, honest and teachable. Locks and bolts are but little used, and but little needed; working wools are safe, although lying in all directions. Ten years ago a person scarcely dared to lay a tool down as it was almost sure to be stolen.<sup>472</sup>

<sup>471</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 198–212

<sup>472</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 54.

This use of sources is very illustrative of the formation of knowledge by the Committee in two ways. First, this passage was given in the report as information that was derived from Coates, whilst in it originated from Davis and was relayed to the Committee by Coates. This quote thus flattened out the visibility of the original source and highlighted one of the few sources named by the Committee. Second, this passage is indicative of the weight that was given by the Committee to the goal of spreading Christianity to non-Christian peoples. This is evident in pointing out the number of Māori who were seemingly being converted to Christianity. The number of Māori converts and the number of Māori attending the services by the missionaries was also a matter of great focus in the early-19<sup>th</sup>-century missionary correspondence to Britain more generally. This indicates its value to the missionaries and to the mission societies. For example, George Clarke and other missionaries repeatedly informed their parent societies of the numbers of Māori attending communion and Māori candidates for baptism.<sup>473</sup> Yet this passage also contained further details of Māori that served to highlight the change that was claimed to have taken place in them.

The security the missionaries enjoyed and the connected lack of need for locks was one of these details. As a sign of the expressed improvement among Māori, the perceived safety and security of Europeans and their property was of significant importance. Ballantyne has discussed fences and fencing as a symbol of the missionary project. While fencing around mission stations has been seen in historical research as a demarcation between the European and ‘civilised’ world and the outside ‘heathen’ and ‘uncivilised’ lands, Ballantyne points out that it was also a matter of security for the missionaries, and at times a point of contention. Fencing was erected to provide security to missionaries and their livestock, but it was also broken by Māori individuals and groups who were looking for tools or livestock, or as a result of Māori plundering parties following a slight or infraction to the local

<sup>473</sup> On references to Māori converts in missionary correspondence see e.g. the following quotes: ‘About 80 Natives sat down with us to the Lord’s table when we last met [...] [w]e have upwards of 50 candidates for Baptism[...]’, letter from George Clarke to the Secretaries of the Church Missionary Society, 3 November 1835, qMS-0463 Clarke, George, 1798-1875: Letters and Journals, ATL. See also: ‘I have translated 13 letters sent me by the candidates for baptism[...]’, letter from William Yate to the Secretaries, 15 August 1831, Micro-MS-Coll-04-64 William Yate letters 1827–1834, Journals, Reports, Papers 1828–34, ATL; ‘I baptized eight adult natives at Waimate last Sunday[...]’, letter from William Yate to the Secretaries, 16 November 1831, Micro-MS-Coll-04-64 William Yate letters 1827–1834, Journals, Reports, Papers 1828–34, ATL; ‘Sunday 20. Paptized[sic] 2 Children of Tapahe’s [...] Sunday 17. Married 2 Couples Paptized 10 Persons viz. 3 Children & 7 Adults’, Diary of Rev William White, 20 October–17 November 1833, Micro-MS-0612-17 Diary of Rev William White 1823-1835, ATL.

people by the missionaries.<sup>474</sup> As such fencing was related to very practical matters concerning a sense of security, or threats to it from the missionaries' perspective. Moreover, following the Enlightenment context of the report and its humanitarian perspective, private property was viewed by Enlightenment thinkers as closely related to stable political regimes.<sup>475</sup> This goes to show that the security of private possessions and the lack of theft might have appeared as indicators of a budding civilisation for an early-19<sup>th</sup>-century reader. With this context in mind, the reporting from Coates that locks were of little use indicated a change towards more security in the lives of the missionaries and in their contacts with the local Māori.

This quote from Coates, however, did not elucidate in any detail what had caused this change in Māori behaviour and the increase in security. Ballantyne notes, for example, that breaking mission station's fences and robbing its gardens in Rangihoua in 1825 ended when Thomas Kendall, a CMS missionary who had had an affair with a daughter of a local *tohunga*<sup>476</sup>, was dismissed. Another missionary, William Hall, attributed the subsequent calm to this dismissal.<sup>477</sup> This goes to show that there could have been various causes for different reported circumstances in New Zealand. Indeed, the cause for the change as detailed by Coates was left unclear. However, in the context and use of the Aborigines Committee and lacking a more specific context from the interaction between Māori and missionaries in New Zealand, Coates's reporting of the security in Waimate worked at least to imply a civilising missionary influence over the general Māori character.

The quote that was attributed to Coates is also a good example of the extent of detail with which the section on 'Effects of fair dealing' was written. This section of the report consisted of the Committee's presentation of the supposed good that missionaries had done in many different colonies and other lands and it was not categorised into different geographical areas. This gave a general impression that 'fair dealing', which mostly meant missionary work, was generally effective in different cases and with different peoples. As such, in this section individual areas the Committee had examined did not receive extensive examination or close attention, but multiple brief passages like the one attributed to Coates on Māori improvement were given in the section relating to different peoples and places. In relation to Quebec, for example, the Committee cited a statement by the Bishop of Quebec:

<sup>474</sup> Ballantyne 2015, 12 & 90–92.

<sup>475</sup> Irving-Stonebraker 2017, 96.

<sup>476</sup> *Tohunga* were equivalents to priests in traditional Māori culture. See Keane 2011a.

<sup>477</sup> Ballantyne 2015, 92. For details of Kendall's circumstances in Rangihoua see Binney 1990.

The Methodist Society have been very successful in converting a great portion of the Mississagua tribe from heathen ignorance and immoral habits to Christian faith and practice; [...] A great proportion of the tribe have become sober and industrious in their habits, well clad as to their persons, and religious in their life and conversation.<sup>478</sup>

These kinds of descriptions of details about the conversion and changed customs were particularly cited about indigenous peoples in North America and Polynesia, as well as Māori. The descriptions were not extensive or specific; instead they painted a picture of civilising having taken place particularly through to missionary work.<sup>479</sup>

This sprinkling of detail and different sources in the report can be partially explained by the style of writing and the structure of the Committee's report. The relative brevity of the detailed passages on individual peoples was not due to a lack of source material. Coates provided a great deal further information on missions in Australia, which was followed by his explanation of the state of the mission in New Zealand. According to the Minutes of Evidence, Coates reported concerning New Zealand that there was an 'extent of matter arising out of the proceedings in the mission, illustrative of its progress'. He unpacked this 'extent of matter' by reading to the Committee extracts of letters from Rev. William Williams, a CMS missionary in Paihia, and the lay missionary George Clarke, which described the annual examination taken at the school, of which Williams was in charge. These were intended to display manners and the progress of education among Māori at the missionary school. Following the reading of these extracts, Coates provided further a large number of papers extracted from various missionaries' correspondence from New Zealand to the Committee. These extracts were grouped under headings such as 'Progress of Industry and Civilization in New Zealand' and 'Progress of Religion in New Zealand'. Among these papers was the extract from a letter by Richard Davis, dated December 14, 1835, which was quoted nearly on the whole in the report as Coates's 'long list of improvements'.<sup>480</sup>

The extent of the specificity that arose from the papers provided to the Committee by Coates was not included in the report proper by the Committee. Anna Gurney and others in Buxton's inner circle in the Committee highlighted only a few witnesses in the report proper who had actually been interviewed by the Committee. Hence, they omitted mentioning any of the second-hand sources named by Coates. Thus, it would appear in this case that having been interviewed by the Committee

<sup>478</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 47.

<sup>479</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 47–58.

<sup>480</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1836*, Minutes of Evidence, 520–524.

and having presented evidence in person was in practice given more weight by the Committee than having actually been an eyewitness present in New Zealand. Some further detail on New Zealand was given from the testimony of William Yate, as he also had been interviewed by the Committee in person. This manner of using sources also appears to have been related to the structure of the report and the practicalities of how it was composed. Elbourne suggests that the Committee's rhetorical force depended on the idea of its comprehensiveness.<sup>481</sup> Presenting sources on different places and peoples would have played into this comprehensiveness. Yet, possibly due to the form and genre of the report not all material was raised into the report proper. Instead, even if the detailed passages in the report proper were rather short, as they were in the section on 'fair dealing', the appended extensive Minutes of Evidence and the frequent citations to the Minutes could have served to emphasise the comprehensiveness of the Committee's work. Furthermore, a reader who was not deeply familiar with the subject matter of the different colonies and the state of the mission in New Zealand might not have known that Coates was not an eyewitness. The Committee presenting Coates as a source interviewed by the Committee and as a credible person due to his station as a mission society secretary, might have been enough for have him to appear as a credible source.

The impact of textual genre in the use of sources is further accentuated particularly when one compares the Committee's report to *The British Colonization*. All the detail from the Committee's Minutes of Evidence was not relayed in the report proper, but largely remained in the Minutes. But further on in the chain of intertextual transfer of knowledge, these papers as they were recorded in the Committee's Minutes of Evidence constituted a large portion of the quotations included in Wakefield and Ward's *The British Colonization* and they were presented as direct quotations from the Aborigines Committee's report.

Wakefield and Ward employed these missionary testimonies and papers in a completely different manner to the Aborigines Committee. Instead of brief references and quotes from the secretaries' testimonies, Wakefield and Ward utilised large portions of different testimonies nearly in their entirety. This is most notable in the section 'General Character of New Zealanders', which was situated directly after the initial characterisation of what was seen as the past features of Māori. This heavy emphasis on long quotes from empirical seeming sources in presenting Māori appears to have served as a means for Wakefield and Ward to show New Zealand, with the people living there, as a space suitable for colonisation. This kind of quoting was an overarching strategy for them. They also used quotes in the earlier chapter, entitled 'Principles of Colonization', for example, from the Select Committee of the

<sup>481</sup> Elbourne 2003a.

House of Commons on the Disposal of Lands from 1836 and from Wakefield's own *England and America*<sup>482</sup> to argue the case for the specificities of their colonisation model.<sup>483</sup> Of course, since both *The British Colonization* and *England and America* were published anonymously, Wakefield and Ward could not point to the former's theories as their own or as directly connected to the NZA's plans. Instead, Wakefield and Ward used these kinds of quotes as argumentation drawn from other sources. In the 'General Character of New Zealanders', and particularly in the latter part of this section in which they presented the 'Progress of New Zealanders in Religion, Civilization and Industry', they employed the same strategy of quoting in presenting Māori. In this section the strategy appears to have been a way for Wakefield and Ward to place their general colonial theories into the concrete context of New Zealand.

In introducing the evidence that was used to present Māori improvement away from their previously presented savage customs, the evidence was lifted from the Aborigines Committee's report. One difference, however, was that the Minutes of Evidence were presented in greater detail than in the Aborigines Committee's report proper. Unlike the Committee's referencing, it was stated that the evidence from the testimonies of Coates, Ellis and Beecham consisted to a large part of correspondence with various missionaries in New Zealand spanning many years. Wakefield and Ward also argued that the pieces of evidence published in the Aborigines Committee's preliminary report of 1836 spoke for themselves regarding the state of Māori. They argued that in merely presenting the evidence as they were recorded, the reader was provided the possibility to arrive at an enlightened judgement of the matters at hand:

[T]he very words of the reverend correspondents are given [...] in the language, and under the impressions existing at the time. In this way, the true state of matters, the facts upon which our opinions are formed, and from which our inferences have been drawn, are presented entire to the public; and the best and most satisfactory opportunity is thus afforded to parties themselves, of arriving at a clear and decided judgement.<sup>484</sup>

<sup>482</sup> *England and America* 1833. *England and America* was Wakefield's analysis of North American political economy. It was published anonymously during Wakefield's work for the South Australian Land Company and it wove support for colonising South Australia into its analysis of North America. Using America as an example, Wakefield argued in favour of the merits of selling colonial waste land, which was also at the core of his later plans and theories. See Birchall 2021, 146–147.

<sup>483</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 10–13 & 18–23.

<sup>484</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 197.

What is apparent here is the emphasis on facts and the appearance of objectivity on the part of Wakefield and Ward themselves in quoting the testimonies from the report. In this sense, the difference between the strategies of presenting sources, and by extension the building of the credibility of their knowledge claims, between the Aborigines Committee's report and *The British Colonization* is striking. In the case of Māori improvement, Wakefield and Ward seemed to propose that credibility arose from more empirical evidence. They even distanced themselves from the construction of the knowledge of Māori character by providing pieces of evidence for the reader to come to their own conclusions. This was a significant contrast to the manner in which Buxton and his inner circle attempted to build credibility through opaque references to Coates and a few other missionaries, who were simply given as credible authorities on matters pertaining to New Zealand. The strategy employed by Wakefield and Ward must, of course, be viewed critically as an argumentative strategy, since selecting the appropriate passages to be quoted and printed, even if these were reprinted on the whole, was a creative process of knowledge production. As Livingstone illustrates, in relation to reading and knowledge, no clear boundary can be drawn between the acts of production and consumption. Reading and the formation of knowledge that was bound to it were creative encounters with existing texts, in which 'meaning is made and remade'.<sup>485</sup> Equally, Wakefield and Ward read, interpreted and selected the texts that were to be included in *The British Colonization* based on what they considered to have been useful for proving their knowledge claims. Through this reading and by passing the texts from one context to another, these texts received new meaning and implications and were not objective or impartial representations of the situation in New Zealand.

This contrast between the strategies in the Aborigines Committee's report and *The British Colonization* can be viewed in the wider context of representing distant, and, for majority of the intended audience in Britain, unknown and unknowable lands. As noted, travel writing by people who had visited New Zealand, or any other distant land, can be seen as very different in genre than either the Aborigines Committee's report or the NZA's somewhat lobbyist book. Yet, contrasts between strategies of credibility similar to those adopted by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward were visible in the evolution of travel writing. Keighren, Withers and Bell propose that there was a distinct change from the 18<sup>th</sup> to the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century in the form of travel accounts. Earlier travel writing especially blurred distinctions between 'travel fact' and 'travel fiction' and was more reliant on the subjective experiences of the traveller. Later writing leaned more towards 'scientific travel reporting' in which the self of the traveller could have been suppressed and the

<sup>485</sup> Livingstone 2005, 395.

narration was intended to be more fact-laden and objective.<sup>486</sup> The strategies employed by Buxton and the people close to the Committee and Wakefield and Ward, appear to have leaned on both of these two forms of writing. This can be explained to some extent by the fact that they were published in the late 1830s during a period of that change in the style of travel writing. This could reflect some more general contexts of different and possibly fluidly changing bases for credibility in writing in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century.

The references to the testimonies of Coates, Ellis and Beecham in the report of the Aborigines Committee seem to have leaned more heavily on the secretaries' characters as ascertaining credibility, rather than the extensive detailing that would have been provided by them. This does not mean that the Committee's report lacked detail, but rather that they were not presented as extensively in the report proper as they were in the Minutes of Evidence. Conversely, Wakefield and Ward presented more detail in the form of the extracts from missionaries that Coates provided to the Committee, which were printed in the Committee's Minutes of Evidence. Wakefield and Ward's use of sources and the appearance of different voices is also comparable to the evolution of travel writing. In earlier travel writing the traveller was often present as a voice and as the observer, whereas by the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century in scientific travel writing the self was often 'written out' and suppressed to present a seemingly more objective and scientific approach.<sup>487</sup> Wakefield and Ward can be placed somewhere in the middle of these strategies, since they did not write out the missionaries as the observers of these pieces of evidence, but they did write themselves out by pointing to the sources, though selected sources, as a way for the readers themselves to ascertain knowledge of the matter themselves. Thus, Wakefield and Ward seemingly provided evidence from which readers could draw their own conclusions, with direction and nudges from the two authors. The Committee, then again, provided more direct arguments, which gained their authority from the supposed credibility of the sources.

The use of missionary sources in the Aborigines Committee's report is very consistent with its general stance, since its suggestions were closely related to gaining more support for missionary endeavours. This and the Committee's close connection to missionary actors meant that they had closely intertwined goals, and the Committee received promotion from missionaries for their own work. This suited the Committee's argumentation well. Nonetheless, questions of why missionary sources were equally presented by Wakefield and Ward and what their relationship was with missionary work are still worth more extensive exploration.

<sup>486</sup> Keighren, Withers & Bell 2015, 74.

<sup>487</sup> Keighren, Withers & Bell 2015, 74.

Indicative of at least Wakefield and Ward's rhetorical stance towards missionaries in New Zealand was that they gave primacy to people belonging to missionary societies as sources in their section on Māori improvement. They were presented as 'distinguished, and honoured by the distinction of having dispensed those benefits amongst them'.<sup>488</sup> This was not necessarily only rhetoric, since Wakefield also expressed some interest in having clergymen in the proposed colony. But it also seems that much of the information from the missionary sources, which was presented to the Committee also, fit into the arguments of the NZA. At least this was the case once they had been selected and filtered through Wakefield and Ward's perspective.

The evidence from missionaries, as relayed to the Committee by Coates, was reprinted in *The British Colonization* in the same form as it had been originally printed in the Committee's Minutes of Evidence. Wakefield and Ward introduced Coates as the spokesman who presented the evidence in the quoted passage. They proceeded by quoting his reading of the extracts from William Williams and George Clarke, followed by the papers from a number of missionaries, including Richard Davis, William Richard Wade, William Yate, William Colenso, James Shepherd, John King and William Williams, as they had been presented to the Committee by Coates.<sup>489</sup>

Whereas in Elbourne's view the rhetorical force of the Aborigines Committee lay in the comprehensiveness of the Committee's work, a similar intention can also be seen in Wakefield and Ward's use of these citations. The number of different missionaries quoted in this extract from the report gives Wakefield and Ward's examination an air of extensiveness and comprehensiveness. This can be paralleled with how scientific travellers used citations and references of previous writings to situate themselves within textual networks. Keighren, Withers and Bell demonstrate how for travel writers, citations of other authors placed these authors in positions of credibility as travellers, witnesses and authors. As well as demonstrating the learnedness of the author in citing these sources, this kind of citing of different sources placed the authors into the context of what was known previously. Of course, the context for Wakefield and Ward was different, since they could not evaluate the truthfulness of these earlier writers based on their own experiences, which Keighren, Withers and Bell note as an important aspect of citing sources.<sup>490</sup> However, they did still present evaluations of missionaries as credible sources of information on Māori

<sup>488</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 196.

<sup>489</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 198–212; For the corresponding text in the Committee's report see *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 521–524.

<sup>490</sup> Keighren, Withers & Bell 2015, 75–82.

improvement. Wakefield and Ward noted that missionaries had the ‘the distinction of having dispensed those benefits amongst them [Māori]’. In a way Wakefield and Ward adapted similar bases for credibility to their own context and genre as were typical to travel writing. Rather than seeming to rely on only a few sources, this extract from the Committee’s Minutes, thus, gave an appearance of numerous sources who were all in agreement.

The passages of text from all these missionaries were indeed directly quoted from the Committee’s report. Hence, they carried with them much of the similar significances as were attributed to Māori Christianisation by missionaries and mission societies. The quoted passages included mainly examples of Māori as industrious in their farming and building houses in relation to the mission stations, their excitement about book pressing by the missionaries, their increased observance of the Sabbath and their attendance at services that were held by the missionaries. In general, the descriptions of Māori presented them as increasingly showing interest in the missionaries’ teachings. Such messaging was a crucial component in missionary writing in general in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, and much of this messaging was on par with the contemporary ideas of missionaries spreading Christianity and progress to non-Christian people. British missions in Polynesia emphasised the education of children, the abolition of certain cultural practices, establishing Western agriculture and industry and Christianisation in general.<sup>491</sup>

This messaging of improvement was also fitting for the message Wakefield and Ward intended to convey in their claims of Māori character. The contrast of the book’s previous section, in which Māori were presented in their ‘uncivilised’ state of the past in comparison to the section on improvement achieved by the missionaries, was aptly summarised in the quoted Coates’s reading of an extract from Clarke:

I could not but contrast in my own mind, the present appearance of these natives with their past situation. Here, thought I, are a number of poor cannibals, collected from the different tribes around us, whose fathers were so rude, so savage, that for ten years, with much pain and vexation, and exposure, the first missionaries lived among them, often expecting to be devoured by them. A few years ago they were ignorant of every principle of religion; many of them, like their fathers, had glutted in human blood, and gloried in it; but now there is not

<sup>491</sup> Johnston 2003, 120–121.

an individual among them who is not in some degree acquainted with the truths of the Christian religion[...].<sup>492</sup>

Contrasting the alleged views of Māori character and improvement from savagery towards civilisation in this passage illustrates that there was a close convergence between at least some views expressed in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century by Wakefield and Ward on behalf of the NZA, on the one hand, and missionaries and mission societies, on the other. The alleged improvement, as perceived by British missionaries, in Māori was of value to both parties. Here it can be viewed as a justification for colonial action in the argumentation of both the missionaries and NZA. As Moon notes, the concept of savagery was occasionally used as a justification for paternalistic approaches to Māori, ‘as though their savage state was a condition that required remedy’.<sup>493</sup> This justification for improvement was in line with the interests of missionaries, and by extension the Aborigines Committee, as well as Wakefield and Ward. The capacity of missionaries to help other people improve, based on the European views, was crucial in terms of justifying the missionaries’ presence and their need for resources, for example, in their search for financial support. Equally, it appears to have been important for Wakefield and Ward to present improvement in Māori character as proven by empirical evidence in order to argue for the feasibility of the NZA’s publicly expressed goal of a ‘deliberate and systematic plan for preserving and civilising’.

The extracts from the Aborigines Committee were not, however, the only missionary sources used by Wakefield and Ward. In July 1837, Major John Campbell of the NZA sent a letter to Dr Samuel Hinds, requesting the latter’s assistance in formulating the NZA’s plans for New Zealand. Hinds was an Oxford educated Doctor of Divinity and the chaplain to the Bishop of Whatley.<sup>494</sup> Wakefield had also been in contact with him earlier. Following his conversation with Wakefield, Hinds was requested by the NZA to join the groups of settlers that would establish the colony in New Zealand and to head the colonial administration ‘which would embrace the Church, the protection, and introduction of the natives within our settlements, and the spread of Missionary labours in other parts of the country’.<sup>495</sup> Although not wishing to leave for New Zealand, Hinds did accede to helping formulate the NZA’s plans for Māori.

<sup>492</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand 1837*, 200–201; original in *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1836*, Minutes of Evidence, 522.

<sup>493</sup> Moon 2017, 5.

<sup>494</sup> On Hinds see Moloney 2001, 160; Blacker 2016.

<sup>495</sup> Letter from Major John Campbell to Rev. Dr Samuel Hinds, 13 July 1837, fr. 361–362, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Letter book 1837, ATL.

Hinds wrote the chapter entitled ‘Religious Establishment’ in *The British Colonization*, which was not attributed to him as an author, in the same way as the whole *The British Colonization* was published anonymously for the NZA. This chapter by Hinds answered to the NZA’s apparent need for a clear plan for the role of Christian Church in their colonisation scheme.<sup>496</sup> Hinds’s chapter on the ‘Religious Establishment’ echoed the sentiments of improvement and missionaries’ role in it as presented through the evidence drawn from the Aborigines Committee’s interviews. In his chapter, Hinds noted that missionaries of the CMS and WMS had been successful in their early work in improving and civilising Māori as ‘[b]oth parties have been and are at this moment zealously employed; they have removed the first, if not the worst obstacle to the general conversion of the natives’. Here he referred to the changes in Māori customs and character that missionaries had allegedly achieved. Hinds continued that their aid could be relied upon ‘in any scheme for the extension of those benefits which they have been so happily instrumental in imparting to their immediate neighbourhood’.<sup>497</sup>

Also, beyond this Hinds had another role in presenting the NZA’s plans in *The British Colonization*, which was indicative of the NZA’s interests in receiving information on Māori improvement. While the majority of the missionary evidence cited by Wakefield and Ward was quoted from the Aborigines Committee’s report and its Minutes of Evidence, Hinds also provided another line of inquiry towards missionaries. In the section on Māori improvement in *The British Colonization*, after the long passages of text quoted from the Aborigines Committee, more alleged evidence on this improvement was presented in the form of ‘anecdotes regarding the natives, [that] exhibit the gradual evolution of higher principles, of habits of industry, and of honour, in the ordinary transactions of life.’ These were cited as originating from a letter Rev. William White, who was stationed in Hokianga, wrote to Dr Hinds.<sup>498</sup> What makes this piece of evidence particular in comparison to other missionary testimonies referenced in *The British Colonization* is that this information was actively sought by the NZA and was received directly from the source, White himself. Most of the other sources quoted by Wakefield and Ward were quoted from other readily published books and pamphlets, as was mostly the case with Wakefield and Ward’s numerous citations of the Aborigines Committee’s report and previously published travel accounts.

<sup>496</sup> See e.g. letter from Edward Gibbon Wakefield to Catherine Torlesse, 12 October 1837, Wakefield, E. G., Wakefield family papers 1815–1853, Micro-MS-Coll-20-1887, ATL; See also Burns 1989, 47.

<sup>497</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 69–70.

<sup>498</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 198 & 230–240.

White had been contacted by Robert Roy, a member of the NZA, in September 1837 when the former had returned to Britain. White was furnished with questions on New Zealand that were drafted for the NZA's use by Hinds. These questions were related to the general state of the mission in New Zealand and the situation of Māori and European interaction with them, including the origins of the mission and the number of Māori who had converted to Christianity. White was requested to answer these questions so that the answers could specifically be used in what Roy described as 'the small work in explanation of the objects of the Association, about to go into press', meaning *The British Colonization*.<sup>499</sup> White wrote in response to Hinds and referenced the exact questions in giving his answers. The part of White's letter to Hinds that was brought up in *The British Colonization* was in response to a question about whether there were 'anecdotes illustrative of the capacity, intelligence, and moral feelings of the natives'. This description of the query also appeared in *The British Colonization* before White's answer was quoted.<sup>500</sup> White indeed provided individual anecdotes that served to illustrate Māori character as it was seen to have been after contact with missionaries.

In the anecdotes from White, Māori individuals often appeared seeking help from him or other missionaries. With the instruction they had sought, these Māori exhibited industry in working to earn money or in becoming allegedly more moral and well-behaved. The claimed change in Māori character through missionary work was particularly emphasised in anecdotes, which according to White showed how previously '[t]he principle of moral honesty was nearly unknown; the following facts, however, will satisfactorily show what now exists, and is practised, by the Christian New Zealanders'. The following anecdote then went to show how some Hokianga Māori had bought goods from Europeans on credit and had intended not to repay them, but since they began to feel that 'they had to account to a Supreme Being' they felt a moral obligation to pay their debt.<sup>501</sup> As narratives of industriousness, morality and honesty, White's anecdotes appear typical in their narrative forms to contemporary narratives of improvement. But these quotes from White that were not filtered through the Aborigines Committee's perspective were less focused on the Christianisation of Māori and the theme of honesty was related to commercial transactions with Europeans.

<sup>499</sup> Letter from Robert Roy to Rev. William White, 1 September 1837, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Letter book 1837, ATL.

<sup>500</sup> Letter from Robert Roy to Rev. William White, 1 September 1837, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Letter book 1837, ATL; See also *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 230.

<sup>501</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 232–233; For the whole of White's anecdotes cited by Wakefield and Ward see *ibid*, 230–238.

Altogether, the questions from Hinds to White offer a glimpse into matters that were of interest for the NZA in terms of how they gathered information on the mission in New Zealand and the Christianisation of Māori. The questions asked of White were related to the date the mission in New Zealand began, as well as the conduct of European settlers in New Zealand and the possible reception of British settlement by Māori. Two questions were posed on the topic of civilisation and improvement; one about the number of Māori that might be baptised and one to which White replied with his quoted texts about ‘anecdotes illustrative of the capacity, intelligence, and moral feelings of the natives’. The questions sent to White, as they were transcribed in the letter book of the NZA, show that this question was, however, even more leading than this and that this subject had already been discussed with White prior to these questions having been presented to him. The question to White in fact requested

any leading anecdotes, illustrative of the capacity, or intelligence, or moral feelings of the natives, their willingness to work as labourers, it properly paid, and fairly dealt with. Perhaps the anecdotes, mentioned in the Association Chambers, will be repeated in writing. The two young chiefs, the twelve chiefs who renounced the power of selling their lands without Mr. White’s consent, the arrangements as to land purchased from the natives in 1826, or 1827.<sup>502</sup>

These cases mentioned above were recounted by White in the quotation from his letter answering these questions as quoted in *The British Colonization*. These questions and the leading nature of the latter question on the anecdotes explain, at least to some extent, the seemingly heavier focus on Māori industriousness, rather than religiousness, that was apparent in White’s answers in comparison to those quoted from the Aborigines Committee. This is despite the mention of Māori working in the mission stations. While Hinds did ask White about the number of Māori who had been baptised and were ready for baptism, the more detailed question and the one extensively quoted in *The British Colonization* was not related to religion, although its answers were related to missionary influence on Māori. The NZA’s connection with Hinds and White can therefore be seen as a glimpse into the interests of the NZA. The connections through Hinds and White provided information that was specifically sought after by the NZA for their specific use. This information in turn was of a much less religious-leaning nature than the Aborigines Committee’s presentation of Māori improvement.

<sup>502</sup> Letter from Robert Roy to Rev. William White, 1 September 1837, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Letter book 1837, ATL.

The nature of the different pieces of evidence used by Wakefield and Ward is curious. Their utilisation of quotes from the Aborigines Committee's Minutes and White's answers can be viewed from two different perspectives. On the one hand, from a history of knowledge viewpoint, these pieces of information from various missionaries in New Zealand, which were used as evidence of Māori improvement by Wakefield and Ward, had completely different provenances. The information from White was directly sought after by the NZA and directed at that which interested them, whereas the missionary citations from the Committee's Minutes had been filtered through communication between the missionaries, their parent societies and eventually the Aborigines Committee before reaching Wakefield and Ward. Yet, even though Wakefield and Ward had William White for their direct line of inquiry, they notably also gave nearly equal space and focus to the other missionaries. This would imply that in so doing they intended to boost the credibility of their knowledge claims by making use of what appeared as a multitude of sources and mass of evidence. At the same time, they diminished the existence of different networks that resulted in them receiving the information, rather than, for example, highlighting their direct access to information from White.

On the other hand, this can also be viewed from a contemporary perspective to Wakefield and Ward's use of missionary sources. On this point, it is notable that the differences in provenance between the different missionary sources would have most likely remained unnoticed by contemporary readers. To a reader, whether in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century or later, who was not familiar with the lines of communication in the background of *The British Colonization*, all the missionary evidence might have appeared to have been eyewitness testimony that was very similar in nature. White's information could have simply appeared as having been more focused on labour and industriousness than religion in comparison to the other missionary sources. Thus, the whole extensive mass of evidence could have appeared consistent and unified as evidence on Māori improvement from a humanitarian missionary point of view.

This phenomenon is comparable to the Aborigines Committee citing Coates as the source for the information that actually originated from Richard Davis in New Zealand. In the report, Coates was introduced twice as the secretary of the CMS in reference to his testimonies.<sup>503</sup> Yet, neither of these references mentioned that he had not been an eyewitness in the mission field. Nor was it expressed or implied in the report that the evidence referenced from Coates was originally provided to him by other sources and relayed by him onward to the Committee. As the role and authority of Coates was not expressed in a transparent way, an uninformed reader may have assumed that he was an eyewitness to these alleged improvements. This appearance

<sup>503</sup> See *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 15 & 54.

was further emphasised by the use of the pronoun ‘we’ in the citation, with the quotation seemingly appearing as Coates’s voice rather than Davis’s. It appears as if Coates himself stated that ‘we met [74 Māori] at the Lord’s table’. With the examples of Wakefield and Ward using White and the Aborigines Committee as sources in *The British Colonization* and the appearance of Coates as the original source in the Committee’s report, it becomes clear that processes of forming and claiming knowledge can be exceedingly complicated. Simply relying on the report or *The British Colonization* without following the traces of transfer of knowledge, can give a somewhat false impression regarding the origins of the evidence upon which knowledge is built.

However, it is evident that there were many nodes among the networks of communication between some of the missionary evidence having originated in New Zealand and eventually having been printed in *The British Colonization*. Evidence from Davis and Clarke, for example, was first sent from New Zealand to the secretary of the CMS, who relayed portions of it to the Aborigines Committee. The Committee subsequently printed those texts in the Minutes of their report, which were then selected by Wakefield and Ward for printing in their work. Along these processes of transfer and mediation, there were many occasions and opportunities for selection and re-evaluation of the information. In comparison, Hinds’s questions to White and the latter’s direct answers provided a far more direct line of inquiry for the NZA on New Zealand. Both Hinds and White were active co-operators with the NZA. Pat Moloney describes Hinds as ‘an ecclesiastical apologist’ for the NZA and M. B. Gittos notes that White supported the NZA until he later began to view Wakefield’s plans as ‘self-aggrandisement’ and an attempt to separate Māori from their lands.<sup>504</sup> With the rather direct connections of Hinds and White, the line of inquiry presented to White and intended for *The British Colonization* can be viewed as particularly illustrative of the interests of the NZA and Wakefield and Ward.

The many kinds of communicative processes and use of information originating from New Zealand discussed above raise questions about the significance these processes and strategies for credibility could have had on knowledge that was formed about Māori in Britain. In my analysis, I have identified ways in which missionary sources, even the very same pieces of information, were used to create knowledge claims of Māori improvement in the Aborigines Committee and *The British Colonization*. The ways of using sources show significant differences in the strategies of credibility, with significant differences in the manner and accuracy with which the origins of the information were presented. There was also a major difference in credibility that appears to have arisen in the Committee’s case from a

<sup>504</sup> Moloney 2001, 160; Gittos 1990.

few named authorities explaining the situation in New Zealand, with further detail referenced and appended *en masse* in the Minutes of Evidence. This was in contrast to Wakefield and Ward presenting long, allegedly objective passages, from seemingly numerous sources so that the reader could come to the same, curated conclusion as the authors in their argumentation.

I have yet to discuss one of these sources who was used as an authority on New Zealand and who received a great deal of attention in the Aborigines Committee's report as well as in *The British Colonization*. William Yate of the CMS was referenced repeatedly in both works. Thus, a closer look at his role and use as a source provides an illuminating parallel between the differences in formation of knowledge adopted by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward and their use of sources to further elaborate on the processes analysed above.

## 2.2.2 William Yate in Intertextual Communication

Of the mass of evidence that was gleaned from missionaries through different channels for the use in *The British Colonization* and the Aborigines Committee's report, the evidence provided by William Yate merits special attention. This is due to the large number of quotations from and references to evidence provided by him, but also due to the nature of the movement of knowledge between New Zealand and Britain in which he was a link. In terms of the processes that led from the in-the-field observations by British missionaries to references to those observations used as sources on New Zealand and Māori, these lines of communication were varied and seemingly even haphazard. The multiple nodes through which the narratives and observations passed and the different meanings these pieces of alleged evidence gained along the way illustrate how the selection and different forms of quoting across these networks of communication could be used to affect the significance of the original observations. Focusing here on Yate as one actor and node in the networks of communication between New Zealand and Britain helps further specify some of the processes that took place in that communication. This focus on one source shows further convergences and divergences in the use of the same source, as well as how his credibility was articulated. It also provides a specific window into what knowledge claims of Māori improvement were presented in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century.

Yate was an ordained missionary for the CMS. He arrived in Paihia in 1828, where he was stationed until visiting England in 1834 without the permission of the parent society. In 1837 he was dismissed from the CMS following rumours of

homosexual relationships with a British sailor and Māori youths.<sup>505</sup> In 1836, when in London, he testified before the Aborigines Committee over the course of two days providing first-hand accounts from New Zealand.<sup>506</sup> Yate's testimonies on Māori are here especially significant in terms of matters of authority and evidence. He was one of the few witnesses, out of the mass of evidence the Committee gathered, whose testimony was raised to a significant and visible role in the Committee's formation of knowledge concerning the state and character of Māori. Passages of his correspondence to the CMS were provided to the Committee by Coates, but the Committee mainly cited Yate's own testimony directly before the Committee.

### Illustrative Testimonies from a Witness before the Committee

His position as an eyewitness and a witness before the Committee raises questions. In the report proper, Yate was not explicitly introduced as a missionary who had practically been in New Zealand, but this was, as per usual, ascertained in the beginning of his interview and written up in the Minutes of Evidence. Thus, in comparison to references to Coates, who was introduced as a mission secretary, Yate seems to have been given less explicit authority on New Zealand as his status was not clearly stated, unlike the emphasis on the well-informed nature of the three secretaries. Yate's role as an eyewitness could, however, be easily read from the report since in a few references to him, he was presented as having taken an active part in missionary interactions with Māori.<sup>507</sup> It seems curious, however, that this was not underlined as a strategy by the Committee to highlight his authority.

Thus, whereas Coates and the other secretaries were seemingly given as good sources due to their character, it would seem that the use of Yate as a source leaned in a different direction. In Yate's case, he and his evidence were cited repeatedly and on a number of different topics by the Committee in a way that seems to have leaned away from his credibility having arisen from his status. Instead, it seems to have stemmed from the detailed and comprehensive accounts he provided. This appears more in line with how Elbourne describes the Committee's rhetorical force and Laqueur's theorising that committees in general received their credibility from detailed information. The differences in the approaches between Yate and Coates could have been potentially based on the fact that Yate was actually an eyewitness

<sup>505</sup> See e.g. Binney 1990); Binney 2004.

<sup>506</sup> For Yate's testimonies see *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, 188–206.

<sup>507</sup> See *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 15 & 55.

and did not need boosting since his accounts were documented in the Minutes, whereas Coates was a second-hand source and might have required boosting.

It is also possible that the rumours of Yate's affairs with other men sullied his reputation so that his person alone was not emphasised. In September 1836, when Yate was staying in Australia, an informal inquiry by William Broughton, the Bishop of Australia, took place regarding Yate's affairs. This occurred after Yate was interviewed by the Aborigines Committee but before the Committee's final report was published. No definite decision was made, but Yate was suspended from his duties and he returned to Britain to try to clear his name.<sup>508</sup> It is possible to speculate whether all this could have impacted how Yate was presented by the Committee, but there is no clear indication of it in Buxton's correspondence. Also, in 1835–36 Yate appears to have been held in good repute, since after his book was published, he held a speaking tour in England. His book had been well-received and enabled him to go on the tour. This speaking tour and the reception of his book could even have influenced why he was viewed as a good source and cited frequently by the Committee.<sup>509</sup> Furthermore, if his reputation had been seen as a problem by the Committee by the time the final report was published, the Committee could simply have not named him in the report as they did with many others. Nevertheless, the Committee's use of Yate as a source indicates that even its strategies for credibility cannot be viewed too narrowly, since he was cited and presented as a source in rather a different manner than Coates and the other mission secretaries. Yate's authority was not underlined in the same manner as those of the secretaries.

Evidence from Yate received plenty of attention in the Committee report in the section 'Effects of fair dealing and Christian Instruction'. Following the citation of Yate's early impressions of Māori as 'a thoroughly savage people', a direct quotation was included in the report from the Minutes. This passage was presented as 'so characteristic of the manners of the people and the missionaries' method of influencing them'. This quotation from Yate featured his descriptions of two cases in which war between two Māori parties had broken out and Yate credited missionaries with acting as mediators between the opposing parties and de-escalating the situations.<sup>510</sup> This reference to Yate's evidence is in line with the Committee's most emphatic focus on European action over the indigenous people, and how the

<sup>508</sup> Binney 1990. Ballantyne suggests criminal charges against Yate were not brought because there was growing anxiety in New South Wales over the supposed prevalence of same-sex relationships and the Crown Solicitor did not wish to bring more attention to the subject, despite a strong case against Yate. See Ballantyne 2015, 158–159.

<sup>509</sup> Wevers 2013, chapter 4; Ballantyne 2015, 145–146.

<sup>510</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 52–53; For the passage in the Minutes of Evidence see *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1836*, Minutes of Evidence, 189–191.

effects of this European conduct were presented through its effect on Māori. Here, the presentation was related to the supposedly positive actions taken by missionaries in influencing Māori.

One of the cases recounted by Yate was the so-called battle of Hokianga. According to Yate's account, after an insult against Warrehumu, meaning Te Whareumu of Kororāreka, there was a conflict in which Te Whareumu was shot and killed alongside his wife, children and twenty others. This resulted in Te Whareumu's kin requiring satisfaction for his death and eventually led to two parties of 2000 Māori facing-off against each other in the Bay of Islands when missionaries intervened. According to Yate's evidence, 'two or three' of the Māori wanted a peaceful resolution to prevent serious loss of life in the battle and asked the missionaries to intervene. The missionaries managed to have Tereha, possibly meaning the *rangatira* of Waimate called Rewa, to order peace on behalf of both opposing parties.<sup>511</sup> As the Committee recounted this case based on Yate's evidence, the main emphasis was on the missionaries, their actions and the seeming proof of the supposedly beneficial influence they appeared to have on Māori. Yate's evidence was introduced as '[o]ne of the first proofs which the missionaries had acquired' of the missionaries' impact on Māori, and after the quotation it was noted that his testimony was an example of missionaries 'being thus instrumental in preserving peace in the country'.<sup>512</sup> Thus, instead of focusing explicitly on how 'fair dealing and Christian Instruction' effected Māori, the Committee emphasised the missionaries' alleged capabilities and influence over Māori.

This narration of the battle of Hokianga was of course very much recited from a European evangelical perspective. This context is significant here in contrast to what could be seen as other sides of the story. Irrespective of missionary action, the Māori groups in question also had their reasons to avoid conflict. But from a missionary perspective, this was perceived as a win for the mission. Judith Binney has suggested that finding their role as peacemakers was seen by missionaries themselves as a significant step forward after their early struggles to find purchase for their mission and gain independence from their Māori protectors under Māori terms. Early in the mission Māori chiefs who came to an agreement with missionaries about establishing mission stations on their land were, after all, capable of exerting a great deal of control over missionaries. Ballantyne indicates that Māori chiefs were able to, for example, exercise significant control over the location where the Rangihoua station was established through personal connections and extending protection over missionaries. This provided them with the greatest available advantages. For the CMS missionary Henry Williams to have been invited to mediate the dispute at

<sup>511</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 52.

<sup>512</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 52–53.

Hokianga was therefore particularly important from a missionary perspective.<sup>513</sup> Angela Ballara notes, however, that while missionaries played a part in settling this situation, in which many deaths had taken place and a major war was possible, the most important factor in this case was still the fact that the opposing parties were closely linked by marriage and war was ultimately undesirable for all.<sup>514</sup> Yet, from a contemporary missionary perspective this incident could definitely have been seen as their achievement. It was definitely portrayed as such by the Aborigines Committee, who generally minimised Māori proactivity in interactions to a great extent in their report.

A very similar message could also be read of the other incident in which a captain of a British whaling ship incited a battle between Māori parties because he had felt slighted by one of the parties. Also in this case, Yate described how missionaries managed to intervene and negotiate peace, further pointing to their good influence, as well as to the bad influence of whaling ships.<sup>515</sup>

Yet, while the emphasis was on European action, the formation of knowledge claims on Māori improvement were not insignificant here. Contrasting the earlier examination of the Committee's presentation of Māori warfare to presenting missionaries as peacemakers seems to have provided a contrast that showed that improvement, as seen by contemporary European eyes, was taking place. This would have seemed to provide proof that eliminating characteristics related to savagery that were attributed to Māori, such as their perceived constant warfare, was possible and even achieved through missionary work.

Yate's evidence was also used to provide further accounts of missionary influence in supposedly civilising Māori. A statement from Yate was cited stating that 'the missionaries have been enabled to effect another great good, in abolishing the custom of tapuing, or rendering sacred and unapproachable a particular place or person; a superstition which opposed the greatest obstacles to improvement and civilization'.<sup>516</sup> This was particularly significant since the custom of *tapu* was considered a superstition and 'the greatest obstacles to improvement and civilization'. Thus in keeping with Jean and John Comaroff's analysis, the removal of such 'superstitions' was considered not only an object for missionaries in Christianising indigenous peoples but also a necessity for civilising them.<sup>517</sup> Yate

<sup>513</sup> Binney 1969, 146–148; Ballantyne 2015, 70–74. Ballantyne suggests that missionaries only managed to gain economic independence from local Māori in the mid-1820s, after the mission stations of Paihia and Whangaroa were founded. See Ballantyne 2015, 100.

<sup>514</sup> Ballara 2003, 98–99 & 110–111.

<sup>515</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 53.

<sup>516</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 53.

<sup>517</sup> The removal of so-called superstitions was also a central theme in British colonialism in India, relating for example to *sati* or a widow's self-immolation. In India, the British

provided the Committee with further testimony on the kinds of effects of missionary work among Māori in response to a direct question on the subject from the Committee:

What have been the effects of the exertions of the missionaries in a general manner? –Abolishing their superstitious observations, establishing the Sabbath, rendering the natives more industrious, bringing a large proportion of their land into a state of cultivation, preventing war, ameliorating the condition of slaves, and making the language a written one.<sup>518</sup>

This answer was not, however, included in the report. This was similar to how much of the detail about Māori was left out from Coates's testimony. The tenor of this question from the Committee and the answer by Yate, however, appears to have matched the overarching theme of the Committee's report. It presented the contrast between Māori as savage, but emphasised that these aspects of savagery had been overturned into civilisation.

It is again possible to contrast what was presented and what might have been closer to a more objective reality of the situation in New Zealand. Relating to the apparent role given to Māori, Ballantyne notes that minimising their active social role in the report's evidence was at odds with other missionary writing. He points out that this was also true to Yate's own writing, since in his original correspondence he often commented on missionaries' difficulties in 'managing' Māori. This included the local Māori's willingness to not only engage with but also contest missionary teaching and the control Māori could have on the commercial and social relationship with Māori.<sup>519</sup> In stark contrast to Yate's testimony and the claims formed with the use of his evidence, he had written to his parent society, for example, about the unwillingness of local Māori to accept Christianity and a long time of peace having ended in 1830 in the Bay of Islands.<sup>520</sup> As such he provided a very selective picture of what seems to have been the reality.

used systems of education for this reform, which were on a completely different scale than educational missionary activity in New Zealand by the 1830s. See e.g. Mann 2004, 17–22.

<sup>518</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 200, question 1782.

<sup>519</sup> Ballantyne 2011, 252.

<sup>520</sup> See e.g. Letter from William Yate to the Secretaries of the Church Missionary Society, 1 May 1829, Micro-MS-Coll-04-64 William Yate letters 1827–1834, Journals, Reports, Papers 1828–34, ATL; Letter from William Yate to the Secretaries of the Church Missionary Society, 29 March 1830, Micro-MS-Coll-04-64 William Yate letters 1827–1834, Journals, Reports, Papers 1828–34, ATL.

There was also discrepancy between the use of Yate's evidence in portraying missionary influence among Māori and the more objective real-world situation and power balance. This was not necessarily a completely falsified image that ran absolutely against Yate's writing. In general tenor, Yate's writings from New Zealand and the Committee's approach to claimed Māori improvement appear to have been very much in line with each other. The passages from Yate's testimony on missionaries promoting peace between Māori parties were in direct response to the enquiries: 'In what instances have the missionaries exercised their influence in making peace between contending tribes?' 'Do you recollect any other instances in which the missionaries have been engaged in promoting peace?'<sup>521</sup> These questions were quite leading and as such indicative of the Committee's interest in the subject. But considering the rather direct line of transfer of knowledge from Yate's observations to them having been communicated directly to the Committee without middlemen, there is less question about the accuracy of these statements as they relate to Yate's own views, irrespective of their relation to any objective real-world state of being.

In fact, much of Yate's correspondence reflected this optimistic view of missionary influence among Māori. His correspondence to the parent society often emphasised his view of the potential and influence of missionary work in New Zealand. For example, his writings included similar language of improvement that appeared in the Aborigines Committee's report. Following the death of Hongi Hika, the Ngāpuhi *rangatira*, Yate wrote that the missionaries feared that the mission station would be plundered 'according to Native custom' and that a large number of the *iwi*'s slaves would be killed as satisfaction for Hongi's death. However, in the letter he expressed surprise that the missionary exertions undertaken to teach the local Māori how such customs were 'folly and wicked' had paid off and, thus, '[s]o remarkable however, is the change in the conduct and superstition of the Natives that not an individual has been slain. The lives of all have been spared, and the Earth was not permitted to gorge itself with the blood of human sacrifices.'<sup>522</sup> This 'change in conduct and superstition' was very much reflected in the Committee's quoting of Yate's evidence on the topic of the removal of *tapu*, which was considered a similar

<sup>521</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, The Reverend William Yate 12 February 1836, 189–191, questions 1615 & 1627.

<sup>522</sup> Letter from William Yate to the Secretaries of the Church Missionary Society, 17 March 1828, Micro-MS-Coll-04-64 William Yate letters 1827–1834, Journals, Reports, Papers 1828–34, ATL. For further example of Yate's optimism in Māori character see Letter from William Yate to the Secretaries of the Church Missionary Society, 28 April 1831, Micro-MS-Coll-04-64 William Yate letters 1827–1834, Journals, Reports, Papers 1828–34, ATL.

superstition. Yate's testimonies and the references to them in the report did not necessarily display the relationship and the complete picture concerning the balance of power between missionaries and Māori in an objectively realistic manner. Yet, these optimistic views were ingrained in Yate's writing and were further relayed to the Committee and their report, thus making them 'real' in terms of European narratives having had real life consequences following Roque and Wagner. Yate's personal views also appear as having fit well into the Committee's presentation of Māori improvement, which probably made him a good witness from Buxton and Committee's perspective.

How could this seeming contradiction between attempting to civilise and helping to improve, on the one hand, and largely ignoring Māori perspective and diminishing their active participation, on the other, then be reconciled? Penelope Edmonds suggests that early-19<sup>th</sup>-century antislavery campaigners were more interested in what she calls 'paternalistic colonialism' that did not countenance indigenous people's sovereignty than in human equality.<sup>523</sup> Since these same people were involved with the Aborigines Committee, this line of thinking could have been translated into more interest in a paternalistic moral duty to help indigenous peoples improve than in those indigenous peoples themselves. Thus, their interest would have been directed at those imparting improvement rather than those that were being improved.

From the apparent intersection of Yate's and the Aborigines Committee's final findings, as put to the report by Anna Gurney and Thomas Fowell Buxton, the space and focus given to Yate in the report is understandable. It is also consistent with the Committee giving apparent credence and authority to those individuals specifically interviewed as witnesses over others further back in the networks of communication. This provides a further mechanism for the flattening of quoted sources. This strategy or manner of quoting could explain why Yate, rather than other missionaries from New Zealand like Clarke or Davis, received a great deal of attention in the report. Conversely, while Yate was also utilised as a source in *The British Colonization*, he appeared as one missionary among many that were referenced in Wakefield and Ward's examination.

### Creative Quoting and Fixity of Text between Yate and *The British Colonization of New Zealand*

In the Aborigines Committee's case, Yate provided a rather direct line of enquiry between the Committee and New Zealand. However, in *The British Colonization*

<sup>523</sup> Edmonds 2018, 5. Edmonds bases this partly on Joel Quirk's analysis of the progress of the antislavery campaigning. See Quirk 2011.

Yate was featured through different routes passing through more nodes in the networks of communication between New Zealand and Wakefield and Ward. One of these routes was the Committee's Minutes of Evidence, extracts of which were incorporated in *The British Colonization*. In addition to Yate's own testimonies, Wakefield and Ward also used some of the extracts from letters sent by Yate from New Zealand to the CMS. These had been provided to the Committee by Coates, Ellis and Beecham and transcribed in the Minutes. These had not been discussed by the Aborigines Committee in the report proper. As another route, Wakefield and Ward also quoted passages from Yate's book *An Account of New Zealand; and the Formation and Progress of the Church Missionary Society's Mission in the Northern Island* that was published in 1835. These passages appeared as narratives from Yate, in which he described the reception missionaries received among Māori and how Māori characters were changing in according to his experiences.<sup>524</sup> In comparison to the Aborigines Committee's report, the manner in which Wakefield and Ward used Yate as a source through these references is distinctive. Yate having been a missionary and having testified in person appears as a significant reason why he was cited so often by the Committee and named as a source. In *The British Colonization*, in turn, Yate and many other missionaries featured in the role of eyewitnesses from New Zealand, whose evidence was given in the form of quotes and extracts that were more or less explicitly quoted from texts published in London rather than received directly from him by Wakefield and Ward. However, this provenance did not appear as a problem in Wakefield and Ward's rhetoric and formation of knowledge as those sources were cited on an equal footing with the more directly received evidence of White, without any clear differentiation between their value or status as evidence.

Instead, in contrast to the Aborigines Committee's citing of these sources, Yate was given more explicit authority as a source by Wakefield and Ward. While in the Aborigines Committee's report Yate was barely introduced beyond what was recorded in the Minutes of Evidence, the reasons for his apparent authority were stated quite explicitly by Wakefield and Ward in their introduction of the section on the 'General Character of the New Zealanders'. Yate was introduced as a person 'who for so many years presided in New Zealand over the Church mission',<sup>525</sup> which appears as the reason passages of his evidence and his publication were quoted by Wakefield and Ward. Despite these differing strategies in citing sources, the subject matter of Māori improvement was similar in the Committee's report and *The British Colonization*. Wakefield and Ward summarised that 'the class of facts possesses peculiar interest, which discloses, on the part of the natives, the gradual abandonment of wars, and a desire for the blessings of peace and civilization by accepting the

<sup>524</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 218–230.

<sup>525</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 197.

interposition of the missionaries as mediators and advocates of peace'.<sup>526</sup> Later on Wakefield and Ward noted that Yate's testimonies before the Committee strongly supported the view of Māori improvement by Coates.<sup>527</sup> Thus, Yate's evidence was not presented as anything particularly new in comparison to the testimonies of the mission secretaries. But since Yate was introduced as having worked in the field and the secretaries' evidence arose from their correspondence, he appears to have provided further pieces of empirical eyewitness evidence on perceived Māori improvement.

The manner in which Wakefield and Ward presented Yate's evidence to the Committee is quite curious when examined more closely. Wakefield and Ward cited the papers from Yate, which were provided to the Committee by Coates, in the same form as they appeared in the Committee's Minutes of Evidence. Yate's own testimony before the Committee, however, was more curious in terms of transfer of knowledge. Presented under the heading 'Extract from the Evidence of the Rev. William Yate before the Select Committee on Aborigines, February 13, 1836, Wakefield and Ward accurately provided the origin of the passages of text. This is notable since Wakefield and Ward's citations were not always accurate or transparent. On the surface, this cited text also appears to have followed the form of the Minutes of Evidence in the Committee's preliminary 1836 report. The questions from the committee were presented one after another with the corresponding answers by Yate following each question in the same format as they were printed in the Minutes. There was, however, a difference in a number of the questions having been omitted by Wakefield and Ward. In the Committee's Minutes, all questions were numbered, but these numbers were not included in Wakefield and Ward's quotation.<sup>528</sup> For a comparison between *The British Colonization* and the Aborigines Committee see Illustration 1 and Illustration 2. This omission could have been by design, due to the manner in which Yate was cited here. While the passage was presented as an extract from the Minutes, there were significant differences in the version in *The British Colonization* in comparison to the Committee's report.

<sup>526</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 197–198.

<sup>527</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 218.

<sup>528</sup> See *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 212–218.



In Wakefield and Ward's use, the questions posed to Yate and his answers were parsed together from the Minutes of Yates' testimonies from two different days. Questions by the Committee and Yate's answers did not appear in *The British Colonization* in the same order as they were printed in the Minutes of Evidence and Wakefield and Ward's 'extract' did not make up any complete portion of the testimony. Instead, text in *The British Colonization* was a compilation of many different passages in a different order than the questions had originally been posed.<sup>529</sup> These extracted passages included the above-discussed summation by Yate of missionary impact on Māori character, as well as his narrative of the battle of Hokianga that was also quoted in the Aborigines Committee's report proper. As such the similar tenor between quotations of Yate in the report and in *The British Colonization* is understandable. After all, in *The British Colonization* missionaries were generally given as having had significant influence over Māori and having been able to change their customs in a way that conformed to 19<sup>th</sup>-century British ideals of civilised and acceptable behaviour.

Such selectiveness in the way Yate's evidence was quoted by Wakefield and Ward, however, leads to significant questions about how printed text could be trusted in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. On this matter, a look into the field of the history of the book takes us to the question posed by Adrian Johns in his extensive *The Nature of the Book*: 'What could one know in such a realm [of printed records], and how could one know it?' From the 16<sup>th</sup> century, the beginning of what he calls a time when printing began to thrive, to the 18<sup>th</sup> century Johns connects so-called 'textual stability' to the printed text's claim to credibility. From early on, printed text was lauded by printers among others for its capability to preserve knowledge. As many nearly identical copies could be made of a text, this resulted in the supposedly stable and unchanging nature of printed text. This stability, in turn, was what allegedly made the spread and maintaining of knowledge trustworthy and authoritative. Johns notes that this claim was even originally a contentious one and in the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries contemporaries were aware and wary of pirated copies and other problematic prints. Therefore, the fixity of text was not always centrally attributed to printed text.<sup>530</sup> Neither was this exactly accurate in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, since there could have been many versions of a given book in circulation erasing the idea of a definitive stable or fixed text even once printed. Furthermore, scholarly work on the

<sup>529</sup> The passages from Yate's testimony in *The British Colonization* were originally printed in the Committee's 1836 report's Minutes of Evidence under the following question numbers presented here in the order they appear in *The British Colonization: 1776–1785*, 1615–1619, 1625–1626, 1614, 1741, 1765–1766, see *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 189–201.

<sup>530</sup> Johns 1998, 5–6 & 30–32.

history of the book has identified that editing books was one particularly significant part of the process of producing books, which could influence text's content.<sup>531</sup> This indicates how text is subject to changing significances particularly, among other circumstances, in intertextual transfer of knowledge.

It is evident from Wakefield and Ward's way of citing and parsing together passages from Yate's testimony into an alleged 'extract' of his testimony, that in intertextual referencing the fixity of text was not guaranteed. Nonetheless, the printed text was important for Wakefield, Ward and the NZA for spreading their message, whether the form of print made its message credible or authoritative or not in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. Wakefield advertised their plans and requested that his acquaintances order and read *The British Colonization*, describing it as everything that was needed to be known of the NZA's plans. Through his contacts he endeavoured to make the book and the NZA's objects known to wider networks, such as the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge and various missionary bodies. He even asked the Earl of Durham to seek the Queen's permission for the book to be dedicated to her in an apparent attempt to make her aware of such plans.<sup>532</sup> From the way the book was advertised and distributed personally, it was evidently deemed to be an effective way of advertising and gaining attention for the NZA's plans.

Successively, it can be asked whether referencing sources in an objectively inaccurate manner might have affected the book's message in contrast to its sources. The selecting of specific texts actually appears to have been a clear strategy for arguing the plans of the NZA's. In his letter to Dr Samuel Evans, the secretary of the NZA,<sup>533</sup> Wakefield noted how he desired *The British Colonization* to achieve its impact by not having been 'a mere mass of facts, but a well selected collection &

<sup>531</sup> Keighren, Withers & Bell 2015, 19–20. See also Darnton 2003; McGann 2003.

<sup>532</sup> For advertising *The British Colonization* in personal correspondence see Letter from Edward Gibbon Wakefield to The Earl of Durham, 30 September 1837, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Letter book 1837, ATL; Letter from Edward Gibbon Wakefield to W. J. Beattie, 4 October 1837, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Letter book 1837, ATL; Letter from Samuel Hinds to the Secretary of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, no date, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Letter book 1837, ATL; Letter from Samuel Hinds to Revd. Dr Bunting, Senior Secretary of the Wesleyan Missionary Committee, no date, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Letter book 1837, ATL; Letter from Samuel Hinds to the Revd. Secretary of the Church Missionary Society, no date, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Letter book 1837, ATL; Letter from Edward Gibbon Wakefield to Catherine Torlesse, 12 October 1837, Wakefield, E. G., Wakefield family papers 1815–1853, Micro-MS-Coll-20-1887, ATL.

<sup>533</sup> On Evans see Temple 2012, chapter 13.

digest upon each point'.<sup>534</sup> This shows that these quoted pieces of evidence were intended to be carefully selected to illustrate the state of affairs in New Zealand. Whether this illustration was meant to demonstrate how Wakefield sincerely viewed New Zealand and Māori from his perspective in London, or whether it was merely a rhetorical device for furthering the NZA's plans, is up in the air.

In terms of credibility, that which Wakefield and Ward more explicitly emphasised in their argumentation was that their book and its knowledge claims were grounded on sources and evidence, as has so far been discussed at length. Yet, a completely different matter is how the text at hand was formed from those sources out of sight of the possible readers. Even if the text of *The British Colonization* could have been viewed as 'stable', in the sense that it could be printed and in the same form repeatedly and distributed widely, the same could not objectively be said about the transfer of the textual material from the used sources to the extracts of those sources that were eventually printed in Wakefield and Ward's book. Lester and Dussart have adapted Bruno Latour's concept of immutable mobiles to discuss how humanitarian arguments and measures can be seen as 'mutable mobiles' that required changing or adapting in their nature and form as they were imported to various places. They view the humanitarian project articulated by the Aborigines Committee as one such mutable mobile. They suggest that this was a project of humanitarian concern that was adapted to different colonies and places.<sup>535</sup> This view focuses on the mutability of centrifugal plans, such as the ones from the Aborigines Committee.

However, a similar view can be applied in the other direction. Plans and argumentation in *The British Colonization* as well as in the Aborigines Committee's report were presented through formation of knowledge based on a rather selective manner of gathering evidence. Thus, in creating claimed knowledge and arguing for such plans the selectively and creatively cited sources appear as equally mutable mobiles. This illustrates mechanisms of the mutable nature of materials and individuals as well as the knowledges and skills which they embody, which the movement of knowledge brings to the fore according to Kapil Raj.<sup>536</sup> Texts that the Committee and Wakefield and Ward received centripetally from missionaries and other sources had been originally created for their particular contexts and uses. But after these were received as information on New Zealand in Britain, the texts and sources were adapted and their implied significances possibly changed to some degree to suit the respective argumentation that was formed as they were used for

<sup>534</sup> Letter from Edward Gibbon Wakefield to Dr Samuel Evans, 11 May 1837, New Zealand Company Micro-MS-0460 Records 1836-1840, ATL.

<sup>535</sup> Lester & Dussart 2014, 4, 35 & 173.

<sup>536</sup> Raj 2007, 20–21.

creating argumentation or claimed knowledge in *The British Colonization* and the Aborigines Committee's report.

Such instability or mutability could have had an impact on the credibility of text based on 18<sup>th</sup>- and 19<sup>th</sup>-century standards. In Johns's analysis of piracy, or, as he defines it in early modern printing, 'the unauthorized reprinting of a title recognized to belong to someone else by the formal conventions of the printing and bookselling community', eroded the public's trust in printed text.<sup>537</sup> Similarly, inaccurate quoting from a source would almost certainly have been viewed as a challenge to a printed work's credibility. However, in Wakefield and Ward's case again the instability of the quoted text and its possible impact on the credibility of the book would only have been apparent to those who could have and had closely compared the texts of *The British Colonization* and the Minutes of the Aborigines Committee's 1836 report. Ascertaining such reception or possible criticism of *The British Colonization* is difficult, since little archival material on this seems to have survived. Irrespective of whether this selectivity was noticed and judged by contemporaries, the way Yate's testimonies were quoted by Wakefield and Ward provides an example of how selectively and 'creatively' empirical sources could be used. This was possible through processes of transfer and formation of knowledge that were used to create knowledge with significances or implications that were new or specifically intended to be highlighted by the author of the new work.

What then was the effect of this selective quoting by Wakefield and Ward and what was omitted? Among these questions and answers from Yate's interview in the Minutes that were quoted by Wakefield and Ward as evidence of Māori improvement there were also responses that appear to have portrayed Māori in slightly less peaceful terms. The Committee questioned Yate on Māori ownership of firearms. Yate's answers to these questions implied that Māori did receive firearms from European sailors. Furthermore, the local Māori groups had also traded for such weapons even after the battle of Hokianga, which Yate presented and which appeared by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward as an exemplary case of missionaries having exercised their influence to make those Māori groups more peaceful:

1621. Have they generally fire-arms[sic]? —They are all armed.

1622. Where do they get those arms? —From the whale vessels and the vessels that come for flax and timber; I have seen the Bay of Islanders make a present of a thousand stand of arms to their enemies, the people at the south.

<sup>537</sup> Johns 1998, 32.

1623. When was that; during a war? —Just after a war. After a war the enemy visits them and dwells for some time in their residences, and it is the custom of the country to make them presents, and that particular present was to show that they were not afraid of them.<sup>538</sup>

Successively, Yate noted that the two Māori sides had remained on good terms after the battle, which is not surprising considering Ballara's evaluation of the situation that the two sides were already closely bound by intermarriage. Nevertheless, these few questions could have been read to imply that despite the missionaries having prevented a battle from taking place, these Māori groups were still interested in arming themselves and had not seemingly dismissed all possibility of further warfare. Such a reading could have slightly undermined one of Wakefield and Ward's express intentions for the section on Māori improvement of showing them as having become more peaceful. This could have well been the reason for omitting this passage. Although the same must also be noted of the Aborigines Committee and their report, as these exact same questions, numbered 1621 to 1623, were also omitted from their quotations of Yate's evidence. This was done in the Committee's report in a slightly more transparent manner, since the questions in the quotation included in the report proper were numbered and a closer look at the quotation might have revealed to a reader that these questions were missing from the quotation. In both *The British Colonization* and the Aborigines Committee's report, however, it seems that these questions and their answers did not fit the intended formation of knowledge of Māori improvement and thus they were in both cases omitted from the quotations.

There were also other long passages of text among and between the questions selected to be included in *The British Colonization* concerning missionary activities among Māori that were not referenced either by Wakefield and Ward or the Aborigines Committee. Notably, in contrast to the Committee's discussion of Māori improvement, Yate's testimony on *tapu* and its supposed removal by missionaries were not discussed at all by Wakefield and Ward. Neither did Wakefield and Ward mention Māori converts to Christianity, despite Yate having discussed them among the questions quoted into *The British Colonization*.<sup>539</sup> In fact, *tapu* was mentioned in

<sup>538</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1836*, Minutes of Evidence, 190.

<sup>539</sup> For Yate's evidence on *tapu* and Māori converts to Christianity see *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1836*, Minutes of Evidence, 191–192 & 199.

*The British Colonization* on only a few occasions.<sup>540</sup> Even though other customs that were called superstitions were discussed by Wakefield and Ward, *tapu* does not appear to have been a concern for them.

The omission of discussing *tapu* and the Christianisation of Māori was in all likelihood mostly connected to Wakefield and Ward's focus on the more practical and secular sides of colonisation, rather than spiritual improvement. In discussing Māori superstitions as aspects of savagery, the focus in *The British Colonization* was on the impact of these so-called superstitious practices on the numbers of Māori, rather than as an impediment for civilisation as in the Aborigines Committee's report. With this focus, Wakefield and Ward possibly disregarded *tapu* because they saw no link between it and the Māori population, whereas in the Committee's report *tapu* was specifically presented as an obstacle for civilisation. This attitude by the Committee possibly derived from their more spiritual perspective. Thus, Wakefield and Ward's the omission of discussing *tapu* and converts to Christianity in Yate's evidence indicates that the spiritual side of colonisation was not of major interest to them. Furthermore, the same can be said with regard to the NZA's plans, even though the chapter from Dr Hinds of 'Religious Establishment' was included in the book.

Instead, Wakefield and Ward's more practical approach to colonisation was exemplified by their quotations from Yate on whether Māori would approve of European and missionary action in New Zealand:

"Do they appear anxious to attend the schools?—Yes, and to send their children. They have established schools in their own villages, under the direction of native youths, under the superintendence of the missionaries themselves, visiting them once a month, or according to the distance.

"Have you a sufficient number of religious instructors now?—No; we want 20 more, at least. I succeeded in my object in coming to England so far. I wanted five more clergymen, and three or four schoolmasters, and a wheelwright. [...]

"Do you imagine that they are not averse to a fair system of civilized government?—I think, from all I know of them, they are desirous of it. They are continually applying to us to give them rules and regulations by which they

<sup>540</sup> Brief remarks of *tapu* were in Wakefield and Ward's extracts from Nicholas's *Narrative of a Voyage to New Zealand* and Yate's *An Account of New Zealand*. See *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 227–228 & 295.

should conduct themselves in their intercourse with Europeans, and with each other.<sup>541</sup>

Wakefield and Ward went further than the Aborigines Committee's examples of missionary influence in keeping peace, removing superstitions and ameliorating the living conditions of Māori. They placed greater emphasis on the societal conditions in New Zealand. From their selections of Yate's evidence, they seem to have raised possibilities that were apparent from the given evidence of creating institutional organisation, such as schooling and 'civilized government', in New Zealand as means of improving Māori. This appears as a similar approach to civilisation as was suggested by Utilitarian political philosopher James Mill for India. Mill viewed that India had not acquired a high degree of civilisation because of 'despotic Oriental regimes'. He argued that this could have been alleviated by the introduction of Western systems of 'light taxes and rational, codified, accessible laws'.<sup>542</sup> Notably, the topics of schooling and indigenous education were central to much British missionary work, not only in the Pacific mission but also in other colonies such as India. In Polynesia, schools and the teaching of the English language, for example, were seen by missionaries as crucial tools for civilising and Christianising indigenous peoples.<sup>543</sup> Yet, for Wakefield and Ward the Christianising aspect of schooling does not appear to have been the central rationale behind such efforts. The quoted testimonies from Yate also included a question and answer on religious instruction. However, generally in *The British Colonization* religious aspects of the NZA's plans were very brief and unspecific in contrast to other more secular aspects of their plans. In this context, schooling and other forms of 'civilized government' were emphasised far more.

Rather than indicating the value of schools arising from religious instruction, Wakefield and Ward appear to have been more focused on introducing British social systems to New Zealand. This was as a significant difference in emphasis between the Committee's report and *The British Colonization* that would appear to have arisen from their differences in goals. Wakefield and Ward in promoting organised settlement and settler colonialism found use in Yate's evidence in seemingly highlighting the usefulness of organisation and institutions, such as schools as examples of what governmental organisation could possibly achieve. In contrast,

<sup>541</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 213 & 217; For the original form in the Aborigines Committee's Minutes of Evidence see *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence 198 & 200.

<sup>542</sup> Mann 2004, 12.

<sup>543</sup> Johnston 2003, 120, 123–124 & 132–133. On missionary schools in India in the 19<sup>th</sup> century see Johnston 2003, 66–69. See also Jensz 2012a; Jensz 2012b.

Buxton and his inner circle were mostly in accordance with the perspective of missionary societies in promoting Christianisation. Yet, notably both these emphases arose from the same source material from Yate. This shows how a reasonably extensive mass of source material could be utilised by simple selecting to achieve quite different implications.

Further emphasising Wakefield and Ward's more practical focus were quotations they lifted from Yate's *An Account of New Zealand*. According to Wevers, *An Account* was written when Yate was still in favour of the CMS, and it drew on ethnography and aesthetics to illustrate the progress of converting Māori from denigrated savages to a Christian congregation and the promotion of Christian knowledge.<sup>544</sup> Despite this message, Yate's book had drawn criticism from other New Zealand missionaries for factual errors, exaggerations and what they viewed as his overemphasis on himself in the mission endeavours. Ballantyne suggests that Yate's book was crafted for the expectations of a British public awaiting tales of savagery and the trials of missionaries, rather than to accurately describe their experiences.<sup>545</sup> For Wakefield and Ward's use, however, the book provided convenient narratives of Māori improvement. They included a long quotation from Yate's book, since according to them it was concerned with matters that were not discussed in the evidence before the Committee.<sup>546</sup>

The matters quoted from Yate's book were closely related to 'industry' among Māori in a similar manner to some of the extracts that Coates provided to the Committee and that were quoted by Wakefield and Ward. In the passages from *An Account of New Zealand* Yate noted that the cultivation of land, building houses and other employment that was, according to Yate, 'beneficial to themselves of their families' were becoming more common and Māori were changing from 'the wandering, warlike, thievish practices' to 'more settled, honest, and peaceful habits, wherever the Gospel prevails'.<sup>547</sup> Themes raised here were central to European views of civilisation, and in stadial theories the cultivation of land was seen as superior to 'wandering' ways of living. Working the land, laboriousness and improvements in domestic affairs were viewed as indicative of the level of civilisation in 19<sup>th</sup>-century British views.<sup>548</sup> Yate's presentation in his book also suited Wakefield and Ward's use of him as an authoritative source. As Ballantyne notes, Yate 'adopted the pose

<sup>544</sup> Wevers 2013, chapter 4.

<sup>545</sup> Binney 2004, 162; Ballantyne 2015, 146–148.

<sup>546</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 197.

<sup>547</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 218–219; for the original see Yate 1835, 246–247.

<sup>548</sup> Samson 1998, 29–30.; Hall, C. 2002, 116–117; Johnston 2003, 121–123.

of an authoritative observer, offering an extensive and detailed account of the North Island's geography, resources and peoples'.<sup>549</sup>

In his book, Yate also contextualised his views on Māori improvement with European civilisation. Yate noted that while in his view Māori had improved in their industriousness they were still not quite civilised: 'I would not willingly produce a false impression: I do not mean to say that they are *much more* industrious than they were, or that they are *always* employed; far from it: to a European they much still appear idle, and great wasters of time'.<sup>550</sup> This is again reflective of Cox's identification of the double vision of missionaries,<sup>551</sup> pointing to Māori as improved but still in need of improvement. As this passage was also included in *The British Colonization*, its message fit quite well with Wakefield and Ward's claims of Māori as having been capable of improving, but who were still in need of more improvement, which was supposed to be provided by the NZA's colonisation.

After this comment, however, Wakefield and Ward again used their selective and creative quoting to affect the implications of their source material. Despite again presenting the text from Yate's work as seemingly a continuous quotation, after the paragraph on supposed change in Māori, Wakefield and Ward pasted another paragraph from much earlier in *An Account of New Zealand*. In this paragraph Yate compared the industriousness of Māori very favourably to that of other Polynesian peoples. Yate had opined that as a result of a less favourable climate in New Zealand for various plants, Māori had to work to procure their food in comparison to other Polynesian peoples: 'Viewed as an uncivilized people, the natives of New Zealand are industrious; and, compared with their more northern brethren, they are a hard-working race. There is no effeminacy about them: they are obliged to work, if they would eat[...]'<sup>552</sup> A similar view of the effects of climate on indigenous industriousness and the negative effects of good climate to Polynesians was also expressed to the Committee by William Ellis, the secretary of the LMS: 'They could not be induced to do that [cultivate the soil] while heathen, for they used to say, the fruit ripens and the pigs fat while we are asleep[...]'<sup>553</sup> As analyses and descriptions of indigenous and other non-European peoples' characters, this kind of view of the impact of the environment on peoples' character was quite typical for the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. Many 18<sup>th</sup>- and 19<sup>th</sup>-century European thinkers, like Baron de Montesquieu, Comte de Buffon and Johann Herder, had theorised that the

<sup>549</sup> Ballantyne 2015, 145.

<sup>550</sup> Yate 1835, 247, italicization in the original; quoted by Wakefield and Ward in *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 219.

<sup>551</sup> See Cox 2008, 134–135.

<sup>552</sup> Yate 1835, 105–106; quoted by Wakefield and Ward in *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 219–220.

<sup>553</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 50.

environment affected racial and cultural characteristics of people. In the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, there were theories reflecting Ellis's view that warm climates resulted in the lack of a need for cultivation, which in turn resulted in idleness and sloth. This placed Māori as more industrious by nature than other Polynesians in European views,<sup>554</sup> which was also in line with a stadial view of Māori, placing them as more improved than many other indigenous peoples. Yet, such fruitful soil and climate had also different implications in other European views. For some 18<sup>th</sup>-century European travellers, like Louis de Bougainville, abundant and fruitful islands of the Pacific appeared as the likes of Paradise before the fall of man, with people living in innocent joy. Such views reflected European notions of the 'noble savage' living close to nature,<sup>555</sup> in contrast to the Christianising and civilising view of industry and work as ideals that were to be striven for.

Wakefield and Ward included this passage contrasting Māori with other Polynesians in their book out of its original context. In Yate's book it had appeared as a general description of the relationship between an environment and a people, but the new context in *The British Colonization* gave it new significances. Placing this passage after Yate's comment that Māori had improved to some extent gave it further implications suggesting that while Māori were not necessarily viewed by Yate as completely civilised in European standards, they supposedly had become significantly more civilised than other Polynesian peoples. A major difference here is the timing and reason for the supposed superiority of Māori in comparison to other Polynesians. Yate's original context and Wakefield and Ward's use of these texts both pointed to Māori as more civilised than other peoples. However, what gets lost in the selective quotation is that Yate saw Māori as higher in character than other Polynesian from the beginning. Wakefield and Ward on the other hand turned this general classification of Māori into what appeared as further evidence of the extent that Māori had improved both after and due to European contact. This alluded also that they could improve even further. Similar piecemeal, although not as glaringly incongruent, quoting of Yate's book continued in Wakefield and Ward's text.<sup>556</sup>

Finally, in reference to omissions from used sources, a notable but consistent omission is evident in the Aborigines Committee's report. It is clear that Yate's book was very much concerned with many of the themes and topics that he had communicated to the Committee. Yet, his book was not mentioned in the Committee's deliberations. The Committee's Minutes of Evidence indicate clearly that the Committee was aware of the existence of Yate's *An Account of New Zealand*.

<sup>554</sup> Grant 2003, 25–26

<sup>555</sup> Smith 1989, 42.

<sup>556</sup> For these differences, see Wakefield and Ward's extract from Yate and Yate's original text in: *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 221–228; Yate 1835, 238–291.

At the beginning of their interview with Yate in February 1836, the Committee ascertained from Yate the existence of his book: ‘Have you written a book in reference to missionary exertions in New Zealand? —Yes. [...] That book was published in the last year? —Yes.’<sup>557</sup> Yet beyond this, nothing more about the work was mentioned by the Committee in either the Minutes of Evidence or the report proper. In the context of the Committee’s work, this is not surprising in the least. The fact that Yate’s *An Account* was not mentioned in the Committee’s report was perfectly in line with its manner of referencing sources; namely that barely any other sources were referenced in the report proper other than those arising from the witness interviews and occasional parliamentary papers.

It could, however, be presumed that the Committee could have known of the contents of the book, since they were aware of its existence. The Committee could have asked Yate about matters that he had discussed in his book, especially since the book could have provided the Committee prior understanding of topics, on which Yate had information relating to New Zealand and Māori. It would be reasonable to assume that had the Committee been interested in topics that Yate had raised in his book, such as industriousness and the extent of cultivation of land by Māori, they could have enquired into these topics. Yet, such matters were barely raised by the Committee in the interview with Yate or in the 1837 report. This indicates that they were content with focusing their questioning on the effects of European action on Māori and the alleged moral and religious improvement arising from missionary influence. Thus, the Committee’s focus appears as illustrative of their interests.

Altogether, examining the two sides’ use of Yate as a source provides further distinct contrasts between the knowledge claims formed in the Aborigines Committee’s report and *The British Colonization*, as well as how these were formed using Yate specifically as a source. There was a clear contrast between the more religious and more secular approaches to Māori improvement. There was also a contrast between the Committee and Wakefield and Ward in terms of how their backgrounds and interests influenced their use of select pieces of Yate’s evidence. In the Committee use, these appear as illustrative of both the Committee and Yate’s confidence in missionary action enforcing improvement in Māori. This is most likely the reason why Buxton selected Yate as a witness. In contrast, Wakefield and Ward used more extensive quotations, but also a more creative manner of quoting, to emphasise their own perspective. While Wevers connects Yate’s book specifically to the promotion of Christianity and the Christian print culture,<sup>558</sup> Wakefield and Ward utilised the ethnographical sides of *An Account* to focus on their more secular

<sup>557</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1836*, Minutes of Evidence, 188, questions 1594–1595.

<sup>558</sup> Wevers 2013, chapter 4.

perspective. But notably both sides can be seen as having been very selective in what they quoted and thus raised to the fore.

Thus far I have examined missionaries as the focus in how Māori improvement was presented. This arises from the central role they received in the Aborigines Committee's report, as well as *The British Colonization*, particularly in its section on the 'General Character of New Zealanders'. Despite the central role of missionaries, there were however also other sources cited and other indicators of perceived improvement presented especially in *The British Colonization*. These sources and claims that were drawn from them pointed particularly to factors other than religious and moral change and focused more on the material change that was seen as having taken place. For a complete picture of how Māori change was presented, I will finally here examine this side of the presentation of improvement, which also brings to the fore major differences in emphasis between *The British Colonization* and the Aborigines Committee's report.

### 2.2.3 Commerce, Material Improvement and its Sources

In addition to the views of moral improvement presented in the Aborigines Committee's report and in *The British Colonization* with the use of mostly missionary sources, another view to civilisation and improvement of Māori was linked to material civilisation. A typical view in British 18<sup>th</sup>- and 19<sup>th</sup>-century thinking of civilisation was that their own culture was superior to those of others. This also applied to material culture, meaning that civilising others also implied bringing the fruits of the superior culture to those less improved. This was not exclusively a British view, but similar thinking was evident in France, for example, during the same period.<sup>559</sup> Even in missionary views, the accumulation of material possessions for indigenous people that arose from adopting Christianity, civilisation and agriculture were desired effects.<sup>560</sup>

Missionaries appeared as very significant and central sources for the formation of much of Wakefield and Ward's knowledge claims on Māori. The prominence and value given to missionary sources, relative to other sources was not however equal in the Committee's report and the work of Wakefield and Ward. Other source material, such as travel writing, also received space from Wakefield and Ward. Non-missionary sources were used by Wakefield and Ward to claim supposed Māori improvement, particularly when it came to the more material side of improvement. A similar variety or breadth in referenced sources was not, on the other hand, visible in the Aborigines Committee's report.

<sup>559</sup> Mann 2004, 4–5, 8 & 13–15.

<sup>560</sup> Lester 2002b, 284–285.

This use of sources and the differing emphases given to material improvement and trade with Māori indicate clear differences in how improvement was presented by the two sides as having already taken place, and, by extension, as possible to be achieved in the future. In this final part of this chapter, I will discuss the material improvement and trade between Māori and the British to round out the views of improvement and civilisation that were presented in the Aborigines Committee's report. First, I will examine the significance that was attached to trade and material improvement of Māori by Wakefield and Ward. I will then discuss the complex relationship of humanitarianism and imperial commerce in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. This goes to illustrate the tensions and differences this brought up in the Aborigines Committee's presentation of Māori improvement.

In the context of the outline of *The British Colonization*, missionary sources dominated the section on the 'general character' of Māori. But other sides and other sources of perceived Māori change and improvement were presented in a later section of the book dedicated to existing British trade and shipping with New Zealand. Herein, Wakefield and Ward promoted the promises trade with New Zealand could supposedly present to Britain if New Zealand were colonised. One main point here was that trade was already taking place between the British and Māori in New Zealand and that trade could be expanded still further. Wakefield and Ward noted at the beginning of the section that in forming new colonies it was unusual that 'there is already existing within it, an important and increasing trade', which was alleged to provide great advantages to British commerce if colonisation was to progress.<sup>561</sup> According to Christopher Honoré, trade between New Zealand and Australian colonies amounted to close to £34,000 at the beginning of the 1830s, making Māori important suppliers of goods to the Australian penal colonies.<sup>562</sup>

Material aspects of life and trade were connected to improvement in the early-19<sup>th</sup>-century thinking. Alongside the ideas of civilising Māori from a moral perspective, which was presented with missionary sources, this section highlighted trade and commerce as another aspect that was closely linked to civilisation and improvement in 19<sup>th</sup>-century British thought. Commerce has been generally considered as one of the driving forces of British colonial expansion. By the late eighteenth century, European interests in Chinese markets had drawn European nations to the Pacific and such commerce was considered as necessary for a nation to achieve greatness. Exploration and scientific observation of the Pacific was also utilised for searching for commercial opportunities.<sup>563</sup> According to Martin Lynn,

<sup>561</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 338.

<sup>562</sup> Honoré 2013, 375–376.

<sup>563</sup> See e.g. Lynn 1999, 102; Clayton 2000, 12–14; Pratt 2008, 34–36; Gascoigne 2014, 28–34 & 91–93.

moreover, trade in relation to British expansion was seen as having twofold benefits. Not only could free trade help to expand British manufacturing and boost Britain's situation in the world economy, it was also seen as a force for progress, moral improvement and civilising for non-European areas and peoples. He also notes that the connection between moral improvement of others and British economic gains were regarded as incidental, since free trade was considered to bring benefits to all. Free trade also served to entertain ambitions of global expansion and domination of large areas for the Empire.<sup>564</sup> Therefore, it is unsurprising to find considerations of trade and its benefits to the British and Māori alike in the knowledge formation on New Zealand and Māori improvement. While these aspects of trade between Māori and Europeans and its consequences to the latter were explicitly presented in *The British Colonization*, the few remarks on this subject were given far lesser weight and focus in the Aborigines Committee's report.

### Trade as an Indicator of Improvement

In *The British Colonization* trade with Māori and the possibilities of commerce were given ample attention in relation to the NZA's colonisation plans. This was explicated through Wakefield and Ward's presentation of empirical evidence on trade with New Zealand. The later section of *The British Colonization*, succinctly entitled 'Trade and Shipping', consisted to a large degree of shipping lists extracted from newspapers that detailed dates and the cargo of ships that arrived from New Zealand to British colonies. Among these lists Wakefield and Ward also included further details and narratives about Māori and their state and character, which contributed to forming claimed knowledge of them as subjects for colonisation.

In the midst of the extensively presented shipping lists, which created an image of a wealth of trade between New Zealand and Australian colonies, Wakefield and Ward also presented supposed evidence of what the trade with Māori signified in terms of the larger picture of allegedly helping Māori improve. They connected the detailed trade to the major topic of Māori improvement: 'The imports and exports of New Zealand are important, not only in a commercial view, but also as a certain test of the progress making by the population in civilization and arts of life.'<sup>565</sup> For many Europeans at the time, European goods were an example of the superiority of their

<sup>564</sup> Lynn notes that theories of free trade in the 19<sup>th</sup> century were a complex issue. From another perspective to free trade, it was also viewed that neither colonies nor the British government needed to be involved in trade because of their political ties. Hence, some even criticised holding colonies at all. See Lynn 1999, 103–105. For further examination of British transition to free trade see Lester, Boehme & Mitchell 2021, 144–150.

<sup>565</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 352.

way of life over others. Therefore, introducing such goods to other peoples was considered to have had the effect of sparking a desire for civilisation among those peoples. For example, Dr John Douglas, who edited accounts of Cook's second and third voyages, viewed the explorer as spreading 'the blessings of civilisation under the guise of trade'.<sup>566</sup> Following similar thinking, Wakefield and Ward proposed that sources of information on trade between Europeans and Māori provided evidence of change in Māori. This was demonstrated by changes in the goods Māori wished to receive from Europeans as barter in exchange for raw materials, food and other goods that they traded.

By comparing two lists of merchandise that were bartered with Māori by European traders in the years 1829 and 1837, Wakefield and Ward argued that there was a clear change in Māori wants as illustrated by the change that had taken place in the items that were bartered. The lists from these two years indicated a change in Māori wants from 'powder, muskets, pistols, bullets, cartouch[sic] boxes, flints, lead, and some cases of hatchet and nails' to 'boxes and bales of clothes, blankets, prints, haberdashery, packages of slop clothing, shoes, &c.'. The items from the two discussed years were presented as 'a sample of which the whole trade then was' and were thus given as having been illustrative of wider trade with Māori. Other new wants among Māori, according to Wakefield and Ward, were domestic goods such as soap and iron pots, metal tools, as well as foodstuffs such as tea and sugar. It should be noted that despite Wakefield and Ward presenting the shipping lists in this section, the specific accounts of items bartered with Māori were not clearly related to any of the presented shipping lists and no source was given as to the derivation of these lists.<sup>567</sup> Despite this opaqueness in sources, the change in the bartered items was given as an indicator of a similar change in Māori. They were presented as moving away from the bellicosity and violence that appeared in Wakefield and Ward's claims of Māori savagery towards more peaceful and civilised manners.

The trade that was presented as having taken place with New Zealand and its claimed effects on Māori present two clear implications of Wakefield and Ward's overall formation of knowledge. First, they reinforce Wakefield and Ward's emphasis on Māori as a people in the whole of *The British Colonization*. Nearly all chapters and sections in the book revolved very closely around Māori. They drew Māori character and claimed knowledge about it into close entanglement with many different facets of their argumentation for the NZA's plans. I will return to the implications of this later in the chapter. Second, it reflects Lynn's analysis of the twofold significance of trade in 19<sup>th</sup>-century Britain. Trade with New Zealand was not only portrayed as having been already extensive and ready to be expanded for

<sup>566</sup> Clayton 2000, 8.

<sup>567</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 352–355.

the good of Britain, but also as having had an improving effect on indigenous peoples towards civilisation. Thus, it also provided a justification for colonial actions, such as the ones expressed by the NZA. The claimed changes in Māori wants in trade represented improvement in Māori, such as in their domestic habits. Domestic habits were, after all, aspects of civilisation and improvement in British views of indigenous and colonised peoples. T. J. Tallie notes that ‘domestic’ matters were not a fully formed concept that were exported to different peoples, but changes in clothing, domestic space, language and other signals of improving economic and social structures, naturally viewed through a European lens, indicated progress and civilisation.<sup>568</sup> Along these lines, for Wakefield and Ward this presentation of trade also served to emphasise their argument that Māori would become still more peaceful and improved through further contact with Europeans.

Overall, the idea of change in Māori wants appeared as something more than a mere example of their alleged improvement. This improvement was even alluded to by Wakefield and Ward to have actually also arisen specifically from trade and contact with Europeans. This allusion by Wakefield and Ward was further reinforced by their successive further quoting from Yate’s book stating that ‘[t]he importation of other European articles of dress has much increased the wants of these people’.<sup>569</sup> Generally missionaries appeared in *The British Colonization*, as well as in the Aborigines Committee’s report, both as providers of civilisation to Māori as well as sources of information concerning their state. But the passages on trade emphasised another side of Wakefield and Ward’s knowledge claims, indicating that missionary influence was not the only vector for civilisation. Other ‘civilised’ contact, such as trade, also appeared as a civilising force. The actual processes by which Wakefield and Ward proposed civilising Māori, will be discussed in greater detail in chapter 3.2, but here it is notable that they argued that improvement connected to trade was claimed as already having taken place among Māori.

Some further background to Wakefieldian colonial theories helps further elucidate the significance of trade here. Trade and commerce, especially when connected to the use of land, were generally important matters in Wakefieldian colonial theories. Philip Temple notes that the 1836 Select Committee on the Disposal of Lands, in which Wakefield had many sympathetic friends and to which he testified extensively, wholly endorsed the central tenets of Wakefield’s theories for colonisation in its resolutions. These revolved around the need for labour to be transferred to colonies to make use of the soil and climate of the colonised area and to open new channels for industry and commerce. In Wakefieldian theory, the

<sup>568</sup> Hall, C. 2002, 117; Tallie 2016, 398.

<sup>569</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 353. For the original see Yate 1835, 158.

pressure of a growing population in Britain could be relieved by having settlers form self-sufficient colonies.<sup>570</sup> According to this thinking, the benefit of the colonies to the British Empire was a clear argument on behalf of colonisation. Allegedly they would have solved the problems caused by excess population, while also creating new markets for trade. Since the colonies were to be self-sufficient, according to Wakefield's theories, and would thus not have presented a burden on the Empire, the feasibility of a given area for colonisation rested at least partially on the proposed space's suitability to support a self-sufficient colony. This drew questions of soil, climate and natural products close to Wakefieldian colonisation.

With this perspective in mind, the last sections of Wakefield and Ward's 'Description of New Zealand' paint an interesting picture. The section 'Shipping and Trade' was the final section of the book before appendices, and it followed a long section entitled 'Climate and Soil'. This section contained very favourable descriptions of New Zealand's climate, which was described as having been comparable to Britain in many ways. It also presented the climate and soil of New Zealand as suitable for all kinds of European produce that could be grown there as well as many natural products, fish and birds native to New Zealand.<sup>571</sup> While similar detailed descriptions of flora and fauna were also included in other published works about New Zealand at the time,<sup>572</sup> together these final sections of Wakefield and Ward's book give a glimpse into how New Zealand was presented as having been suitable for colonisation.

The evidence used by Wakefield and Ward in the section 'Climate and Soil' also differed from the earlier discussed missionary-leaning parts of *The British Colonization*. The presentation of New Zealand in this section was mainly documented with various travellers' published accounts of New Zealand. With varying specificity in referencing the sources, most of the direct quotes were from the published travel accounts of travellers such as James Cook, Augustus Earle and John Liddiard Nicholas. Curiously, even the quotes from Nicholas, who participated in NZA meetings, were lifted from his published book instead of any personal communications. Among these travellers' accounts, there were also further quotes from Yate's book, references to communications from Rev. William White and even references to Rev. Samuel Marsden's experiences with the *rangatira* Ruatara. However, on closer examination it is clear that the passages relating to Marsden's experiences were once again direct extracts from Craik's *The New Zealanders*,

<sup>570</sup> Temple 2012, chapter 11 footnote 27; Ballantyne 2014, 32–33 & 40; see also Traue 1993, 4–5.

<sup>571</sup> See *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 302–337.

<sup>572</sup> See Wevers 2013, chapter 4.

which were compiled into that book from other channels.<sup>573</sup> Here, however, these missionaries did not appear in the role of evangelicals or missionaries in the same way as they had appeared in the presentation of the moral improvement of Māori. Rather, they appeared as travellers among the other travellers who had witnessed first-hand the spaces in New Zealand. This section is illustrative of Wakefield and Ward's manner of writing *The British Colonization* as a whole, the book having to a large degree been parsed together from various published accounts available to them. The sources were often presented as credible due to them having been eyewitnesses.

In relation to the knowledge claims that were presented of Māori, the significance of these sources and the claims drawn from them is clear. Not only did New Zealand appear as a perfectly suitable space for colonisation based on Wakefield's colonial theories due to its good land and already existing trade. It was also presented as suitable for 'systematic' and 'civilising' colonisation because Māori appeared capable of civilising, as illustrated by missionary sources and the change in trade that had been conducted with them. This shows a coherence in what Wakefield and Ward presented throughout *The British Colonization*. The different sources cited together by Wakefield and Ward in the context of *The British Colonization* solidified an appearance of the suitability of New Zealand for colonisation both geographically and from the perspective of Māori as a people.

When viewed from a wider perspective on colonialism and global communication, the use of compiled travel writing is also significant as an indication of the role transfer of knowledge played in colonial projects as a whole. Exploration and travel writing have been viewed as having had varying connections to colonial and imperial projects in historiography of empires. Clayton has outlined changes in scholarly views regarding the role of exploration, ranging from the New Zealand historian J. C. Beaglehole's presentation of Cook's voyages as innocent scientific forays to Mary Louise Pratt providing a corrective to such views and pointing to European 'systematic mapping, naming and classification of lands, peoples, and resources' that was undertaken for economic, imperial and hegemonic domination.<sup>574</sup> David Mackay has taken a more moderate position in his examination of Cook's voyages and their imperial outcomes. He has summarised that the role such exploration and travel had was in revealing natural resources to European powers and in drawing distant lands 'within reach' of British interests.<sup>575</sup> Cole Harris

<sup>573</sup> For the original sources of the quotations in the section 'Climate and Soil' see Hawkesworth 1773, 359–361 & 389–391; Nicholas 1817b, 357–358; Craik 1830, 162, 163–164, 169–172 & 173–174; Earle 1832, 131 & 133–135; (Yate 1835), 17–18, 74–75 & 107–112.

<sup>574</sup> Clayton 2000, 13.

<sup>575</sup> Mackay, D. 1985, 194. See also Clayton 2000, 13 footnote 50.

has also offered some criticism to classical postcolonial scholarship, arguing that while it is commendable to analyse broad colonial discourses and colonial cultures that have outlived formal colonial regimes, colonial culture also needs to be contextualised. Harris further argues that to understand how colonialism worked in practice, beyond seeing travel writing, for example, as only complicit in general colonial mindsets, it is essential to examine where colonialism was actually practiced closely contextualised to its actualisation. This contextualisation can open outlooks into the importance of travellers' seeing and writing as parts of colonial enterprise.<sup>576</sup>

Here, the case of Wakefield and Ward's use of travel writing is not as concretely and practically located in the colonised space or the 'contact zone' of European and indigenous interaction as Harris's examination of British Columbia as a colonised space,<sup>577</sup> since *The British Colonization* was completely drawn up in Britain. However, the use of travel writing in *The British Colonization* appears as a very practical way in which travel writing was bound together with practices of colonisation and served to concretely promote British colonial action. The significance of travel writing for colonial plans, such as those advanced by the NZA's, is evident. Such travel writing as a form of communication spanning the antipodes and thus providing seemingly empirical evidence from New Zealand allowed for formation of knowledge claims about New Zealand that appeared credible.

For Wakefield and Ward, the claimed knowledge of the suitability of New Zealand as a space for colonisation can be seen as fitting their ideas into their contemporary views of colonialism. The possibility of founding self-sufficient colonies can be seen as setting the stage for colonisation at a time when public opinion could have been against such endeavours. Lynn notes that while British expansion was extensive between 1820 and 1880, among contemporaries there were questions of the economic implications of this expansion and concern about the expenses. The role of the government as influenced by free trade thinking was not viewed as supporting individual interests to a large degree.<sup>578</sup> In terms of the NZA as a private land company aiming for profit, and since it also sought governmental support for its plans, such an economic climate could have created strain between wider British interests and those of the NZA. Therefore, presenting the situation in New Zealand as having been of possible benefit for the British Empire as a whole, and generally overlooking to mention in *The British Colonization* also the possible economic gains to the NZA or its supporters, could have served as an attempt to sway political thinking in favour of the NZA's plans.

<sup>576</sup> Harris 2004, 165–167.

<sup>577</sup> See e.g. Clayton 2000, 13.

<sup>578</sup> Lynn 1999, 101–102 & 105.

## Commerce and Humanitarianism

While Wakefield and Ward presented trade and Māori improvement as connected issues, only very small indications of similar thinking can be found in the Aborigines Committee's presentation of Māori. The differences in approaches to material improvement between the humanitarian perspective related to the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward's colonial argumentation cannot, however, be drawn too strictly. Instead, themes of commerce and humanitarian concern were entangled in many ways across the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. This can be illustrated, for example, by paralleling the debates on New Zealand with the earlier attempted colonisation of Sierra Leone and other connections between commerce and humanitarianism.

In presenting trade with New Zealand, Wakefield and Ward implied that there could have been benefits to both the British and Māori from commerce. For the role of commerce and trade in such colonial plans, the Sierra Leone Company from the late 18<sup>th</sup> century provided a curious comparison to Wakefield and Ward's presentation of trade as a supposed basis for Māori improvement. In the Sierra Leone Company's documents, Sierra Leone was presented as suitable for founding a colonial settlement due to its natural products and coastal and river trade routes that provided significant potential for commercial profit. In addition to the similar invoking of economic possibilities in colonisation, which is not all that surprising in colonial argumentation, the comparison of Wakefield and Ward's argumentation for the NZA with the Sierra Leone Company is particularly fascinating due to the similarity in their somewhat humanitarian-leaning approaches. In a parallel to the NZA's plan for a 'civilising colony', the plans presented for the Sierra Leone Company were focused around discussions on slavery and slave trade and the abolition of slavery was framed as a significant part of the plans. Furthermore, according to Tcho Mbaimba Caulker, the Sierra Leone Company sought to 'tame the "savage inhabitants"' of the proposed colony through education and civilisation. He also argues, however, that economic profit and territorial acquisition were overarching impetuses for the Company.<sup>579</sup> Padraic Scanlan, however, notes that the Company only had a crude plan for organising an economy based on currency, not barter, in Sierra Leone and had a poor understanding of the political economy in West Africa.<sup>580</sup> There are then significant parallels in the plans and argumentation based on claimed knowledge between the plans of the NZA and the Sierra Leone Company. The humanitarian-inspired plans were based on a similar footing for both the NZA in Wakefield and Ward's argumentation and in Caulker's examination of

<sup>579</sup> Caulker 2009, 57–60.

<sup>580</sup> Scanlan 2017, 30.

the Sierra Leone Company, with colonial expansion and profit in mind as significant driving forces.

There are, however, also significant differences in the political contexts in which the NZA and the Sierra Leone Company were set up. The Sierra Leone Company, with its strong abolitionist background, was formed with the goal of founding a colony that would be made up of free men and former slaves. This was intended to convince the British Parliament of the possible prosperity that abolition and a free workforce could achieve. Many of the Company's directors were members of the evangelical and humanitarian Clapham Sect. The Clapham Sect was also in the background of founding the CMS. Its later generation included Thomas Fowell Buxton and it was central in the establishment of the Aborigines Committee. Sierra Leone became the object of the Company's plans because of an earlier failed attempt at forming a colony there, known as the so-called 'Province of Freedom' by the leading abolitionist Granville Sharp.<sup>581</sup>

Thus, the political contexts appear quite different between the debate about New Zealand in the 1830s and the background of the Sierra Leone Company in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century, which was intended to present an example of the benefits of abolition. Comparing these different contexts, it appears that in the case of New Zealand the evangelical and Clapham Sect-connected side leaned away from colonisation through a joint stock company, which had been proposed in Sierra Leone's case. Instead, the humanitarians around Buxton and connected to the CMS opposed the NZA's plans for colonisation in New Zealand, despite the similarities in the plans and argumentation of Wakefield's Association to the idea that was presented earlier by the Sierra Leone Company. Despite having heard some evidence on Sierra Leone, the Committee remained quite silent on the subject, since in their view the conditions of the people living there were mostly related to slavery and not to the treatment of indigenous peoples. The Committee did, however, note that the case of Sierra Leone showed that improvement was also possible for liberated slaves 'through moral and religious instruction'.<sup>582</sup> Yet, this comparison shows that in British colonialism the connections between economic profit and colonisation, and even colonisation argued with the use of humanitarian language, persisted. This was exemplified by the NZA's presentation of the alleged possibilities commerce provided in New Zealand, but also even in other humanitarian connections.

Commerce and trade were prominent matters for Wakefield, Ward and the NZA in order to present New Zealand as a suitable space for colonisation and Māori as possible trade partners. What role did trade and commerce then play in the

<sup>581</sup> Scanlan 2017, 11–12. On the Clapham Sect and the CMS's connections see e.g. Keefer 2017, 202–203.

<sup>582</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 58–60.

Aborigines Committee's analysis of New Zealand? In the wider picture, humanitarian and evangelical ideologies were not divided from commercial imperial activities. Ideas, such as abolitionism, also had economic and other practical implications for contemporaries beyond the moral and humanitarian arguments. Lord Palmerston, the Foreign Secretary for most of the 1830s, not only viewed abolition as removing a 'foul and detestable crime', but from his free trade thinking he also viewed slave trade treaties as indirectly having been commercial treaties that carried their own rewards.<sup>583</sup> Furthermore, linking commerce more directly to early-19<sup>th</sup>-century humanitarians, the historian Andrew Porter argues that missionary endeavours were connected to ideas of commerce and wealth generated by trade. He notes the establishment of the Sierra Leone Company and its emphasis on trade as an attempt to rescue the 'Province of Freedom' as one example of this.<sup>584</sup> Iain Whyte further notes that in the case of Sierra Leone, as in other 18<sup>th</sup>- to 19<sup>th</sup>-century British interests, particularly in Africa, Christianity, commerce and civilisation stood as cornerstones of British action. Despite this, some humanitarians experienced uneasiness about leading local people to Christianity and civilisation alongside the economic exploitation that was inherent in such actions.<sup>585</sup> Another example of the connections between humanitarians and commerce related to missionary work in the Pacific. Porter points to the dependence of the success of missionary endeavours in the Pacific on trade and Samuel Marsden's promotion of subsistence agriculture to CMS missionaries in New Zealand.<sup>586</sup> From these backgrounds on connections between humanitarian intentions and the commercial interests of the British Empire, it is clear that at least in theory commerce and trade as potential benefits for the Empire were not completely separated from the Aborigines Committee's analysis of contact with indigenous peoples.

The humanitarian and evangelical perspectives of the moral state and character of indigenous peoples were by far the most emphatic foci for the Aborigines Committee. However, some benefits and advantages of trade were occasionally referenced in the Committee's report. The moral improvement of indigenous peoples was linked in a few passages to the benefits that were supposedly to be bequeathed on the Empire if the Committee's proposals were to be followed. In the first paragraphs of the section on 'Effects of fair dealing', it was stated that the allegedly proven capacity of indigenous peoples to improve could be of economic benefit to the British Empire:

<sup>583</sup> Lynn 1999, 107.

<sup>584</sup> Porter 2005, 50.

<sup>585</sup> Whyte 2011, 194. For further examination of this classic combination of Christianity, commerce and civilisation see e.g. Porter 1985; Porter 2004.

<sup>586</sup> Porter 2005, 50.

Independently of the obligations of conscience to impart blessings we enjoy, we have abundant proof that it is greatly for our advantage to have dealings with civilized men rather than with barbarians. Savages are dangerous neighbours and unprofitable customers, and if they remain degraded denizens of our colonies, they become a burthen upon the State.<sup>587</sup>

This statement appeared as a general point, without any more detailed proof or evidence, but the significance of it in presenting claimed knowledge of indigenous peoples and their states appears clear. There was a moral duty to help indigenous peoples improve. Nonetheless, even if this duty did not exist, secondarily, supporting beneficial contact with indigenous peoples would have been a more economically sound line of action than other options. In this statement, there were distinct echoes of the economic arguments for abolition used in the Sierra Leone case. These same arguments were also reiterated in the conclusions of the report.<sup>588</sup>

In this light, the idea of proving that indigenous peoples could be improved and civilised, a notion apparent throughout the Aborigines Committee's report, held with it implications that economic benefits could also be reaped from such action. This economic perspective was more pronounced in relation to other geographical areas than New Zealand. With his focus on the Committee's approach to the Cape Colony, Lester points out that the Committee commented on the cost and lost trade in southern Africa if a more humanitarian and moral system than the settler-led and militaristic colonisation, which the Committee described there, was not adopted.<sup>589</sup> This more pronounced economic view of the Cape Colony is understandable since it was already a settled colony in contrast to New Zealand, the fate of which was under debate. But the economic side was also noted briefly in regards to New Zealand and Polynesia. Citing Yate's testimony that there were at least a thousand to two thousand British subjects in New Zealand, the Committee noted that 'the South Sea Islands are becoming every year more important to our commerce'. Tahiti was also mentioned by Rev. John Williams as an important location for British shipping due to the possibilities of getting provisions, refitting ships and even recruiting crew there. Williams also noted that missionary influence among Tahitians could benefit the Empire's commercial prospects. Improvement arising from missionary work led

<sup>587</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 45.

<sup>588</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 75.

<sup>589</sup> Lester 2002b, 280–281.

to the introduction of European clothing among Polynesians which was noted as ‘a great advantage accruing to our country [...] in a commercial point of view’.<sup>590</sup>

However, relating to the other side of the trade, signs of material improvement among Māori or other indigenous peoples were barely mentioned by the Committee in the report proper. This is quite the opposite of what more typical missionary representations of indigenous peoples included. Tallie notes that missionaries often relied upon visible markers of civilisation, such as European-style clothing, to also show the spiritual change that was taking place through their work.<sup>591</sup> For all the significance clothing and other material improvement entailed for British 19<sup>th</sup>-century mission, this aspect of civilisation did not receive much attention from the Committee relative to other, more moral aspects of improvement. In the Committee’s report some ‘improvement in dress’ was noted as having taken place among indigenous peoples in North America.<sup>592</sup> In relation to Tahiti, the Committee’s quoting from Williams included his observation that ‘[w]herever Christianity is introduced, of course European clothing and European habits are introduced’.<sup>593</sup> Discussion of trade between Europeans and Polynesian peoples more generally, however, was very limited. Considering that the paucity of references to clothing or similar matters appears as something of a divergence from many other missionary and evangelical discourses, it would appear quite clear that the Committee was not particularly interested in this aspect of improvement.

Among these brief remarks there was a rare, albeit very brief, consideration of the views and desires of Māori themselves. The Committee referenced Yate’s testimony that in addition to the missionaries there were 12 or 14 European families of respectable character in New Zealand, as opposed to the lawless Europeans of whom the Committee was very critical. Following this reference to Yate, there was also a vague remark that ‘it is also stated that the natives are very desirous of having Europeans reside among them, from the advantages they derive from them in the way of traffic’.<sup>594</sup> This remark was not annotated to point to any witness testimony, but the phrasing comes from the testimony of one Thomas Trapp, who had stated to the Committee that he had resided in New Zealand for 15 months. This passage was part of his answer to the question ‘Do you think it would be conferring a blessing

<sup>590</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 57. Similar arguments were also cited from Rev. William Ellis. See *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 50.

<sup>591</sup> Tallie 2016, 398–399. On missionary focus on clothing Polynesian peoples see Johnston 2003, 147–155.

<sup>592</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 48.

<sup>593</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 57.

<sup>594</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 57.

upon the New Zealanders if the number of missionaries was augmented?’<sup>595</sup> This Māori desire for trade was a notable topic in European–Māori interactions in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. For many Māori chiefs trade and barter with Europeans was useful and beneficial. For example, Hongi Hika made use of his connections with British missionaries to access European goods. Ballantyne argues that such commercial advantages enabled him to send *taua*, war parties, to the south and to thereby enlarge his power.<sup>596</sup> But the beyond this brief and curiously uncited, vague reference to Trapp’s evidence, trade with Māori and their willingness to have more such exchanges received little attention.

In the context of the whole of the Aborigines Committee’s examination of New Zealand and other Pacific islands the significance and attention given to trade was very small in comparison to the claimed effects of Christian instruction. It is also noteworthy that unlike Wakefield and Ward’s presentation of New Zealand as a space for colonisation and further commerce, again the Committee cited only missionary sources here. The lack of citation to Trapp’s evidence could have been an oversight in the writing of the report, but it also could have been due to Trapp not having been a missionary, unlike nearly all other sources that were specifically cited and named in the Committee’s report. This would further reinforce the perspective that in the Committee’s discussion of indigenous peoples and their improvement all the sources that received significant attention were closely intertwined with evangelical views and ideals. These had a significant focus on the moral and religious aspects of civilisation and improvement. Furthermore, even the brief references to trade with Polynesians and their acquisition of European clothing were given by the Committee as having arisen from missionary influence. This was in contrast to Wakefield and Ward’s allusions that trade and contact itself could result in changes and apparent improvement. This tied even the brief remarks on material improvement to missionary work, which was consistent with the Committee’s focus.

Underlining this difference between the Committee’s view and *The British Colonization*, there was in fact in the report also a cautious example of Europeans introducing trade to indigenous peoples. The Committee referenced the testimony of Dr Thomas Hodgkin, a physician who after the publication of the Aborigines Committee’s report in 1837 was inspired to found the British and Foreign Aborigines Protection Society with Buxton as its president.<sup>597</sup> The Committee stated that evidence showed that driving indigenous peoples in Upper Canada from their lands and introducing the fur trade among them had ‘rendered them so completely a

<sup>595</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1836*, Minutes of Evidence, 461, question 3962.

<sup>596</sup> Ballantyne 2015, 3 & 73.

<sup>597</sup> Porter 1999, 209; Lester 2008, 71.

wandering people that they have very much lost any disposition which they might once have felt to settle'.<sup>598</sup> There was a citation in the margins of the report, alongside this declaration, pointing to the Minutes of Evidence, in which Hodgkin characterised indigenous peoples who lived among 'civilized settlers' as having been 'very much reduced to a state which resembles that of gypsies' in Britain.<sup>599</sup>

While this citation of Hodgkin was rather vague, it appears that this piece of evidence was useful enough for the Committee to be cited. Hodgkin was not referenced by name in the report proper despite him having been interviewed by the Committee personally. In the witness interview when asked for his sources of information, Hodgkin, who had characterised himself as having been greatly interested in the subject of indigenous peoples generally, stated that '[w]hen circumstances would admit I have endeavoured to obtain information from individuals that have fallen in my way, who have been amongst those people, and I have also endeavoured to collect information from the writings of various travellers who have been amongst them'. He also stated that 'I have had a few opportunities of communicating with the North American Indians themselves',<sup>600</sup> which appears to have taken place in Britain rather than in North America. Hodgkin's personal connections within British Quaker communities would seem to point to why he was interviewed by the Committee. He was well connected to Quaker families such as the Gurneys, Frys and Buxtons, which brought him early on in his life close to abolitionist work and T. F. Buxton.<sup>601</sup> Despite the vague documentation and citing by the Committee, this example of the European effect on indigenous peoples appears as a caution against carelessly expanding trade among indigenous peoples. This, in turn, appears to have been in line with the Committee's negative consideration of non-missionary European interaction with Māori in New Zealand.

Altogether, connections between commercial activities in colonies and humanitarian concern for non-European peoples were complicated issues for contemporaries. The Aborigines Committee's approach can be seen as one way of steering through the matters related to colonies. As noted by Porter and others, British evangelical and humanitarian views were often connected to commercial plans and ideas that sometimes created some internal tension between such ideals. Porter's acknowledgement of Samuel Marsden's ideas of trade in relation to early-19<sup>th</sup>-century humanitarian thinking highlights the differences between views held by

<sup>598</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 7.

<sup>599</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 459, question 3921.

<sup>600</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 454.

<sup>601</sup> Laidlaw 2007, 133–135.

Marsden and other evangelicals and the Committee's views. The presentation of trade with indigenous peoples in the Aborigines Committee's report, which was mostly presented with the testimonies of British CMS and WMS missionaries, showed trade in a very different light than in Marsden's views. Marsden advocated, for example, that iron tools introduced to Māori were instruments for their improvement, indicating a firm connection between Māori material wants and the condition of their level of civilisation and improvement. Marsden's views have often been summarised in his statement from 1810 that 'commerce promotes industry – industry civilisation and civilisation opens up the way for the Gospel'. Such views by Marsden were influential in setting up the missionary endeavour in New Zealand.<sup>602</sup>

Yet, while Marsden appeared as a central figure in the background of much missionary activity in New Zealand and as a significant node for communication between New Zealand and Britain, he did not appear as such a major source of information in the Aborigines Committee's report in the manner of William Yate or the three missionary society secretaries. Neither was Marsden's view of trade strongly represented in the report. Marsden was not, in fact, interviewed by the Committee, and instead information from him was derived by the Committee mainly from the mission secretaries from their various correspondence with other missionaries, rather than from Marsden himself. Porter attributes Marsden's absence from the Committee to his age and infirmity. He successively died in May 1838. But while Marsden was held in high regard by Buxton and other humanitarians,<sup>603</sup> Marsden's views of commerce would appear to have been somewhat contrary to those of Buxton and the majority opinion of the Committee, which could also explain his near complete absence from the Committee proceedings. In contrast to Marsden's views, material improvement did not appear in the Committee's view as much of a cause, but the effect of other missionary civilising efforts for indigenous peoples. Therefore, the little attention given to Marsden in the report would appear consistent with differing opinions between the Committee and Marsden on matters such as the role and impact of commerce and other non-evangelical contact between Europeans and Māori.

Similar complexity and strains between material improvement and evangelical views was evident in other contemporary discussions as well. Marsden and his views of commerce appeared at times to be at some odds with other missionaries' views even beyond the case of the Aborigines Committee's report. Illustrative of such

<sup>602</sup> Ballantyne 2015, 48–49; Ballantyne 2016. This statement from Marsden was in a letter to the governor of New South Wales Lachlan Macquarie. See e.g. Scrimgeour 2006, 6; Johnston 2011, 38–39.

<sup>603</sup> Porter 2004, 141.

different perspectives, Anne Scrimgeour has identified different approaches that were held to civilising Aborigines in South Australia in the 1840s. She argues that missionaries and George Grey, who was appointed as governor of South Australia in 1841 and later governor of New Zealand in 1845, acknowledged in the 1830s that Aboriginal peoples were capable of being civilised. But there were stark differences as to what that civilising entailed. Unlike missionaries, many of whom in Scrimgeour's case were German Lutherans who considered it necessary to segregate Aboriginal people from the corrupting influences of European migrants, Grey considered commerce as a core of civilisation. In addition to this distinction between an official like Grey and evangelical missionaries, Scrimgeour notes that Marsden also expressed views similar to those of Grey, who viewed commerce as necessary for industry and the promotion of civilisation in South Australia.<sup>604</sup> The differences in the views of trade between Marsden and the German Lutheran missionaries discussed by Scrimgeour could be put down to sectarian issues. Some of Marsden's views on Australian Aborigines, however, also faced opposition from other British Protestant missionaries. Marsden had a pessimistic view of Aborigines that was related to his view of trade and industry as vectors for civilisation. He considered them beyond the reach of evangelisation since, according to him, they demonstrated no interest in trade or industry. Such pessimism towards the possibilities of missionary success with Aborigines drew criticism from others, including Rev. Robert Cartwright and Archdeacon William Broughton.<sup>605</sup>

In light of all these tensions, what is evident here is that commercial questions were occasionally closely tied to issues connected to missionary and humanitarian action. Hence, there was no clear distinction between trade and commerce having only been supported by colonialists like the NZA and not by evangelicals. Different views on trade also arose among evangelicals. Thus, questions of commerce, material improvement and civilisation in a wide perspective of early-19<sup>th</sup>-century colonialism cannot be viewed too narrowly as certain views having defined certain approaches to colonial action. Yet, in the formation of knowledge about Māori and the argumentation on New Zealand there appears a clear distinction in the presentation of trade between the colonial, although also humanitarian-leaning, presentation of the NZA's plans in *The British Colonization* and the Aborigines Committee's humanitarian and evangelical approach to Māori civilisation.

This examination shows that the use of different sources and different contemporary discourses was very fluid and changeable. Wakefield and Ward's presentation of Māori and trade drew on and was connected to many colonial

<sup>604</sup> Scrimgeour 2006, 6–7.

<sup>605</sup> Gascoigne 2002, 157; Johnston 2011, 38–39; Ballantyne 2015, 48–49; Ballantyne 2016.

discourses both in evangelical and colonial directions. Alongside the other chapters and sections of *The British Colonization* that focused on moral improvement in Māori and with the frequent use of missionary evidence, even this material side of claimed Māori improvement leaned on humanitarian language and narratives of improvement. However, this was in part used to show how the settler colonialist plans of the NZA for New Zealand were allegedly not only morally but also economically sustainable. In contrast, in the Aborigines Committee's report matters of trade and material improvement were barely mentioned, otherwise than merely in passing. This emphasises the interconnectedness and tensions that existed between various aspects of British colonialism when applied to different goals and perspectives.

Finally at the end of this chapter, I will now return to the role Māori and the formation of knowledge claims on them played in Wakefield and Ward's presentation of the NZA's plans. For the Aborigines Committee tasked with examining the indigenous peoples, such a focus is not surprising. The Committee was tasked with examining the state and well-being of various indigenous peoples in keeping with Buxton's humanitarian agenda. What is more surprising in relation to the Aborigines Committee is that despite their assignment, those indigenous peoples and their active participation in any interactions received fairly little attention from the Committee. But considering my earlier point that Māori were central in most sections and chapters of *The British Colonization*, even in discussion of trade and commerce, it is curious why Māori featured so prominently in *The British Colonization*.

The prominence of indigenous people is a major contrast to Wakefield's earlier writings on his colonial theories, in which indigenous peoples received barely any attention. In Wakefield's anonymously published *A Letter from Sydney* the emphasis was in outlining his colonial theories based on concepts such as the sufficient price of land, although this term was not yet used by Wakefield in *A Letter*. These theories and plans were given as answers to problems caused by poverty in Britain and as models to form proper and 'civilized' colonies.<sup>606</sup> While Ballantyne notes that concepts such as 'civilisation' and 'improvement' were central to Wakefield's thinking in *A Letter*,<sup>607</sup> these concepts were directed at the colony and the colonial landowners, workers and society at large. The improvement or civilising was not directed at Australian Aborigines, as noted earlier. This contrast is significant in terms of why and how knowledge claims were formed of Māori in the context of the debate on New Zealand. The comparison between the role of Māori in *The British Colonization* and lack of indigenous acknowledgement in Wakefield's earlier works

<sup>606</sup> See Wakefield 1829.

<sup>607</sup> Ballantyne 2014, 45.

raises significant questions about the role of Māori in *The British Colonization*. Why did Māori feature as significantly as they did in this presentation of knowledge about New Zealand even though indigenous peoples were not widely discussed by Wakefield as a factor in his earlier colonial theories?

This contrast can be attributed to the humanitarian climate of British political discussion in the 1830s. For example, one can point to the humanitarian leanings of the Colonial Office's undersecretary James Stephen on matters related to the Aborigines Committee and their presentation of the situation of indigenous peoples in the colonies.<sup>608</sup> As noted before, sceptically it could be questioned whether the humanitarian language in *The British Colonization* and the civilising plans of the NZA were sincere or merely humanitarian gloss and rhetoric on colonial plans in order to gain approval considering the humanitarian concern for indigenous peoples within the Colonial Office.

This influence of the contemporary political climate cannot be dismissed. Claire McLisky, for example, has observed that 'at least [an] outward profession of religion' in parliamentary circles was a force that enabled Buxton and other humanitarians to move their agendas forward and set up the Aborigines Committee. This humanitarian and religious approach was powerful at the time, even though it might not have been enough to effect real change. She suggests that the power of commercial interests over humanitarian concern can at least partly explain why many of the recommendations by humanitarians in the Aborigines Committee and the following Aborigines' Protection Society were never fully implemented.<sup>609</sup> Following this idea of the 'outward profession' of humanitarian concern, it would be possible to imagine that the inclusion of Māori and the views of their possible civilising in *The British Colonization* could have been simply fitting the NZA's plans into the outwardly, if not thoroughly, humanitarian climate of the discussion on indigenous peoples.

In Wakefield and Ward's case, their focus on Māori as merely outward humanitarian rhetoric is however somewhat undercut by the NZA's internal discussions as they appear in the Association's documents. In a meeting of the NZA in May 1837 Wakefield pressed upon his fellow members 'the necessity and urgency of some government and law being established in New Zealand, in order to the protection of life & property, both native & European, which are now endangered by the irregular colonization going on'. Wakefield's view on the state of New Zealand was at that time based on the Aborigines Committee's report.<sup>610</sup> Considering

<sup>608</sup> See e.g. Laidlaw 2004, 14; Laidlaw 2005, 150–151; Lester & Dussart 2014, 226–227.

<sup>609</sup> McLisky 2015, 61.

<sup>610</sup> 'At a meeting held at the rooms of the New Zealand Association', 31 May 1837, fr. 306–307, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Minutes etc 1837, ATL.

such internally expressed use of evidently humanitarian language, it would be difficult to pin the whole of the humanitarian argumentation of the NZA and particularly Wakefield as mere rhetoric.

A less sceptical and more nuanced view to the question can be pondered by taking into consideration Daniel Clayton's approaches to 18<sup>th</sup>-century 'geographical conditioning of processes of cultural interaction, modes of representation, and relations of power in different locales and at different scales'. In his examination of the pre-colonial period of contact between Europeans and the indigenous inhabitants of Vancouver Island, Clayton emphasises that the local conditions of Vancouver Island had an effect on Western translocal discourses and colonial projects. Clayton argues that Vancouver Island and its surrounding areas were drawn into and intertwined with Western interests and imperialism through exploration and commerce. But to understand how Vancouver Island was fashioned as an imperial space and 'produced' in Western discourses it is necessary to take into consideration intersections of global and local forces and the parts of the world where they took place. European ideas were not mechanically applied to new areas, but colonial projects 'worked through local conditions, involved negotiation and resistance, and thus underwent translation'.<sup>611</sup> Following this idea, it is necessary to recognise that European ideas relating to colonisation, like Wakefieldian colonial theories, were not applied mechanically to different locations. Instead, they required negotiation and localisation in a similar way to how empirical evidence was used to adapt general preconceptions of non-European peoples into specific situations, such as early-19<sup>th</sup>-century New Zealand as I have illustrated earlier. The acknowledgement and discussion of Māori appears as one aspect of this localisation.

What is notable, however, is that Māori were specifically acknowledged and adapted into Wakefieldian theories in a way Australian Aborigines were not. There appear to have been distinct differences in how Māori and Australian Aborigines were perceived by the British in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century that might to some extent have influenced this difference. This difference could have possibly been due a number of factors. Among other reasons arising from perceptions or and relations with those peoples, Māori were often perceived as more civilised in character than Aborigines and more willing to trade with Europeans.<sup>612</sup> South Australia was not perceived as having been properly inhabited, resulting in an effect similar to *terra nullius*, in contrast to the more sedentary Māori.<sup>613</sup> And, moreover, Māori maintained control

<sup>611</sup> Clayton 2000, xii–xiii.

<sup>612</sup> Mitchell, J. 2011, 78–79; Attwood 2020, 30–31.

<sup>613</sup> See e.g. Salesa 2013, 30; Standfield 2018, 72–73; Birchall 2021, 151. Attwood also points out that Joseph Banks testified before the House of Commons Committee on Transportation in 1785 that there were very few Aborigines in New Holland and a small

over their land through the acquisition of firearms and through their greater numbers in comparison to the sporadic settlers.<sup>614</sup> The neglect of Aborigines in contrast to Māori continued beyond the NZA and Wakefield also later in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The historian Jessie Mitchell points out that even in the Aborigines Protection Society in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century there was protestation that Māori and First Nations were excluded from political participation, whilst Aborigines were largely ignored.<sup>615</sup>

As such, this would indicate that the manner in which the object of colonial action was perceived impacted how colonial action was to be taken. If Australian Aborigines were not viewed as active participants or owners of land, they could have been dismissed altogether, whereas Māori were perceived in a manner that required them to be taken into account in colonial plans. On the other hand, this also points to the significance of knowledge in colonial action. Wakefield's apparent concern for Māori appears to have arisen from his reading of the Aborigines Committee's report. Thus, it is possible that once he was made aware of the situation in New Zealand by the Committee's report, he included matters related to indigenous peoples in his planning. One can speculate whether he might have incorporated considerations of Aborigines into his plans had he been made more aware of them before writing his texts on South Australia. Or on a more sceptical note, it could be viewed that he incorporated Māori into his plans because he identified that it was necessary also to consider indigenous people, since the Aborigines Committee had drawn them into the spotlight of colonial action. What appears clear, however, is that in localising his colonial theories to New Zealand, Wakefield perceived, for one reason or another, that it was necessary to take Māori into consideration.

This examination of forming knowledge claims of Māori shows that the multitudinous aspects of argumentation, formation of knowledge and the surrounding political climate cannot be separated. Instead, they should be viewed as interwoven parts of the complex tapestry of colonialism. Wakefield and Ward's argumentation and related knowledge formation need to be considered in connection to the political climate in Britain, which possibly directed Wakefieldian theories to incorporate humanitarian language and plans that were directed towards indigenous peoples. But equally Wakefield and Ward's presentation of their colonial plans also needs to be viewed alongside the local context of New Zealand to which these plans were applied. In 2014, Ballantyne has noted that it would be valuable to track the localisation of Wakefieldian ideas across the globe, because much of the work on

armed force could ensure the formation of a British colony there. See Attwood 2020, 28–29.

<sup>614</sup> See e.g. Evans et al. 2003, 24–26.

<sup>615</sup> Mitchell, J. 2011, 62–63. For a further comparison between British negotiations with Māori in contrast to the disregarding of Australian Aborigines see also Standfield 2018.

British imperial political thought has focused on a small handful of English liberal thinkers mostly concerned with India.<sup>616</sup> Furthermore, it is necessary to consider altogether how Wakefieldian plans were localised to suit New Zealand, while also taking into account the contexts of political argumentation in Britain. Neither the contemporary political climate nor the local conditions in New Zealand can provide full answers as to why and how Māori were presented by Wakefield and Ward, or the Aborigines Committee for that matter. Instead, my examination of the formation of knowledge concerning Māori shows that there was an interplay between the two aspects, which both impacted the content and the manner of forming knowledge claims of Māori character. When taking into account further aspects, like the goals and interests of those taking part in the formation of knowledge, it is evident that formation of knowledge was a complex and multifaceted phenomenon. Yet, as it was here undertaken as a part of colonial action, it is evident that colonialism was an equally complicated phenomenon. Hence, studying it requires multitudinous aspects to be considered. My examination of the formation of knowledge about Māori provides one perspective on this complexity as it ties together theoretical thinking of indigenous peoples and more practical colonial action, which both influenced and impacted each other.

## Chapter Conclusions – Claiming and Proving from One’s Perspective

In this chapter, I have examined the knowledge claims formed of Māori by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward as a part of their argumentation on the supposedly appropriate lines of action to be taken with regards to New Zealand. This presentation of knowledge claims, which were supposedly proven with quoted and otherwise referenced pieces of evidence, was closely tied to their more specific arguments on why and what kind of action was needed. The claims of Māori character were central in this argumentation. Thus, by focusing specifically on the formation of these knowledge claims and the use of sources in this formation of knowledge I have identified important mechanisms that impacted the content of these knowledge claims and that enabled contemporary strategies for credibility to be used for forming significantly differing knowledge claims from similar or even the very same sources.

The use of empirical, or empirical-appearing, evidence is evident in both sides’ formation of knowledge. Knowledge claims of Māori were formed accommodating contemporary criteria for credibility in using sources that were made available by communication in networks between New Zealand and Britain. But these criteria,

<sup>616</sup> Ballantyne 2014, 45.

such as the increasing reliance on empirical observation, were not always adhered to strictly. Sources and pieces of information that had the desired impact on the formation of knowledge were also used for some more flexible ‘proving’, for example, by implying eye witnessing or explicitly underlining a person’s supposed credibility, even when this would not have been more objectively accurate. Thus, while typical contemporary criteria for knowledge were used, the interests and perspectives of the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward seem to have outweighed more objective formation of knowledge on occasions.

But it would be too straightforward to assume the existence of any clear and specific criteria for forming knowledge or for presenting its credibility. The comparison between the Aborigines Committee’s report and *The British Colonization* shows that there existed distinctly different strategies for showing credibility. The Committee emphasised a few named and seemingly authoritative sources, who supposedly portrayed how the matters at hand were, whereas Wakefield and Ward cited a larger mass of selected sources to indicate that their claims were true. Although pointing to similarities that could indicate some more commonly shared ideals of credibility, the sources used by both included close details of the matters at hand. The Aborigines Committee provided a mass of evidence in their Minutes of Evidence to further back up their claims, even though by far all these pieces of evidence were not raised into the report proper.

There were also close similarities in the sources used by the two sides. For example, missionaries received a great deal of attention, with Wakefield and Ward having even quoted passages from the Aborigines Committee’s report. Despite these similarities, some adherence to contemporary criteria for forming knowledge and the closeness of the humanitarian perspective that both sides applied to New Zealand, there were also clear divergences in the knowledge claimed of Māori. This was achieved, for example, through selective and even creative quoting as well as diminishing or emphasising certain themes like Christianisation. This changeability of pieces of information and knowledges as they were communicated further can be illustrated by viewing them as mutable mobiles. There was also a difference in emphasis in how missionaries were presented as sources. For the Aborigines Committee, missionaries were highlighted as nearly the sole authorities of knowledge, even overriding Māori perspectives, despite the latter having been the object to be civilised. In contrast, Wakefield and Ward used missionaries as prominent sources, but still as sources among others, including Māori. These slight differences in knowledge claims of Māori character became even more emphasised in connection to the more practical argumentation about what should have been done with New Zealand, which I turn to in the next chapter. Here, in terms of formation knowledge, it is evident that as knowledge is and has been a complex phenomenon,

the complexities of formation of knowledge allowed also for flexibility in what was claimed as proven knowledge.

Finally, zooming in from the nature of knowledge and formation of knowledge, these knowledge claims had clear significances in the more specific case of the 1830s debates on New Zealand. Reflecting contemporary European thinking of savagery, civilisation and the progress that humans could possibly achieve in that scale, the presentation of Māori character appears as having been a part of the argumentation for proving the feasibility of the respective plans of the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward. Both sets of plans were focused on civilising Māori, and the evident dichotomy of past savagery and possible civilisation appears to have served as proof that the plans of action suggested by the two sides for New Zealand could achieve the desired effect. But how was this civilisation supposed to be achieved in Māori and why was intervention deemed necessary by the two sides? In the next chapter I examine how the knowledge claims of Māori and the situation in New Zealand were applied to advocating the need for action in New Zealand and to the more specific argumentation about why certain lines of action were supposedly preferable to others.

### 3 Arguing for Action with Claimed Knowledge

Contemporary ideals of empiricism and flexible mechanisms of transfer of knowledge were used by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward to form what they claimed was proven knowledge about Māori. Beyond processes and mechanisms of formation of knowledge and representation of so-called ‘others’, these claims were also used with practical interests in mind. As the historian of travel writing Steve Clark has pointed out, travel writing’s ‘power to generate meaning tends to be reduced to cynical legitimization of more basic and brutal mechanisms of power’. Yet, there was ‘productive force’ in travel writing as well.<sup>617</sup> In the case of the formation of knowledge by Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward, this productive force was directed at forming claims to knowledge for the purpose of achieving practical effects on British policy towards New Zealand. The knowledge claims of Māori were deeply intertwined with the entire argumentation of the Aborigines Committee and the NZA about what was to be done with New Zealand. Presenting claimed knowledge of a people was not simply a theoretical discussion about a distant subject, but it was also significant for practical aspects of colonialism. I now turn to how these claims to credible, source-proven knowledge were brought together and used in arguments concerning colonial action. Whereas the previous chapter focused mostly on centripetal processes of communication that were used to form claimed knowledge, I now turn more to the centrifugal effects that these knowledge claims had when they were presented as part of colonial argumentation.

I identify two perspectives in the practical argumentation that was presented in the Committee’s report and *The British Colonization*, which I will explore more closely. First, there was clear argumentation in both works for the need and justification for British action in New Zealand. Second, as the necessity to act was ascertained, both sides presented specific arguments outlining what were supposedly the best courses of action vis-à-vis New Zealand and why their respective suggestions were the most appropriate. All this argumentation was carried out

<sup>617</sup> Clark 1999, 9.

through a lens of assessing how Māori were as a people or how European action would have impacted them. How then were these knowledge claims translated into argumentation for practical colonial action? Why did the need for action arise from knowledge claims on Māori? Why could the same sources and, on the surface, very similar claims of Māori improvement be used to promote very different lines of action relating to New Zealand?

Based on these perspectives, this chapter is divided into two parts that illustrate the different aspects of the presented argumentation. First, I examine the argued reasons for British action in New Zealand. The majority of this argumentation was related to European settlers and traders' actions in New Zealand and the successive perceived 'fatal necessity' to act in New Zealand. Much of this was related to conflicts and what were termed atrocities that European settlers and traders were accused of having caused or instigated in New Zealand. Relating to this topic, which has received much scholarly attention, I examine particularly why the need for action was connected to knowledge claims about the state and character of Māori and how this supposedly led to the need to act. This sheds light on how the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward justified colonial action and its need in New Zealand. It also shows how they contributed to the idea of a fatal impact in New Zealand. I also examine justifications that were cited for action in New Zealand that went beyond settler violence. This brings to the fore further differences in how Māori opinion and activity were acknowledged by the two sides. The latter part of this chapter binds together the different strands of knowledge claims on Māori and the argued need for action in New Zealand. In this final part of my examination, I delve into why certain lines of action were presented and argued as having been preferable to others. I also examine how such argumentation was based on formation of knowledge and how the actions that were suggested were related to the general interests of the different sides.

Historiography related to the colonial history of New Zealand in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century has to a significant degree focused on the drafting of the Treaty of Waitangi, the consequences that ensued from this and the beginning of the 'official' colonisation.<sup>618</sup> This perspective places figures such as William Hobson, James Busby and the officials in the British colonial administration at the forefront of attention. This focus is understandable, since as the historian Michael Belgrave points out, from today's perspective the Treaty provides context for investigating

<sup>618</sup> For examinations and interpretations of the significance of the Treaty in historiography see e.g. Ross 1972; Orange (1987) 1997; Adams, P. (1977) 2013; Ward, A. (1999) 2015. See also more detailed examination of the historiography relating to the Treaty in Belgrave 2013, chapter 2; Attwood 2019.

Māori claims against the British Crown.<sup>619</sup> However, as Bain Attwood remarks, simply viewing the past from the perspective of the needs and contexts of the present can be problematic.<sup>620</sup> As an example of this, the early 19<sup>th</sup> century and events that were not intimately related to the actual drafting of the Treaty or the lead up to it have received significantly less attention from scholars in the past few decades. Notably, scholarly work focusing on legal history and networks between British colonies and New Zealand and other imperial networks have made aspects relating to precolonial history of New Zealand a more prominent topic for research.<sup>621</sup> But, as Attwood indicates in his recent work, the making of the Treaty was but one event among many in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century in New Zealand and further historical perspectives to events more generally around this time provide a deeper understanding of the time.<sup>622</sup> In my examination here, I interrogate practical colonial actions that were suggested and planned for New Zealand with a wider perspective than focusing on events that were directly tied to the eventual and official colonisation. The justifications and arguments articulated by the two rather opposing sides of the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward provide perspective on the multitudinous nature of colonialism and the different ways in which colonial action and the objects of this action were perceived and presented in argumentation related to different colonial projects. As part of the multitudinous nature of colonialism, my examination illustrates the effects networks of communication had on the practical aspects of different sides trying to achieve colonial action. Different actors were intertwined with various colonial projects and influenced how action relating to Māori was seen, presented and argued.

<sup>619</sup> Belgrave 2013, chapter 2.

<sup>620</sup> Attwood 2019, 94.

<sup>621</sup> See e.g. Lester 2002a; Lester 2002b; Hickford 2012; Ballantyne 2015. Peter Adams and James Belich also discuss the actions of the Aborigines Committee, missionary societies and the NZA in relation to colonial action in New Zealand in the 1830s. They do this, however, from their more delineated perspectives of decision making in London without much examination of the interplay between events in New Zealand, transfer of knowledge and political action in London. See Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 51–134; Belich (1996) 2007, 179–211.

<sup>622</sup> Attwood 2019, 100.

## 3.1 Establishment of Need and Justification

### 3.1.1 Shades of European Guilt and Arguing for the Need to Act

There were different strands of argumentation in both the Aborigines Committee's report and *The British Colonization* that indicated justification for intervention in New Zealand. The dichotomy of savage past and possible future improvement was a theme that ran through the entire discussion about action in New Zealand in the Aborigines Committee's report and *The British Colonization*. This was inherently related to justifying action in New Zealand, since improvement in Māori was considered desirable. In early Victorian thinking it appears to have been typically accepted that the supposed benefit colonised people reaped from colonisation also justified colonisation. In this way the perceived superiority of British society and the self-assigned duty to civilise and improve others provided British colonial actors with what Michael Mann calls 'a European idiom' that fulfilled an apparent obligation to justify colonial action.<sup>623</sup> There were, however, further justifications and ways of establishing the need to act in New Zealand in the works by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward.

In examining the formation of knowledge claims of Māori, I have thus far focused on aspects of Māori–European relations other than the harm European settlers and traders were accused of having caused in New Zealand. This harm and the blame attached to it has been brought up in historical research, particularly in relation to the Aborigines Committee and their report. The Committee emphasised that European settlers and traders caused harm to Māori, which has been viewed as having created justification for the Committee's suggestions for action in New Zealand.<sup>624</sup> This general tenor of condemnation by the Committee was reflected in the very beginning of their report, in which the Committee stated their objection to dismissing indigenous peoples' well-being. They described that Britons were

apt to class them [indigenous peoples] under the sweeping term of savages, and perhaps, in so doing, to consider ourselves exempted from the obligations due to them as our fellow men.<sup>625</sup>

<sup>623</sup> Mann 2004, 5; Scrimgeour 2006, 3.

<sup>624</sup> Lester 2002b; Elbourne 2003a; Lester 2008; Ballantyne 2011; Ballantyne 2016; Elbourne 2016.

<sup>625</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 3.

They, however, viewed that this habit did not reflect British responsibility towards 'our fellow men'.<sup>626</sup> Similar argumentation relating to supposed concern towards Māori is also evident in how Wakefield and Ward presented some of the contact between Europeans and Māori, but there were also clear differences as to on whom and on what they placed the blame for these harmful effects. This can be seen from why the two sides argued that action was necessary and what sources and knowledge claims were used to back these arguments.

My focus here on the transfer of knowledge and the different coexistent presentations of blame for colonial violence in New Zealand complements the existing historiographical examination of the blame the Aborigines Committee directed at European settlers and sailors. On the one hand, contrasting the Committee's attributions of blame with another contemporary colonial project's discussion of the same subject shows how a similar need to act was produced by the two, but with distinctly different implications for who was to blame. This further illustrates two sides of how violence in the colonies was perceived and discussed, and how this was used in colonial argumentation. On the other hand, tying this argumentation of European blame together with the sources that were cited for arguing it indicates the contingent nature of how empirical evidence could be found and presented to express different interpretations. Here the different interpretations were particularly related to the nature and cause of violence in New Zealand.

To illustrate the interplay of sources used by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward, as well as the knowledge claims they constructed from these sources and their justification for action in New Zealand, I first examine how the two works presented European actions as harmful to Māori. I pay particular attention to one specific conflict that took place in New Zealand, the *Elizabeth* incident, which was used by both sides to show the need to act. Following this, I examine in closer detail the differences in emphases between the interpretations of Wakefield and Ward and the Aborigines Committee regarding European guilt. This indicates how converging accounts of conflicts and what were seen as European-derived evils in New Zealand were given different weight and different significances to support the differing perspectives of the two sides. In fact, Wakefield and Ward's *The British Colonization* and the Aborigines Committee's report drew on very similar sources and similar premisses for promoting a need to act, but offered strikingly different implications and meanings for why their respective plans were preferable. Finally, I examine the relationships between the presented argumentation and the used sources, particularly from the perspective of the history of knowledge. Ideally it could be assumed that when argumentation is driven by an examination and analysis of

<sup>626</sup> Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (*British Settlements*) 1837, 3.

sources, this analysis would precede any apparent interpretations or arguments made from them.<sup>627</sup> However, this does not appear to have exactly been the case here. This indicates that the sources were to a large degree argumentative tools, which is in keeping with how they were selected for forming knowledge of Māori. But the way the two sides received information also influenced their argumentation. In the section following this one, I turn to further justifications that were more closely related to Māori and their own perspective on becoming civilised.

However, before peering deeper into the argumentation employed by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward, it is necessary to briefly discuss the concepts of ‘fatal impact’ and ‘fatal necessity’ in order to understand the premisses of this argumentation. Current understanding of early-19<sup>th</sup>-century New Zealand, the lead-up to the Treaty and the contact between various groups of Māori and Europeans has been significantly influenced by these concepts. They signified 19<sup>th</sup>-century beliefs that European contact with Māori would cause and had already caused Māori as a people to crumble and collapse due to the corrosive effects of European vices, weapons and disease, among other causes. Views of a fatal impact were often propagated by humanitarians and missionaries, and they led to an acceptance in the Colonial Office that there was a fatal necessity for British intervention and protection of Māori in New Zealand or else the destruction of Māori would take place.<sup>628</sup> This view of a fatal impact also placed at odds the dual duties of the British Government with each other, as analysed by Adams. He views that in the early-19<sup>th</sup>-century Britain the government was considered to have two duties for British interactions with other peoples. First, the duty to protect its subjects and, second, the duty to ensure the rights of indigenous peoples, including their sovereignty and independence. Māori were considered to have rights to live on their lands. Yet, since British people insisted on trading and settling in New Zealand the two duties clashed. As Adams points out, intervention in New Zealand in order to secure British subjects’ safety eventually won out. Yet, from a humanitarian perspective the duty of protection was also applied to Māori, at least in theory.<sup>629</sup>

<sup>627</sup> For example, in terms of current Western philosophy an argument has a conclusion and premisses that support it, see e.g. Tindale 2004, 2; Walton 2007, xv. It is safe to say that if a conclusion is drawn before premisses supporting it are found or the premisses are carefully selected afterwards, then the argumentation would objectively appear problematic, even though this is also practically likely to happen on occasion.

<sup>628</sup> See e.g. Adams, P. (1977) 2013; Olssen 1997, 213; Belich (1996) 2007, 126, 186–187; Ballantyne 2011, 234; O'Malley 2012, 149; Attwood 2017, 153. Ideas of fatal impact were also popularised in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century by authors, such as Herman Melville, whose novels portrayed devastating impact of introducing diseases, firearms and the rules of European nations on innocent indigenous peoples. See Howe 1977, 139–141.

<sup>629</sup> Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 47–48.

In previous historiography the concept of fatal impact has also been criticised. Rob Edmond has argued that in historical examination of early European contact with peoples of the South Pacific, historians have read Western sources too uncritically ‘mistaking the intention [of the contemporary writers] for the effect’. Edmond’s criticism is, however, directed at viewing the descriptions by the 19<sup>th</sup>-century writers of Polynesian peoples as fragile and rapidly disintegrating as accurate accounts of what truly took place in the Pacific. To a similar effect, Steven Roger Fischer, in his *A History of Pacific Islands*, explains his theoretical approach by pointing out that unlike mid-20<sup>th</sup>-century historiographical views, according to which Pacific Islanders were ‘naïve victims’ of fatal impact, they instead had strong agency in the early period of contact.<sup>630</sup> A different question is, again, what effect did this view of fatal impact have on contemporaries, who might have believed in its existence? James Belich points out that at particular times in New Zealand’s history there was conversion, conquest and even fatal or crippling impact. Yet, in actuality there was no ‘fatal necessity’ or an imminent threat of the destruction of Māori. But, importantly, the British government came to believe that such fatality existed. This led the government to lean towards intervention in New Zealand.<sup>631</sup> When it comes to how contemporary Europeans viewed interactions with indigenous peoples, the concept of fatal impact appears as having been specifically linked to discourses on the Pacific.<sup>632</sup> This could be due to the influence of missionaries and humanitarian ideals in the late 18<sup>th</sup> and early 19<sup>th</sup> centuries during the time of the most emphatic European expansion to the Pacific. However, the concept of fatal impact has not been commonly identified in relation to other geographical areas at the time.

This view of a fatal impact European contact had on Māori served both to draw governmental attention in Britain to New Zealand as well as to be employed as justification for British action in New Zealand. A central basis for the apparent fatal necessity for British action in New Zealand and its presentation in argumentation on New Zealand was the identification of European so-called settler vices there. These vices that were allegedly being spread among Māori, as well as conflicts incited by European settlers and other outrages committed them, received considerable focus particularly in the Aborigines Committee’s report. It was argued that these contributed to ‘the physical destruction and moral degradation’ of various indigenous peoples, thus also warranting action to be taken in New Zealand. This view was by far not limited to the Aborigines Committee’s view of New Zealand. Similar spread of vices was also identified from interactions between settlers and

<sup>630</sup> Edmond 1997, 10; Fischer 2002, xviii–xix.

<sup>631</sup> Belich (1996) 2007, 126–127 & 187.

<sup>632</sup> See e.g. Edmond 1997; Keown 2007, 32–43.

indigenous peoples ranging from Polynesians to Australian Aborigines across the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries.<sup>633</sup>

An understanding of phenomena such as the idea of a fatal impact benefits from a closer look at the building blocks of knowledge claims on which it was built. Attwood has noted in his examination of early-19<sup>th</sup>-century British ideas of protection of indigenous peoples that protection was an important and widely discussed concept at the time. In the historical examination of the claims to protect Māori, a wide range of different actors have been identified as having taken part in discussions about protection, including missionaries, traders and settlers. Yet, Attwood points out that it has not been generally acknowledged that there was no single discourse for such protection. Instead, he argues, multiple and even contradictory strands of protection talk existed simultaneously.<sup>634</sup> Along these lines, the use of humanitarian narratives and humanitarian argumentation for protection cannot be viewed as having only taken place in the humanitarian promotion of missionary work and opposition to colonial actions. This side of the debates on New Zealand presents only one perspective of the argumentation on New Zealand and the state of Māori that took place in Britain in the late 1830s. The historian Robert Grant notes that the idea of Māori as an intelligent and, as shown in the previous chapter, civilisable people, who were in need of rescuing from escaped convicts and deserted sailors, was frequently cited as an argument for colonising New Zealand.<sup>635</sup> Similarly, Wakefield and Ward also made use of sources and knowledge claims of European settlers causing harm to Māori, which reflected the Aborigines Committee's presentation of the situation in New Zealand.

These different strands of the argumentation were also in close orbit to the Colonial Office. As there were close connections and sympathies between the humanitarian circles and the Colonial Office in the 1830s, this humanitarian perspective that characterised the Aborigines Committee's report has been identified as having been particularly influential within the British Colonial Office. It drew strong approbation from officials such as Undersecretary James Stephen.<sup>636</sup> Also, more generally, much of the communication that reached British colonial government from New Zealand was concerned with unorganised immigration resulting in the spread of vices among Māori. According to James Belich, these officials were 'inundated by reports from New Zealand' in the late 1830s.<sup>637</sup>

<sup>633</sup> Elbourne 2003a. See also Samson 1998, 24–29; Mitchell, J. 2011, 27–28, 176, 186–187.

<sup>634</sup> Attwood 2017, 153.

<sup>635</sup> Grant 2003, 23.

<sup>636</sup> Lester 2001, 106–107; Lester 2008, 69–71.

<sup>637</sup> Belich (1996) 2007, 185.

Thus, while in this study the Aborigines Committee and *The British Colonization* are the main objects of examination in terms of how they contributed to ideas of a need for action in New Zealand, these texts did not exist in a vacuum. There was a great deal of other official correspondence and transfer of knowledge taking place in the late 1830s about New Zealand. Peter Adams argues that James Busby's report in mid-1837, for example, about crimes committed by Europeans in New Zealand was influential in pushing British colonial policy towards intervention in New Zealand.<sup>638</sup> Yet, the Aborigines Committee's report and Wakefield and Ward's book took very active part in lobbying their respective recommendations for action. Part of the argumentation on this matter centred on creating necessity and justification for action. Moreover, looking beyond the official circles of British colonial administration provides a more well-rounded perspective to how the need for action and descriptions of fatal impact in New Zealand were seen in the 1830s.

### Settler Culpability as an Argument in Pressing for Action

As seen in the last chapter, the narration of conflicts that took place in New Zealand was used to show how missionaries were helpful in mediating conflicts and as peacemakers, which highlighted their roles. But on the other hand, conflicts and actions attributed to unlawful or uncontrolled settlers, sailors and other Europeans also served as a more immediate call for action in New Zealand. As Alan Lester, Kate Boehme and Peter Mitchell note, even though there were benevolent ideas of freedom, civilisation and liberalism at play at times in governing the British Empire, this benevolence often dissolved into the application of British power through violence.<sup>639</sup> However, in contemporary discussions about the British Empire these ideals of benevolence were also at play at times in reasoning why British imperial or colonial intervention was necessary or justified. European actions towards Māori that were characterised as evils, outrages or atrocities were greatly in focus for both the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward. Particularly in the Aborigines Committee's report, proportionally a lot of attention was given to narratives of conflicts that had taken place between Māori and European groups or between two Māori groups at least partly as a result of European action, in comparison to the space that was given to other examination of New Zealand.

As a nearly direct opposite to the Aborigines Committee having given relatively little emphasis on Māori as a warlike people, despite that having been a typical characterisation of Māori in early-19<sup>th</sup>-century Britain, the Committee placed a heavy emphasis on the actions of various Europeans in having been the culprits in

<sup>638</sup> Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 77.

<sup>639</sup> Lester, Boehme & Mitchell 2021, 8–9.

conflicts and even for outright having incited warfare. This emphasis by the Committee is exceedingly clear. It is indicated, for example, by the witness interviews held in 1836 in which the Committee explicitly asked Dandeson Coates: ‘Have any acts of cruelty and oppression, committed by Europeans on the natives, been reported to you by persons upon whom you can place reliance?’<sup>640</sup> This emphasis continued through the committee proceedings and was utilised to a great degree in the argumentation advanced in the report.

However, a seemingly humanitarian concern for the wellbeing of indigenous peoples and a perception of culpability of some European settlers did not self-evidently lead to a condemnation of colonial action in all contexts. Continuing the paradoxical nature of the implications that can be drawn from this British humanitarian concern, the NZA used source material with similar humanitarian-leaning stances to present the need for organised colonisation of New Zealand. Wakefield and Ward did discuss warlike behaviour as having been typical to Māori, but also emphasised the claimed change in their character through European contact, were it either evangelical or commercial in nature. Yet, also in their argumentation European settlers were often at fault. This was in parallel to the Aborigines Committee’s views, and it resulted in need for action, whether it was seen as purely based on humanitarian rhetoric or as colonial action for humanitarian results.

The narration of conflicts from humanitarian perspectives in general is not surprising for the time. Lambert and Lester observe that certain colonial spaces were constructed in colonial philanthropy as sites for public concern and imperial intervention. They point to the West Indies and the slave trade, relating to which slave colonies were discussed as ‘un-British’ and ‘aberrant spaces’. This juxtaposed the emerging British national identity with its duties towards other peoples and those ‘aberrant’ places that required intervention. Narratives of violence, pain and suffering were circulated with the use of print culture to garner support for humanitarian action.<sup>641</sup> As colonial violence was against this kind of national duty, it framed New Zealand as such a site for concern and the actual recounting and reporting of conflicts was an important tool for showing this need for concern and action. Specifically, in relation to claims of violence and other European evils, Ballantyne points out that a common humanitarian strategy in the early 19th century was to distribute accounts from the frontier in different media, including pamphlets, sermons and periodicals, as well as in parliamentary forums. This was done to conjure up emotions from readers of colonial violence and suffering so that those

<sup>640</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1836*, Minutes of Evidence, 481.

<sup>641</sup> Lambert & Lester 2004, 329; Edmonds & Johnston 2016, 8–10; Johnston 2016; Lester, Boehme & Mitchell 2021, 37–38.

people could be moved to action against such perceived evils. One example in which this was done in the Aborigines Committee's proceedings was when Coates related a letter from Samuel Marsden, which recounted acts by European sailors against Māori in response to a question of 'acts of cruelty and oppression' by Europeans.<sup>642</sup>

Laqueur also indicates that in addition to his argument that detailed accounts created a sense of credibility to knowledge claims, detailed narration of suffering served to foster compassion, and rich layers of detail that were present in parliamentary inquiries served this well.<sup>643</sup> Thus, there were clear connections between humanitarian interests and the presentation of violence in colonial borderlands. Elbourne notes that a transition from abolition to interventionist arguments aimed at managing violence in the colonies was evident in early-19<sup>th</sup>-century humanitarianism. This also stemmed from the fact that colonial frontiers were often violent, or at least potentially violent, places. Elbourne identifies the Aborigines Committee and other Quaker-led initiatives as indicative of the efforts at the time to 'help distant others', of which ending physical abuse of indigenous peoples was one prominent side.<sup>644</sup> Here, it is equally significant to notice that while there could have been some genuine concern for different peoples and their suffering, narration and knowledge claims of such conflicts were also directly linked to colonialism. The narration and recounting of these European evils was used to create claims of conditions that legitimised and allegedly warranted colonial action.

The significance of these narratives of harm inflicted on Māori in the argumentation presented by the Aborigines Committee is evident when considering their report's characterisations of European contact with Māori and other indigenous peoples. Prime example of this is the *Elizabeth* incident. Nearly all European contact, excluding missionary work, was presented as harmful to Māori by the Committee. This was generally summarised in the early pages of the Aborigines Committee's report, where their view was stated clearly: '[T]he intercourse of Europeans in general, without any exception in favour of the subjects of Great Britain, has been, unless when attended by missionary exertions, a source of many calamities to uncivilized nations.'<sup>645</sup> To early-19<sup>th</sup>-century humanitarians, this view of harmful contact quite naturally excluded the effects of missionaries and their civilising mission from the criticism. Instead, it emphasised the supposed importance of their endeavours as seen in the previous chapter.

<sup>642</sup> Ballantyne 2016. For more examples of use of humanitarian narratives to enact change see Johnston 2016.

<sup>643</sup> Laqueur 1989, 190–192.

<sup>644</sup> Elbourne 2016.

<sup>645</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 5.

Relating to New Zealand and the Pacific more specifically, the Committee quoted Rev. John Williams's testimony on interactions between Europeans and indigenous peoples in conclusion to the presentation of the state of the Pacific islands. Williams condemned most European action: 'I should say, with few exceptions, that it is decidedly detrimental, both in moral and civil point of view.' He added that as a missionary he would rather go to a place where there had been no contact with Europeans than to a place after European influence.<sup>646</sup> This emphasis in the report is explained to some extent by Buxton's memoir. In the memoir, it was stated that '[t]he object of the report was to prove, first the destructive cruelty to which the native tribes had generally been subjected' and secondly that humane treatment led to indigenous peoples' increase in numbers and acceptance of Christianity and civilisation.<sup>647</sup> If the report and its objects were seen along these lines, it explains the rather limited perspective presented in it. Focusing on the supposed good done by missionaries and the alleged evils of settlers were perfectly in line with this characterisation. Such a perception of the report's goals also points to why other aspects of the case, such as indigenous activity, were to a significant degree disregarded, since this was not part of either the 'destructive cruelty' or humane treatment of indigenous peoples by Europeans.

In the report, much blame for the 'destructive cruelty' was placed specifically on European sailors, whalers and sealers, runaway convicts from Australian penal colonies and most settlers in New Zealand. These Europeans had been drawn to New Zealand since the turn of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries by opportunities, which Belich has summarised as 'flax, timber, and whales; seals, sex and souls', the last one applying to missionaries. Whalers, sealers and convicts were not generally seen as respectable settlers and their hard labour and need for recreation after long months at sea placed them as agents of vice in the minds of many contemporary Europeans.<sup>648</sup> However, Ballantyne points out that scholarly work on the interactions of whalers, sealers and sailors in crossing cultural boundaries with Polynesian peoples indicates that there was also mutual reliance and relatively benign relations between these Europeans and local peoples.<sup>649</sup> But the negative views of these groups in general were also clearly expressed at the very beginning of the report's section on Islands in the Pacific:

Our runaway convicts are the pests of savage as well as of civilized society; so are our runaway sailors; and the crews of our whaling vessels, and of the traders

<sup>646</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 25.

<sup>647</sup> *Memoirs of Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton, Baronet* 1848, 415.

<sup>648</sup> Belich (1996) 2007, 128–134 & 137–139.

<sup>649</sup> Ballantyne 2012, 126–127.

from New South Wales, too frequently act in the most reckless and immoral manner then at a distance from the restraints of justice: in proof of this we need only refer to the evidence of the missionaries.<sup>650</sup>

Here immorality and reckless actions illustrated the general harm these groups were perceived to cause to Māori by the Committee. Notably, this presentation was based on missionary sources. Such casting of blame on certain groups for their immoral and harmful influences towards Pacific peoples was not untypical in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. For British missionaries across the Pacific other Europeans, such as beachcombers, escaped convicts and traders, appeared as a threat to the missionaries' own goals. In Tahiti, the Society Islands and other Pacific islands, missionaries reported these other Europeans as having been worthless characters, who caused depredation in contrast to the allegedly beneficial work of the missionaries themselves. Jane Samson points to this as an exclusionary tactic to bolster the missionaries' status, since thus they appeared as true defenders of Christianity and civilisation, in contrast to the other white men, who were betraying their own culture. She also suggests that the confrontational relationship between missionaries and many beachcombers and settlers also arose from the lower social status of the latter in contrast to the missionaries.<sup>651</sup> How far this explains the contradictions between missionaries and whalers, for example, is uncertain. But certain social aspects, such as the whalers having been seen as uneducated, uncivilised and against some cultural norms in their use of alcohol and sexual relations with Māori women in all likelihood placed them as contrarians to the more middle-class missionaries and evangelicals.

In the Aborigines Committee's report, and to some extent in *The British Colonization*, the contestation between missionaries and other Europeans in the Pacific was clearly present as missionaries were referenced as claiming that harmful effects arose from the presence of those other Europeans. Following the Committee's general condemnation of sailors, whalers, sealers and convicts, it provided more detailed listing of different problems that had been reported from New Zealand. The Committee presented a damning overview of all these kinds of atrocities, which was mainly based on witness testimonies from Yate, Ellis and Coates and papers from other missionaries. The Committee pointed to murders, other 'contamination' and even tattooed Māori heads having been sold in New South Wales as indicators of the moral corruption that called for action to be taken. They also noted that Europeans caused general immorality, intoxication and impediments to civilisation because

<sup>650</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 14.

<sup>651</sup> Samson 1998, 24–27.

they had set up grog shops for selling ardent spirits.<sup>652</sup> This presentation of harm caused by British sailors appears as something of a concerted effort on the part of the evangelicals and missionary groups in the 1830s since Coates had also been in direct contact with Lord Glenelg in the Colonial Office. In 1835, for example, Coates informed Glenelg of the nature of British sailors in the Pacific, describing them as ‘the worst class of Sailors [who were] almost altogether destitute of religious instructions or moral restraint’. This and the desire for trade in timber and flax in New Zealand, in his view, caused ‘the most grievous wrongs and injuries’ particularly in northern New Zealand.<sup>653</sup> Here, in Coates’s description the perceived religious and moral difference appears to have been a significant cause for the juxtaposition between missionaries and British sailors and traders. Yet, the more apparent goal of Coates’s communication and the successive work of the Aborigines Committee was to bring to the fore these wrongs so that supposedly proper action could have been taken to redress these wrongs.

The relationship of what was blamed on the sailors and settlers by missionaries also carries curious contradictions between what practical interactions between different groups were like in New Zealand. While conflicts in which Europeans were deemed guilty of incitement were discussed by the Aborigines Committee in relation to New Zealand, weapons were not specifically mentioned as a problem there. But relating to the South Sea Islands generally, Ellis pointed to firearms as one cause for depopulation in the islands and his statement was quoted in the report proper.<sup>654</sup> The Committee had also questioned Yate as to whether Māori had firearms, to which he responded that they received weaponry from whaling ships.<sup>655</sup> Ballantyne, however, notes that in the actuality of the early mission in New Zealand, lay missionaries were involved in private trade and mission stations also became places through which Māori could acquire muskets, fowling pieces and gunpowder. He also notes that the CMS missionary Thomas Kendall acted as a broker, who facilitated Hongi Hika’s purchases of weaponry from visiting ships.<sup>656</sup> It might be possible to view Ballantyne’s observation that Māori received fowling pieces from missionaries as an attempt by the latter to transform Māori hunting customs into something more British in style, as was typical for missionary work in different aspects of life. Yet, contrasting the nuances present in the actual life in New Zealand, compared to the

<sup>652</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 14–23. See also Lester 2002b, 281–282.

<sup>653</sup> Letter from Dandeson Coates to Lord Glenelg, 29 August 1835, fl. 361–362, CO 209/1, TNA.

<sup>654</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 24.

<sup>655</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1836*, Minutes of Evidence, 190, questions 1621–1622.

<sup>656</sup> Ballantyne 2015, 111–112.

argumentation that took place in Britain, illustrates perfectly how the argumentation played on simplifications and stereotypes of what was seen as having taken place in New Zealand. These focused, for example, on how sailors caused harm in their actions and through the sale of weapons and alcohol, whereas missionaries worked hard in their endeavours for the spiritual improvement of Māori. This simplification of life into an argument was in all likelihood a result of both selectivity in how argumentation was formed, as well as less deliberate viewing of matters through one's particular perspective and lens.

Wakefield and Ward approached the subject of colonial action from a different perspective than the Committee; namely with the intention of arguing for settler colonialism rather than the Committee's quite opposite view of denouncing most European contact. Despite this, they also gave plenty of attention to negative effects of European actions. Such negative aspects of European contact, as presented by Wakefield and Ward, appear as the flipside to all the depicted supposedly beneficial and civilising results that they claimed European contact had achieved in Māori. After some initial comments in *The British Colonization* on Māori 'savagery' and their apparent capability to become civilised, European sailors, convicts and 'sojourners' were named as culprits for the negative impact on Māori:

But the picture of intercourse with civilised man, has its dark side also; and a very black one it is. New Zealand is already colonized by Englishmen. [...] There is no law, no authority of any kind to restrain either class [i.e. settlers and sojourners] from following the impulses of their own mere will. Imagine that the laws were suspended in England for a month! By imagining this, it will be understood that the runaway convicts are not the only class of British subjects who prove a curse to the natives.<sup>657</sup>

Furthermore, in one of the sections of the detailed description of New Zealand, Wakefield and Ward summarised British actions in New Zealand as they were discussed in various chapters of *The British Colonization*: '[It] discloses new and appalling facts in the dark history of human depravity. Britain is charged "with the guilt and disgrace of having occasioned and tolerated such atrocities"'.<sup>658</sup> The lack of law mentioned by Wakefield and Ward was a recurring theme in British discussions of New Zealand in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, since it was considered that as a foreign land British laws could not be made to apply in New Zealand. This placed British sailors in New Zealand outside the British laws, a problem, which, for example, New South Wales governor Lachlan Macquarie attempted to rectify as

<sup>657</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 30.

<sup>658</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 132

early as 1814 after representations of New Zealand made to him by Marsden. He asked the imperial government for legislation for extraterritorial power in order to subject ships in New Zealand to British laws, but did not receive his wishes.<sup>659</sup> In general, these descriptions by Wakefield and Ward of uncontrolled European contact with Māori were in many ways reminiscent of the Aborigines Committee's report. Not only did they include narratives of runaway convicts from Australia, they also pointed to some European and namely British settlers and seafarers as having been at fault as 'a curse' to Māori. These sections of *The British Colonization* consisted, in fact, of many similar and even the same narratives and accounts that were also cited in the Aborigines Committee's report.

Regarding how the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward presented harmful actions of Europeans, which were often related to violence that caused harm to Māori, the historian Philip Dwyer's analysis of violence in history helps to illustrate what the two sides presented as having been violence and harmful in relation to their argumentation. Dwyer notes that violence is a contested concept, complicated, for example, by how that which can be seen in one context as violence might not have appeared as such at a given time. There are also questions about the relationship of 'legitimate' and 'illegitimate' violence. Dwyer suggests that this conceptual complexity can be eased by historians defining or demarcating the limits of their study and introducing typologies of violence specific to the topic under discussion. As an example, he indicates that different forms of violence can be related to colonisation: atrocities, such as executions and torture by European imperial powers to subdue local resistance; economic violence, such as confiscation of crops or livestock; cultural violence in attempting to destroy a group's religion or culture and forced migration.<sup>660</sup>

Comparing these typologies to how Wakefield and Ward and the Aborigines Committee presented the situation in New Zealand it is clear that some of the harmful influence of Europeans as presented in the Committee's report and *The British Colonization* fit into these classifications. Settlers and sailors were blamed for atrocities. Both the Committee and Wakefield and Ward generally condemned the illegitimate requisition of land from indigenous peoples or otherwise defrauding them.<sup>661</sup> Moreover, the accusations that Europeans were corrupting Māori can be seen as a form of cultural violence. But as Dwyer also notes, violence is culturally and historically contingent.<sup>662</sup> For example, considering the concept of cultural

<sup>659</sup> Attwood 2020, 102–103.

<sup>660</sup> Dwyer 2017, 12–14.

<sup>661</sup> See *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 5; *The British Colonization of New Zealand 1837*, 31.

<sup>662</sup> Dwyer 2017, 16.

violence, in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century there were explicit intentions to transform Māori into a people who abided by British ways of living, which appeared as the desired course of action in much of British thinking at the time. Yet, from a 21<sup>st</sup>-century perspective, that is clear cultural violence or cultural imperialism. The perspective of the viewer influences what is viewed and presented as violence. This is similar to how Anna Johnston describes how the evangelical social mores of British missionaries in New South Wales were challenged by living among convicts, military men and Aborigines. This led to the dissemination of missionary narratives providing troubling accounts of problems and failures of settler colonialism in Australia.<sup>663</sup> This is not to suggest any belittling of real-world harm caused by violence or incidents that took place in New Zealand; rather it is to note that the narration of violent incidents in argumentation of the Committee's report and *The British Colonization* was not only related to what practically took place, but also to the intentions of presenting this narration. In terms of the argumentation presented in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, it is apparent that different forms of harm and violence were attributed by the two sides to European actions in New Zealand. Moreover, what they disseminated as narratives and claimed knowledge of violence or harmful actions was influenced by their moral and societal preconceptions. I also argue that these were influenced by the two sides' goals and interests. In analysing the argumentation of Wakefield and Ward and the Aborigines Committee, the presented cause for these forms of violence is equally significant as how the violence was described.

To uncover how and why these somewhat converging arguments of European guilt by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward were used to argue the need and justification of British action in New Zealand, despite the differences in their goals, I will raise as an example into focus one specific conflict between Europeans and Māori. The case of the brig *Elizabeth* was discussed at length in the Aborigines Committee's report and *The British Colonization*. This was by far not the only conflict mentioned or discussed in the Aborigines Committee's report and *The British Colonization* that was blamed on European action. The Aborigines Committee paid even more attention to such conflicts than Wakefield and Ward did.<sup>664</sup> The *Elizabeth* incident is a good representation, however, of the ways and

<sup>663</sup> Johnston 2016.

<sup>664</sup> Other conflicts that were discussed by the Committee and mainly in Wakefield and Ward's citations of the Committee's report were as follows: In the so-called Girls' War Captain Brind, master of the whaler *Asp*, incited war between Māori parties in Kororāreka. See *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 15; *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 34–35. Relating to this, the Committee also cited Marsden's letter to Governor Darling. See letter from Samuel Marsden to Governor Ralph Darling, 2 August 1830, fl. 15–18, CO 209/1, TNA. On

differences in how these kinds of narratives were used by the two sides. As discussed in the last chapter, trans-antipodean communication regarding the *Elizabeth* incident contained many strands and actors, and even resulted in a rare acknowledgement of Māori as sources of information by the Aborigines Committee. Ahu and Ware, the latter of whom was named by Marsden but omitted by the Committee, were noted as having provided Marsden the information he had of the incident. But reporting of this case was also an example of how sources were flattened out, as some were referenced and others were not. I return to this incident here because a further look at how and in what contexts this incident was presented by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward and what networks of communication lie in the background of this presentation shows the intertwining of different actors and interests and how specific argumentation arose from this multitudinous background. By contrasting the contexts in which this incident was discussed in the Aborigines Committee's report and in *The British Colonization* this case becomes very illustrative of their ways of attributing guilt to settlers, sailors and other Europeans.

In the Aborigines Committee's report, the emphasis on the guilt and the harmful influence of Europeans on Māori was on full display in their recounting the *Elizabeth* incident. In 1830, *Elizabeth*'s captain Stewart ferried Te Rauparaha's warriors to war against Ngāi Tahu in exchange for a cargo of flax. Stewart also lured the Ngāi Tahu *rangatira* Te Maiharanui on board the *Elizabeth* where Te Maiharanui and his wife and daughter were taken captive. Over a hundred of the Ngāi Tahu were killed in the incident and dozens were taken captive. Stewart's involvement in the incident raised alarm in British colonial governance and highlighted New Zealand as a legal void in which actions of Europeans could not be properly adjudicated.<sup>665</sup>

In the Committee's report, the suffering and cruelty endured by the Ngāi Tahu Māori that were taken captive aboard the *Elizabeth* was recounted in detail. This included how Te Maiharanui was tied and 'struck through the skin of his throat under the side of his jaw' with a hook with a cord tied to it.<sup>666</sup> This account, along with other pieces of evidence used by the Committee regarding the *Elizabeth* incident came to the Committee from Rev. Marsden, who had written of the incident to Governor Darling. A copy of the letter from Marsden to Darling, dated April 18, 1831, outlined the case and what had led to it and was brought before the Committee

the Girls' War see Ballara 2003, 201–204. Also, Captain Guard's actions in the *Harriet* incident were extensively discussed and criticised. See *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 18–22. The Committee also quoted Yate's evidence on the battle of Tauranga, see *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 53.

<sup>665</sup> Sanborn 2005, 253; Ballantyne 2016.

<sup>666</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 16.

by Coates, who had received the copy from Marsden.<sup>667</sup> Ballantyne views this letter from Marsden as a prime example of how accounts of suffering from the imperial frontier were used and reused to create humanitarian sentiment and sympathy as it was passed from Marsden to Coates to the Committee and onward. Herein, sympathy was directed at the Māori who had suffered in the conflict. In the Committee's proceedings, Marsden's letter was provided to the Committee specifically following their questions about whether there were 'any acts of cruelty and oppression, committed by Europeans on the natives'.<sup>668</sup>

Looking at the communication that led to this presentation of the case by the Aborigines Committee, in addition to the British humanitarian argumentation and presentation of suffering, there were other aspects at play as to how this incident was communicated. Māori proactivity in this communication and the influence of this kind of communication across official British administrative channels was also prominent. This highlights how the evangelical-humanitarian presentation of the case was only one context in which this incident was discussed.

Marsden's letter to Darling, which was included in the Committee's Minutes, was based on statements received from Ahu and Ware and it provided details of the incident.<sup>669</sup> Other accounts of the incident also circulated in British political circles in the following year. On April 13, 1831, Darling wrote to Viscount Goderich and presented an account of the *Elizabeth* incident to Goderich and referenced his earlier dispatches about 'sanguinary proceedings' relating to actions of British vessels and crews in New Zealand. Darling stated that he was first told of the incident in February 1831 and that his information came from 'a son of one of the principal Chiefs'. As Darling reported these matters to Goderich, he told that this son was sent to Sydney 'to tell the Governor all that happened'. Darling also noted that with this son of the chief the nephew of the Māori chief named Mara Nui, meaning Te Maiharanui, also came to Sydney.<sup>670</sup> These referenced Māori were possibly Ahu and Ware. In February, Darling had also received reporting of the *Elizabeth* incident that included, among other documents, depositions from merchants who had travelled on the *Elizabeth*, a seaman and a carpenter from the *Elizabeth*, as well as a Māori who was

<sup>667</sup> See *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 482–484.

<sup>668</sup> Ballantyne 2016; see *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 481.

<sup>669</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 482–484.

<sup>670</sup> Dispatch from Governor Ralph Darling to Viscount Goderich, 13 April 1831, fl. 28–34, CO 209/1, TNA.

introduced as Pery. According to the deposition, Pery was from Akaroa and had been brought to Sydney by a captain who had promised to take him to Europe.<sup>671</sup>

All these references to Māori sources are very vague. Marsden presented Ahu in his letter to Darling, written in April, as the younger brother of a chief named Moweeterranne, but it is somewhat unclear if Darling referred to him and Ware as those Māori who had come to Sydney due to the incident. Attwood has cited Ahu and Wharepoaka, or Ware as named by Marsden, as the two young *rangatira* who were sent to Sydney to complain about the treatment of Māori by certain Europeans.<sup>672</sup> If so, it is unclear whether Pery had any role in this communication other than having been aware of the situation and having been in Sydney at an opportune moment to provide a deposition on the incident. Nevertheless, what is clear is that these details and Pery's deposition point to the very real and active participation of Māori individuals in networks of communication between New Zealand and Britain. It also highlights their interests in making British officials in Australia aware of the nature of contact between some Europeans and Māori.

In addition to Māori activity having been significant here in the communication of information of the incident, the narration of events, such as the *Elizabeth* incident, to Britain did have its impacts on how the need to act was perceived in Britain. In governmental as well as humanitarian circles the *Elizabeth* incident elicited plenty of scorn towards the actions of British crews in New Zealand. In particular, the fact that Stewart escaped any punishment when the matter was adjudicated in New South Wales caused consternation. Ballantyne notes that Goderich, whom he describes as a fierce opponent of slavery, in answering Darling's account of the incident underwrote 'feelings of shame, frustration and anger when it was Britons whose actions tarnished the empire'.<sup>673</sup> In the British colonial administration the *Elizabeth* incident provided a final push towards acceding to appoint a British Resident in New Zealand to address the need for order among British subjects in the islands and to manage relations with Māori.<sup>674</sup>

The humanitarian concern that was part of Goderich's push to appoint a Resident in New Zealand was paralleled by the attitude with which the Aborigines Committee

<sup>671</sup> The documents contained depositions from Gordon Browne, the merchants Joseph Barrow Montefiore and Arthur Kennis, the seaman William Browne, *Elizabeth*'s carpenter John Swaney and Pery, whose deposition was translated by Gordon Browne. See dispatch from T. Rossi & F. Hely to Governor Ralph Darling, 7 February 1831, fl. 35–51, CO 209/1, TNA. See also Ballantyne 2016.

<sup>672</sup> Attwood 2020, 109.

<sup>673</sup> Ballantyne 2016; Attwood 2020, 109. For Goderich's answer see dispatch from Viscount Goderich to Major General Bourke, 31 January 1832, fl. 66–69, CO 209/1, TNA.

<sup>674</sup> Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 36; Moon 2020, 82–83.

presented the incident in their report six years later. This same narrative that had influenced the decision to install a Resident was again used to push for further intervention in New Zealand. In the Aborigines Committee's report, after the Committee had recounted the incident based on Marsden's account, including the descriptions of cruelty on Te Maiharanui on board the *Elizabeth*, Darling's words were used to emphasise the significance of the case. While Māori of Ngāti Toa were presented as the instigators of the conflict, the Committee quoted Darling's letter of April 13<sup>th</sup> to note that '[t]he sanguinary proceedings of the savages could only be equalled by the atrocious conduct of Captain Stewart and his crew'. What is more, 'Captain Stewart became instrumental to the massacre (which could not have taken place but for his agency) in order to obtain a supply of flax'.<sup>675</sup> In the context of the Committee's views of Māori character it is notable that warfare among Māori was considered 'savage' and required missionary action to counteract it, as I have argued. As such, the Committee did not particularly approve of the Ngāti Toa action, even though it was also noted that Te Rauparaha may have had sufficient cause by his own reckoning to act as he did.<sup>676</sup> Yet, Captain Stewart's actions were underlined as the main problem behind the incident. The Aborigines Committee with their quote from Darling and the parenthesising of Te Rauparaha's culpability placed the blame for the *Elizabeth* incident squarely on Captain Stewart and this appeared as a prime example of European guilt. These kinds of action by Europeans were thus used by the Committee to emphasise the need for intervention in New Zealand in a very similar way as the same accounts of the *Elizabeth* incident had motivated Goderich years back. The Committee did not comment on the fact that after this incident the action of placing a Resident in New Zealand had been taken, and they did not comment on whether the position of the Resident had been successful in preventing further incidents. Instead, the *Elizabeth* incident served for them as proof of the harmful impact European sailors could have on Māori.

The *Elizabeth* incident was by no means the only case presented by the Aborigines Committee to reflect their view of European guilt, and any possible idea of Māori culpability for such conflicts not touched on. For example, Ballantyne notes that the Committee's recounting of the incident echoed evidence gathered by the Committee regarding the *Harriet* incident and the actions of its captain John Guard

<sup>675</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 16.

<sup>676</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 16. This notion of Te Rauparaha having had cause for his action was explained in Marsden's letter to Darling in which he outlined the background of this conflict. It was noted that Te Pehi Kūpe, who had visited Europe in 1826, was a chief from Kāpiti and he was killed in Araroa by the Ngāi Tahu. For this the Ngāti Toa of Kāpiti required satisfaction. See *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, *Minutes of Evidence*, 482–483.

following his return to free his wife and children. In the evidence from assistant naval surgeon William Barrett Marshall, Guard's torture of Ngati Ruanui chief Oaoiti was recorded in great detail.<sup>677</sup> This evidence was not cited in the report proper, but based on other pieces of evidence most of the blame was cast on Guard even though the Māori parties in this conflict were noted as having partaken in the violence that occurred. The evidence cited in the report included testimonies from Marshall and Captain Lambert of the HMS *Alligator* that was sent to resolve to conflict.<sup>678</sup>

Recounting cases like the *Elizabeth* incident and Guard's case played into the Committee's claims that Māori were indeed warlike in their 'original' character before the British brought Christianity and civilisation to them. For the sake of the Committee's argumentation this did not remove or reduce European guilt for having been the main causes of conflicts. Instead, the Committee drew on missionary testimonies to pronounce that the cause for the conflicts that took place involving Europeans 'when completely sifted, has been always traceable to the Europeans'. This was a view that was also stated to the Committee by Ellis and Yate.<sup>679</sup> Consistent with the Committee's approach to all topics relating the New Zealand, Māori did not appear in the Committee's examination in the report as significant sources of information or proactive actors. Instead, as with the missionaries imparting civilisation among them, Māori appeared as objects of European action to be civilised, corrupted or protected. This was at odds, for example, with the above-discussed roles of Māori individuals in communicating information about the *Elizabeth* incident to Britain.

This focus on European guilt, in turn, provided the Committee with arguments that immediate action was needed to stop these evils, which went to justify the Committee's suggestions for action. This was further underlined in manner that the Aborigines Committee also explicitly linked their presentation of the incident to how news of it had been received in British colonial administration. A quote from a dispatch from Lord Goderich regarding the *Elizabeth* case was included in the report. In this, Goderich called for action to be taken to protect Māori in order to prevent them from following in the footsteps of 'the number of those barbarous tribes who [...] have fallen a sacrifice to their intercourse with civilized men, who bear and

<sup>677</sup> Ballantyne 2011, 252–253.

<sup>678</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 18–22.

<sup>679</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 21. For Ellis's statement, see *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 501. For Yate's statement, see *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 194, question 1693.

disgrace the name of Christians'.<sup>680</sup> In the Aborigines Committee's report, this indignation expressed in Lord Goderich's voice is especially significant when considering the wider context of the Committee's views of British and European actions in the colonies and other lands. The whole report was prefaced with the duty of civilised British to help others, alongside the humanitarian language directed at engendering emotion as highlighted by Ballantyne. Ideas of British duty and interest were also raised.<sup>681</sup> Thus, the presented atrocities appeared as an antithesis for the ideal of British action and the detailing of such atrocities went to prove how the presented state in New Zealand was untenable.

The narration and claims of European actions and their moral standing appear then as part of the argumentation that was used for creating need for action. Along these lines Lester remarks that there were both secular and spiritual grounds for the Committee to act in New Zealand. Britain, with its perceived great civilisation and possible benefits for indigenous societies, was morally bound to prevent harm and provide civilisation.<sup>682</sup> It was, after all, noted in the beginning of the report that as '[i]t is only too easy to make out the proof of all these assertions' of harmful European actions and thus the necessity to act also rose directly from these European harmful acts. The Committee stated that '[i]t will be easy also to show that the result to ourselves has been as contrary to our interest as to our duty'.<sup>683</sup> The need for action was thus not only based on indigenous suffering but also centrally on European guilt for causing it and a sense of duty to promote civilisation and wellbeing of other. This sense of duty and confidence in the British capability to lead the way in the world and help others permeated British thinking about Empire more widely in the early to mid-19<sup>th</sup> century. In some cases, this view led to calls for an expansion of British interests overseas,<sup>684</sup> but in the Aborigines Committee's case it served as a basis for calls of the necessity to act for the supposed benefit of indigenous peoples. Of course, it is true that, as Lester has pointed out, even the Committee's suggested action was further colonial intervention in New Zealand,<sup>685</sup> but it is arguable whether the Committee members themselves saw it as such as they opposed the NZA's colonial plans.

<sup>680</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 17; *The British Colonization of New Zealand 1837*, 39. For the original see dispatch from Viscount Goderich to Major General Bourke, 31 January 1832, fl. 66–69, CO 209/1, TNA. See also Ballantyne 2016.

<sup>681</sup> See e.g. Attwood, 2020, 117–118.

<sup>682</sup> Lester 2002b, 282–283.

<sup>683</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 5.

<sup>684</sup> Lynn 1999, 101–102.

<sup>685</sup> Lester 2002b, 281; Lester 2001, 115.

The significance of the idea of European guilt was not only professed outwards, but as indicated by Buxton's memoir, it was considered central to the Committee's work. This is also evident in T. F. Buxton's correspondence from the time of the Committee hearings. Writing to his wife, Hannah Buxton, he noted that the work Anna Gurney had done for the Committee had paid off and that the Committee had received powerful evidence:

Tell Anna we had Capt. Stockenstrom to day[sic] & that this Evidence has been most delightfully frightful & most cheeringly horrid. Oh such a set of villains such robbers such murderers. And Stockenstrom did answer so nobly. It was worth all the trouble Anna had. I think the enquiry will did the greatest possible good. I begin to hope we shall be able to alter the whole of our policy to Savage nations.<sup>686</sup>

Stockenstrom's evidence was related to the Cape Colony, but Buxton's praise of the 'most cheerfully horrid' evidence and the appearance of 'such robbers and murderers' speaks to his view of the significance for the Committee's effectiveness of engendering emotion vis-à-vis European atrocities and showing European guilt towards indigenous peoples. According to Laidlaw, concerning the situation in the Cape and the conflicts between settlers and the Xhosa, Buxton and his family were convinced based on the news arriving from there that action from the imperial government was needed.<sup>687</sup> Southern Africa and the situation there was clearly the most significant case driving Buxton and his inner circle, but very similar arguments concerning European wrongdoing were also extended to other cases in the report, including New Zealand. The evidence presented by the Committee distinctly strove to show the need to act based on arguing that European settlers were the 'villains', a view driven by detailed narration of harm caused to indigenous people like Māori.

This kind of vilification of the European settlers was also served by more widespread contemporary views of settlers, even beyond the juxtaposition between beachcombers and missionaries. Lester points to the necessity for action having been expressed in part by connections between those 'degraded' Europeans and the 'untutored' indigenous peoples in the colonies. The Committee decried that the uncivilised portion of the otherwise highly civilised Britain should spread the 'depraved acts and licentious gratifications of the most debased inhabitants' among

<sup>686</sup> Letter from Thomas Fowell Buxton to Hannah Buxton, 19 August 1835, MSS. Brit. Emp. s. 444 Papers of Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton 1st Baronet (1) Vol. 14 Extracts Relating to Abolition of Slavery, Vol. IV 1835–36, BLOU.

<sup>687</sup> Laidlaw 2004, 14.

the poor Māori.<sup>688</sup> Such notions of European guilt were not unique to the Aborigines Committee. European views of settlers in New Zealand, as well as other colonial contact zones, were also coloured by comparisons of European settlers with local indigenous peoples. Paul Moon notes that among European travellers and writers appeared certain ‘moral relativism’. Māori might not have always been viewed as particularly ‘noble’, relating to the concept of ‘noble savages’, but rather some European settlers were considered as having been worse than Māori in comparison.<sup>689</sup> For example, John Savage, whose published travel account of New Zealand was among the earliest European accounts of New Zealand, feared for the future of Māori due to European disease spreading among them. He made his views of the guilt of Europeans in causing harm to Māori clear. This was based on his observations of there having been ‘the lowest profligate of Europe’ among European whalers and sailors.<sup>690</sup> Similar views of Māori having been generally considered less civilised than Europeans but possessing better characters and qualities than European settlers were also presented in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century by French missionaries.<sup>691</sup>

The *Elizabeth* incident featured significantly in *The British Colonization* as well, especially since Wakefield and Ward quoted the first few pages in their entirety from the part of the Aborigines Committee’s report in which the Islands in the Pacific were discussed. This quotation was included in their book’s early chapter entitled ‘Civilization of the New Zealanders’, but consisted of a wide overarching description of Māori, their character and their contact with Europeans. In this chapter, following Wakefield and Ward’s claims of Māori improvement having arisen from their contact with missionaries and ‘well-disposed settlers’, they raised the ‘dark side’ of contact between Europeans and Māori. As general remarks on this ‘dark side’ Wakefield and Ward noted that

[t]here is scarcely a harbour of either island, not infested with lawless English of one class or other. They encourage natural vices of the natives, and teach them new ones [...] They promote and take part in native wars and massacres. They have spread disease over all the coasts of New Zealand, and have also infected the natives with a taste for ardent spirits.<sup>692</sup>

In many of their basic principles, Wakefield and Ward’s claims of the manner of harmful contact that took place between Europeans and Māori were very similar to

<sup>688</sup> Lester 2002b, 282.

<sup>689</sup> Moon 2017, 7.

<sup>690</sup> Moon 2014, 21.

<sup>691</sup> Jennings 2013, 124.

<sup>692</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 30–31.

that discussed by the Aborigines Committee. Much of European and British action in New Zealand was condemned as harmful to Māori, and these outrages were elucidated with the long passage from the Aborigines Committee's report as a 'description of British colonization in New Zealand'. According to Wakefield and Ward, it was 'high time' that such a description 'should be published with the authority of Parliament'.<sup>693</sup> As a full copy of the Committee's report first pages regarding the Pacific islands, the quote included brief remarks on various criminal and immoral acts by the British as reported by the Committee, but the *Elizabeth* incident constituted the longest part of it.<sup>694</sup>

Since Wakefield and Ward presented the *Elizabeth* incident through a direct quotation from the Aborigines Committee's report, it contained the same detailed narrative of Stewart's treatment of Te Maiharanui as it was described by Marsden and the same expressions of indignation by Darling and Goderich.<sup>695</sup> Wakefield and Ward even further emphasised this indignation and stated after the quotation in their own voice that they had 'a confident reliance that, when the facts shall be generally known, so enormous an evil shall not be allowed to continue'.<sup>696</sup> Thus, there seems to have been a very similar and emphatic damning of European evils in *The British Colonization* as in the Aborigines Committee's report.

The cutting edge of this damning was however directed in a slightly different direction than in the Committee's report. For Wakefield and Ward, Goderich's dispatch, which was quoted in the Committee's report and successively in *The British Colonization*, appeared to point to crucial matters in the interactions between Europeans and Māori. Particularly noteworthy is that while the passage from the Committee's report presenting Goderich's indignation of European conduct was quoted in full by Wakefield and Ward, they also added an italicisation to emphasise a specific passage of Goderich's dispatch. In this italicized portion, Goderich raised the situation of the Australian aborigines in New South Wales and Tasmania as a comparison to the situation faced by Māori. This comparison was to note that in New Zealand, as in the other regions, 'depopulation is already proceeding fast', and thus seemingly raised apparent concern for the future of Māori.<sup>697</sup> With this italicisation Wakefield and Ward raised the possibility that action by people who were not 'well-disposed settlers' could cause the extermination of Māori, which appeared as a particularly important matter. In fact, the threat of extermination was stated as having

<sup>693</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 30–32.

<sup>694</sup> See *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 32–40.

<sup>695</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 36–40.

<sup>696</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 40.

<sup>697</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 39; For the original passage in the report see *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 17.

been the ‘main grounds on which the Association have built their plan for colonizing New Zealand’.<sup>698</sup> This contrast between those Europeans causing harm and other ‘well-disposed’ settlers was explicitly brought up by Wakefield and Ward just before the quote from the Aborigines Committee’s report, as they stated that

[w]ith the exception of a few missionaries in one corner of one of the islands and a few well-disposed settlers in various parts of both islands, the British colonizers of New Zealand seem to vie with each other in counteracting the good which the natives have unquestionably derived from their intercourse with civilization.<sup>699</sup>

Although the designation of ‘British colonizers’ having caused harm to Māori is curious considering that Wakefield and Ward represented an association for private colonisation, these expressions of harm caused to Māori appear in a distinct light in *The British Colonization*. Māori were presented as having been in the process of improving as a result of missionary work and other ‘civilised’ contact. But this improvement was being tarnished by settlers who were not well-disposed and caused among other problems depopulation similar to what had taken place in Australia.

Grant has noted that this need for protecting an intelligent and improving indigenous people from illicit European acts was a frequently used argument for colonising New Zealand.<sup>700</sup> Curiously, it served both Wakefield and Ward and the Aborigines Committee as a means to justify the need to act, despite their rather opposite suggestions for what that action should have been. However, this was a nuanced argument. While this depopulation appears to have been a concern for the Aborigines Committee as well, with the *Elizabeth* incident having been one example of this, the Aborigines Committee’s report emphasised most emphatically the dichotomy of harmful settlers and beneficial missionaries. In *The British Colonization*, the threat of extermination seems to have served a specific end for creating their argumentation of ‘good’ and ‘bad’, or ‘systematic’ and ‘uncontrolled’, settlers. As Attwood has summarised *The British Colonization*, Wakefield and Ward ‘argued that New Zealand was already being colonised in a lawless fashion, that the natives were consequently at risk of extermination’.<sup>701</sup>

Particularly poignant to Wakefield and Ward’s argumentation was their claim that the termination of Māori was being caused by ‘that lawless and infamous mode

<sup>698</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 42.

<sup>699</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 31.

<sup>700</sup> Grant 2003, 23.

<sup>701</sup> Attwood 2020, 122.

of British colonization which is now making rapid progress'.<sup>702</sup> Philip Temple suggests that the Wakefieldian ideals of creating civilised ways of living in New Zealand were attractive to the class of people who could take part in colonial plans in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, like those of the NZA's. For them, these ideals appeared as moving forward with the civilised world, in contrast to the social problems that existed in Britain.<sup>703</sup> Therefore, the condemnation of 'lawless and infamous' forms of uncontrolled colonisation by motley groups of settlers was consistent with the type of thinking and argumentation that could have been effective in driving the NZA's plans. The actions of such settlers were in fact a matter of particular interest to the NZA. The questions formulated by Dr Hinds to William White from September of 1837 included the specific question on whether he could point to '[a]ny leading instances of misconduct and outrage practised against the natives by the runaway convicts or Traders, and generally their treatment of the natives and conduct towards missionary labours whether in support or in opposition'.<sup>704</sup> The specific nature of the question in regards to gaining further information on 'convicts or Traders' and their conduct towards Māori points to an interest in identifying more detail about what would have appeared as an example of the unwanted contact that was to be remedied with the NZA's systematic colonisation. But equally significant was the idea of the colonisation in New Zealand having supposedly already been in motion.

The argument that New Zealand was already being colonised by uncontrolled settlers, who were causing physical and moral harm to Māori, and that this colonisation required systematic control was a central focus in a later, more detailed section entitled 'Existing State of Colonization in New Zealand'. This idea of the ongoing colonisation was first presented in one of the introductory chapters of the book and it was drawn from the Aborigines Committee's general descriptions of the ill-effects of European contact, as well as the presentation and fallout from the *Elizabeth* incident. This then served as a starting point from which Wakefield and Ward presented the necessity, seemingly a fatal necessity, to act in New Zealand unless Māori were to become 'exterminated'. This ran very much counter to the Aborigines Committee's preference of only missionary contact over any settlers in New Zealand, since it presented the case that settler contact could not be avoided. Therefore, systematic action was argued as needed to replace the 'bad' settlers.

<sup>702</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand 1837*, 41. On this theme see also Harrington 2015, 338; Attwood 2020, 122.

<sup>703</sup> Temple 2012, chapter 13.

<sup>704</sup> Letter from Robert Roy to Rev. William White, 1 September 1837, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Letter book 1837, ATL.

This section of *The British Colonization* elucidated Wakefield and Ward's argument that colonisation was already taking place in New Zealand. Consequently, the wrongs of this colonisation should be corrected with proper colonisation based on Wakefield's theories. This section was rife with casting blame on European settlers and sailors for what were presented as immoral actions. It also included an extract of White's answer to the question about the treatment of Māori by convicts and traders. White enumerated as examples fifteen detailed cases of murders, outrages and other injury committed by sailors and other Europeans against Māori.<sup>705</sup> In addition to conflicts and physical harm, this section included large amounts of claimed evidence in the form of Wakefield and Ward's typical long extracts and quotations from various sources. These allegedly proved that the spread of European vices and other harmful effects from the contact were mostly the fault of the uncontrolled European settlers, with these harmful effects having been facilitated by longer and persisting contact as in the Bay of Islands and Hokianga 'where the intercourse with seamen is pretty frequent'.<sup>706</sup> In this section Wakefield and Ward provided further extracts from sources, such as testimonies from the Aborigines Committee's Minutes of Evidence, stories from *The Sydney Herald* and Rev. White's letter to Samuel Hinds to illustrate this perspective mostly regarding the Bay of Islands and Hokianga. Alongside this later narration and use of sources, Wakefield and Ward's recounting of the *Elizabeth* incident therefore carried with it not only the message of humanitarian-sounding concern for European illegalities committed in New Zealand, but also provided very concrete appearing reasons for why action was needed.

It is possible to see this use of European harmful actions against Māori and those actions that were presented as counteracting Māori civilisation as rhetoric that Wakefield and Ward employed to suit the British political climate. But there are also hints at the significance of the claims of European atrocities in New Zealand for Wakefield beyond their use as only outward argumentation for colonial action. In the NZA meeting on May 31, 1837, relating to discussion of the Association's principles for colonising New Zealand, Wakefield stated that there was a 'necessity and urgency of some government and law being established in New Zealand, in order to the protection of life & property, both native & European, which are now endangered by the irregular colonization going on'. This statement is significant for having shown the perceived need to protect both Māori as well as what were considered the 'well-disposed' settlers from uncontrolled European settlers as an argument in NZA internal communications. Thus, it does not appear only as a

<sup>705</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 152–163.

<sup>706</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 132–134.

centrifugal argument for outside parties whom Wakefield and Ward tried to convince of the need to act in support of the NZA's plans.

Additionally, Wakefield's statement was noted in the minutes of the meeting as having been grounded in the Aborigines Committee's report. It was specifically noted, citing the report, that of nearly 2000 European settlers in New Zealand about 200 individuals were run-away convicts and many of the settlers 'continually perpetrated' 'most atrocious crimes' against Māori.<sup>707</sup> The exact numbers of Europeans in New Zealand did not appear in as straightforward a way in the Aborigines Committee as stated here by Wakefield. However, Wakefield's statement in this context of the NZA's internal discussions and the use of the Committee's report indicates that Wakefield's views of New Zealand and Māori were not much different from the Aborigines Committee's stance. What is significant here though, is that the different adjudication of who in general were seen as harmful and who were not resulted in major differences in perspective between the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward.

From the context of Australian colonial history Patricia Grimshaw has contrasted the early-19<sup>th</sup>-century humanitarian language, which appears in modern eyes as paternalistic, ethnocentric and self-serving, with the agenda of colonists who 'by stealth pursued theft, deceit, violence and abuse as their "native policy"'.<sup>708</sup> This contrast rings true as to how humanitarian rhetoric and language was used in the 1830s to contrast allegedly beneficial plans to the harmful, immoral and illegal actions of Europeans in New Zealand. It is, however, necessary to note with regards to the diverse and sporadic nature of British colonial projects in the 19<sup>th</sup> century that this humanitarian, 'paternalistic, ethnocentric and self-serving' language was not only used by missionaries, protectors and such humanitarians, like the Aborigines Committee, to achieve their goals. It was also used by Wakefield and Ward on behalf of the NZA, a private land company attempting to further their own goals of practical settler colonialism albeit with an allegedly humanitarian twist. Also, the argumentation from both Wakefield and Ward and the Aborigines Committee notably carried with it the contemporary paternalism and Eurocentrism of European intervention even if it could have been to some degree sincere in its Eurocentric attempts at altruism at the time.

A wider glance at how the harmful contact with Māori was discussed in Britain in the 1830s reveals that the significance of harm caused by settlers in New Zealand was a complicated topic considering all the different interests and goals of different actors at play. Adams has pointed out that Coates opposed the NZA's plans. He

<sup>707</sup> 'At a meeting held at the rooms of the New Zealand Association', 31 May 1837, fr. 306–308, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Minutes etc 1837, ATL.

<sup>708</sup> Grimshaw 2002, 27.

wrote a pamphlet in December 1837 to outline his and the CMS's opposition for the use of the CMS's deputation for their meeting with Lord Glenelg on the subject of New Zealand. According to Adams, Coates agreed that evil in New Zealand required effective British intervention, but he did not agree with an 'overcharged' picture of Māori population decline. Coates and the CMS recognised the NZA's premiss that uncontrolled colonisation caused crime and anarchy in New Zealand, but claimed that this was also exaggerated to promote their plans. According to Adams, Coates faced a problem with declining Māori population having been linked to those indigenous individuals who were connected with mission stations. Population decline was not convenient for promoting missionary efforts. Therefore, he had to, as Adams notes, 'either forget, or deliberately ignore, the insistent reports from the missionaries in New Zealand' about Māori population decline.<sup>709</sup>

However, Coates did not deny the existence of ills caused by Europeans in New Zealand in his pamphlet, even though he stated his and the CMS's belief that the ills were 'at the present moment exaggerated, to serve the purposes of the Associationists [the NZA] in gaining the sanction of Government to their plan'.<sup>710</sup> In the pamphlet it was repeatedly noted that there were 'serious evils' arising from convicts, sailors and other European settlers towards Māori.<sup>711</sup> These same ideas of a need to act in New Zealand, due to European evils, were also prominent in Coates's correspondence directly to Lord Glenelg of the Colonial Office. He expressed to Glenelg, for example, that some governmental intervention should be directed to '[t]he Bay of Islands[,] being the focus of the evils which afflict New Zealand from the presence of British subjects'.<sup>712</sup> Looking at Adams's view of Coates's criticism on the NZA's statement of New Zealand, this illustrates the implications that existed in different perspectives to European ills caused in New Zealand in relation to different interests and goals. Altogether, there was an intricate balance between the interests of the NZA, Coates and the CMS and the Aborigines Committee, and how these different groups viewed European culpability and the need to act arising from it.

Considering this presentation of the harm inflicted on Māori by Europeans as a reason for action in its wider contemporary climate provides one final, and seemingly paradoxical, juxtaposition in how Māori were discussed. Ballantyne has suggested that as news of European atrocities were met with indignation in Britain, narratives of suffering had very real consequences as they appeared as a part of legitimating British colonial action in New Zealand. This was due to the Colonial Office's

<sup>709</sup> Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 80–82.

<sup>710</sup> Coates 1837b, 6.

<sup>711</sup> See Coates 1837b, 4, 5, 6 & 7–9.

<sup>712</sup> Letter from Dandeson Coates to Lord Glenelg, 3 January 1838, fl. 129, CO 209/3, TNA.

attempts to find effective means for protecting Māori. In this, according to Ballantyne, Māori communities were basically presented as enfeebled and powerless to defend themselves from European harm, resulting in the supposed need for British protection.<sup>713</sup> The *Elizabeth* incident is illustrative of how both the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward took part in building this legitimation and presenting the need for protection due to European ills. From this perspective and in the context of the wider formation of knowledge about Māori by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward, it seems somewhat paradoxical that the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward would have simultaneously presented claims of Māori as an improving people, as I have illustrated, as well as an enfeebled people needing protection. I view these two seemingly contradictory ideas, however, as two sides of the same argument. One side of the argument demonstrated the claimed possibility of what could happen should the given suggestions be carried out, while the other argued what was going on and going to happen without action, which underlined the urgency to act. This ties logically together the presentation of Māori as having been supposedly savage, having been in the process of improving and, yet, having also been in need of protection.

Having now examined in detail how the need arising from European actions in New Zealand was presented by the two sides, I next take a deeper look at how this argumentation was constructed. While again based on empirical-seeming sources, when examined more closely the relationships between the evidence, preconceptions of the topic, conclusions drawn from the sources and the eventual centrifugally presented argumentation appear very complex in nature. As a wider phenomenon in the history of knowledge, the following examination of the Aborigines Committee's and Wakefield and Ward's argumentative forms shows how source-driven argumentation cannot be taken at face value even if the sources used appear reliable and the referencing of those sources appear credible.

### 'Moving Texts' and the Argumentative Form

While knowledge, such as ethnographic knowledge of different peoples presented in European texts produced in Europe, can appear theoretical and somewhat separated from the practices of colonialism, its connections to more practical argumentation are a curious topic from the perspective of the history of knowledge. It points towards uncovering how practices of formation and movement of knowledge can be linked to more practical actions that were taken, for example, as a part of colonialism. Looking at processes of transfer and formation of knowledge alongside political

<sup>713</sup> Ballantyne 2011, 238.

argumentation illustrates how ethnographic knowledge influenced, informed and provided support for the more practical sides of colonial action, thus tying these aspects of colonialism together.

But what does an examination of argumentation from the perspective of history offer to the study of colonialism? Similarly to how interests in studying the concept of knowledge do not always overlap between historical and philosophical research and the concept of knowledge can be approached from different perspectives in those fields,<sup>714</sup> the same is true with argumentation. While a philosophical perspective in the theory of argumentation can offer insight into the logical form of argumentation, from a historical perspective the situated practices that entailed argumentation and the formation and movement of knowledge related to it appear as of greater interest. Although, there can of course also be overlapping between philosophical theories and historical practices, since, for example, classical Greek rhetoricians analysed that argumentation was based on logic (*logos*), emotions (*pathos*) and the credibility of the advocate (*ethos*).<sup>715</sup> These are all aspects that were clearly evident in the Aborigines Committee's and Wakefield and Ward's argumentation on New Zealand and particularly about the presented need for action that arose from European harm inflicted in New Zealand. But beyond simply the presence of these aspects of argumentation in the works of Wakefield and Ward and the Aborigines Committee, it is also worth examining the processes through which they reached and successively presented their argumentation as contingent historical processes. I identify here three significant processes that influenced the presentation of these arguments: first, the practical material aspect of information moving and having been made available; second, the role of empirical evidence and; third, the relationship between the argumentation and the sources, whether argumentation arose from the interpretation of the collected source material or that material was collected in order to fit preconceived arguments.

In practical terms, the connections of argumentation with empirical sources, evidence and claimed knowledge can be examined with the use of the concept of 'moving texts', as analysed by Ballantyne. His use of this concept is two-fold. On the one hand, he points to the capability of text and narratives to engender emotion as discussed above. On the other hand, Ballantyne argues for the significance of the mobility of written word and that paper was a crucial instrument for imperial governance. Paper, for example, allowed legal systems and other governmental bodies to operate across distances. In addition to having been an imperial tool, paper also provided possibilities for others, such as colonised leaders and Indigenous

<sup>714</sup> See Nilsson Hammar 2018, 110–111.

<sup>715</sup> Frost 2005, 5.

peoples to create networks and discursive connections of their own.<sup>716</sup> Based on my analysis of the formation of knowledge about Māori, I suggest further that this also allowed the centripetal accumulation of source material for forming knowledge claims. This movement and the centripetal gathering of material was also connected to the centrifugal presentation of argumentation.

I argue that moving texts also allowed different compilations of sources to be used for creating diverging and competing knowledge claims, which in turn allowed the creation of differing lines of argumentation on matters, such as the colonisation of New Zealand. Printing and spreading text made the centrifugal presentation and dissemination of such arguments for achieving the effects or influence desired by the writers and publishers efficient and capable of reaching a large and widespread audience. This is exemplified by cases like *The British Colonization* or the Aborigines Committee's report. Thomas Laqueur has specifically highlighted the ability of parliamentary inquiry in the form of parliamentary committees and commissions to uncover untold narratives of human suffering. He notes that public parliamentary inquiries, about mining and poverty in England in his examination, made public issues out of matters that were previously little known.<sup>717</sup> Thus, as Ballantyne's moving text, material was collated together and printed in a form that made the knowledge contained within more accessible and easier to disseminate from a centrifugal point of view. As such, this concept of moving texts and the significance of paper and material form help to illustrate the practical mechanisms that connected the dots between different stages of how knowledge was formed and used. Of course, there were also personal interactions that did not leave written traces, but what was made available and visible outside the inner circles of the actors taking part in the argumentation and what was most efficiently and widely disseminated was often specifically the written text, at least in the context of the early-19<sup>th</sup>-century Britain.

Applying this view to the case of the debates on New Zealand, it is evident that the Aborigines Committee, having gathered a trove of detailed evidence, used selected pieces of evidence to form knowledge claims. These claims and the argumentation that the claims were used to support were then presented centrifugally to argue why action was needed in New Zealand and what this action should have supposedly been. Equally, and partially even related to the fact that the Aborigines Committee's report was extensively quoted by Wakefield and Ward, similar processes were prominent with *The British Colonization*. As Rebecca Durrer points out, *The British Colonization* as a book directed at the public domain served to

<sup>716</sup> Ballantyne 2016.

<sup>717</sup> Laqueur 1989, 190–192.

disseminate information about New Zealand to the public.<sup>718</sup> Thus, in this sense it was comparable to Laqueur's discussion of parliamentary inquiries. But without a closer examination of the numbers of *The British Colonization* printed and sold, if such figures exist, it is difficult to estimate its real impact on the public. In a similar manner to parliamentary inquiries as discussed by Laqueur, Wakefield and Ward based their argumentation on the extensive and detailed pieces of claimed evidence that were provided throughout the book. However, notably as the sources that were used were selected and processed, they became what can be termed mutable mobiles, adapting Lester and Dussart's use of the term.<sup>719</sup> This means that their content and significances could have been altered by their new use.

In all this, an important question remains: What was the role of knowledge claims and the pieces of evidence used in the argumentation? This question runs in parallel to the question of what role empirical evidence had in the formation of knowledge. As a further step forward in the processes that spanned the interactions that took place in New Zealand and the argumentation that took place in Britain, it is worth examining in its own right. Considering the general role of evidence in creating such argumentation, a most telling insight into how the Aborigines Committee's inner circle viewed the significance of evidence and the conclusions that could be presented from it can be found in a letter from Anna Gurney. As outlined by Laidlaw, while writing the report Gurney went through the extensive evidence gathered by the Committee.<sup>720</sup> In a personal letter, in which she discussed her family's matters, she also gave a general account of the Aborigines Committee's work. This letter was dated November of 1836, before the final report was written. As a brief summation of the Committee's findings, the letter gives an illuminating look at what Gurney apparently viewed as the most central findings and conclusions from the Committee's work. It is notable that Gurney's characterisation of the Committee's work was very much in line with the eventual findings as presented in the Committee's report, mainly in emphasising the perceived ill effects of European contact with indigenous peoples and the supposed beneficial effect of missionary work:

It [evidence before the Committee] tells a sad tale of the enormities perpetrated by civilized men on Savages, & gives some few beautiful pictures of the effects upon them of fair dealing, & of Missionary Labours. This it proves too that taking in a short range of years, it becomes quite evident that retribution follows

<sup>718</sup> Durrer 2006, 176.

<sup>719</sup> For their use of the term mutable mobiles see Lester & Dussart 2014, 4, 35 & 173.

<sup>720</sup> Laidlaw 2004.

iniquity, & that Christian Conduct towards the helpless & unenlightened does bring its actual rewards [...]<sup>721</sup>

By November, the Committee had concluded its first sessions of witness interviews and the first report of 1836 had already been printed with the Minutes of Evidence from those interviews. Thus, Gurney would appear to have been acquainted with the content of those interviews as she notes that reading this body of evidence ‘has been the chief occupation of the few leisure hours I have yet had in our busy home’.<sup>722</sup> Her concurrence at this time with the eventual findings of the Committee’s 1837 report is not surprising considering her central role in drafting the report. The centrality of evidence gathered by the Committee in presenting the Committee’s conclusions is also evident. She strongly pointed out that the body of evidence collected by the Committee formed a strong impression of the relations between the indigenous peoples and the British. Her short description highlighted the centrality of producing new knowledge by gathering evidence and drawing conclusions from that.

It can, however, be questioned whether the process was as straightforward as it appears in the official, written form of the Committee’s report: first gathering evidence and then forming the conclusions. Considering how arguments, such as the ‘rewards’ for Christian conduct mentioned by Gurney, were constructed, here the role of knowledge claims is evident in creating interpretations and arguments for what was to be done with New Zealand. In arguing for action in New Zealand, sources and knowledge claims constructed from these sources appear as bases that were used to argue why certain lines of action were needed, correct and preferable to others. Ideally, from a philosophical and logical perspective, it could be assumed that the process for forming this argumentation consisted of gathering sources, making interpretations and forming claimed knowledge based on these interpretations of the sources. Then based on the claims to knowledge, the resulting suggestions for action could be presented. However, the timeline of when these kinds of opinions and conclusions of the need to act in favour of indigenous peoples were presented throws into question the primacy of the gathered sources in forming the

<sup>721</sup> Letter from Anna Gurney to M. Le Comte Maurice de Dietrichstein, 18 November 1836, fl. 248–252, MSS. Brit. Emp. s. 444 Papers of Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton 1st Baronet (1) Vol. 15 Extracts Relating to Abolition of Slavery, Vol. V Feb 1836–Aug 16th 1837, BLOU, underlining in the original.

<sup>722</sup> Letter from Anna Gurney to M. Le Comte Maurice de Dietrichstein, 18 November 1836, fl. 248–252, MSS. Brit. Emp. s. 444 Papers of Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton 1st Baronet (1) Vol. 15 Extracts Relating to Abolition of Slavery, Vol. V Feb 1836–Aug 16th 1837, BLOU, underlining in the original.

following interpretations and argumentation in the Aborigines Committee's final report.

While specific pieces of information and descriptions of various events from different parts of the globe were gathered by the Committee to be used as source material, it appears that at least for Buxton the main gist of what became the Committee's argumentation and conclusions in the report were very much formed even before the committee was organised. There is a letter written in Buxton's hand, entitled 'Heads of Resolutions to be proposed at the Aborigines Committee', dated July 26, 1835, a few days before the Committee's witness interviews were begun as reported in the 1836 preliminary report.<sup>723</sup> British guilt in causing harm to indigenous peoples was described in this letter in language very similar to that of the Aborigines Committee's final report. Buxton's letter also called for British responsibility in providing help and civilisation specifically as compensation for the harm caused:

It does not follow because we are civilised Christians that we have a right to rob & murder the Inhabitants of barbarous Countries.

In making settlements in barbarous countries we must necessarily inflict various evils on the Inhabitants, & for those inevitable evils we ought to give them all the compensation in our powers. [...] with some few exceptions, we have been in the habit of considering ourselves at liberty to deal with the Natives on other principles than those of morality & justice. That we have seised[sic] their land, their cattle, & their hunting grounds, have banished them from their Country or inflicted our vengeance upon them for presuming to remain on it. That there are very few instances in which the native population has not decreased & melted away under the influence of our vicinity. [...] That in place of a well defined system & fixed principles often conducts in the intercourse of Europeans with barbarous natives, much is left to the justice & mercy of rapacious adventurers & that the consequence has too often been that the Natives [...] have been still further debased & contaminated by our diseases our vices & our arts of destruction.<sup>724</sup>

<sup>723</sup> According to the Minutes of Evidence, the first witness testimony in front of the committee was given on July 31, 1835. See *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, v.

<sup>724</sup> Thomas Fowell Buxton, 'Heads of Resolutions to be proposed at the Aborigines Committee' 26 July 1835, MSS. Brit. Emp. s. 444 Papers of Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton 1st Baronet (1) Vol. 14 Extracts Relating to Abolition of Slavery, Vol. IV 1835–36, BLOU.

The similarity between Buxton's views in this letter before the Committee's witness interviews and the beginning of the Aborigines Committee's 1837 report is striking. The report was after all supposedly based on the gathered evidence and implications drawn from them. In the report itself was presented a nearly identical general characterisations of the contact between British and indigenous peoples and the blame towards British colonial policy for having forfeited the control over colonisation to individual uncontrolled settlers:

[I]t is from the evidence brought before this Committee during the last two Sessions, that we are enabled [...] to show what has been, and what will assuredly continue to be, unless strongly checked, the course of our conduct towards these defenceless people.

It is not too much to say, that the intercourse of Europeans in general, without any exception in favour of the subjects of Great Britain, has been, unless when attended by missionary exertions, a source of many calamities to uncivilized nations.

Too often, their territory has been usurped; their property seized; their numbers diminished; their character debased; the spread of civilization impeded.<sup>725</sup>

This generalisation of European contact in the Committee's report, with the alleged exceptional quality of missionary work, was presented as having been shown and proven by the evidence the Committee had gathered. Yet, Buxton appears to have had very similar preconceptions even before the evidence was gathered by the Committee. Equally, alongside these attributions of European guilt in both these texts there were also the attributions attached to indigenous peoples as 'barbarous', 'uncivilized' and in contemporary terms generally savage, with the flexibility of these different terms used to connote the idea of inferiority and a need to help them. Thus, Buxton's earlier views and the eventual arguments presented by the Committee allegedly based on empirical evidence were strikingly similar.

It is of course necessary to take into account Buxton's background and earlier connections, which were not made evident in these texts. In the years preceding the Committee's work, Buxton was in contact with various people regarding the Cape Colony, and the conflicts there have often been seen as a major driving force behind him striving to obtain authorisation from the House of Commons for organising the Aborigines Committee. As Laidlaw has shown, Buxton's correspondence with John

<sup>725</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837, 5.*

Philip on the situation of the Cape Colony intensified in 1835. Based on Philip's information, Buxton visited Lord Glenelg in late September of 1835, with papers that Gurney had collated from that correspondence. Pointing to the significance of these empirical sources, Buxton credited 'his passion and Gurney's skilful and arresting collation of edited documents' with the Colonial Office becoming interested in the matter of the Cape.<sup>726</sup> Considering this background, it is unsurprising that he should have had ready impressions of the contact between British and colonised or indigenous peoples. Also considering Elbourne's interpretation that the missionary secretaries' testimonies were discussed in advance before they were officially interviewed by the Committee, which was in strong likelihood a similar case for other pieces of evidence as well, it can be assumed that Buxton was aware of much of what was going to be discussed before the Committee.

Yet, the similarity of Buxton's views before and after the Committee collected evidence on the state of indigenous peoples in different areas raises questions regarding the process through which the conclusions on why action was needed and what should have been done were reached. This has clear implications about how knowledge was used and what its significance was. It is possible to view that the Committee did not gather the mass of evidence and sources in order to simply form an enlightened opinion of contact between Europeans and indigenous peoples. Instead, for Buxton the view of contact between British and indigenous peoples appears to have already been formed to a significant degree and the witnesses would have been selected to provide evidence for arguing this preconceived view. The witnesses invited to testify before the Committee were after all selected with a heavy lean towards missionaries and evangelicals. Therefore, it appears clearly that the evidence that was used to support the Committee's argumentation had a role as instruments in the argumentation. Rather than having been collected in order to reach informed conclusions, they appear to have been used to support preconceived notions.

This instrumental use of knowledge is a significant aspect of how knowledge is viewed historically. In theorising the concept of knowledge Anna Nilsson Hammar urges for a wider conception of knowledge than simply viewing it as something that is only scientific or rational. As another perspective alongside and different to scientific/rational knowledge she points to knowledge that is used instrumentally as a means to an end. Here she discusses particularly tacit or practical knowledge in everyday life,<sup>727</sup> but this perspective also raises further questions about different forms of knowledge that could be used in instrumental manners. It is notable that even this scientific/rational knowledge could be formed and used with instrumental,

<sup>726</sup> Laidlaw 2005, 150–151.

<sup>727</sup> Nilsson Hammar 2018, 112.

means-to-an-end intentions. I argue that the claims which the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward presented appear, or at least could have appeared, to contemporaries as what Nilsson Hammar calls scientific/rational knowledge. They were based on seemingly empirical sources and similar rational thinking. Yet, in their use for argumentation these knowledge claims had an instrumental aspect to them, as they were used to promote a certain line of argumentation. I agree with Nilsson Hammar in her view that knowledge can be defined and viewed beyond the confines of the scientific or rational, and tacit knowledge is an example of this. But different kinds of knowledges could have also been used instrumentally.

Such an instrumental or pragmatic use of what appeared as knowledge was not unheard of in the context of early-19<sup>th</sup>-century British political climate. Laidlaw argues that political and constitutional ideas were employed reactively and pragmatically in the period from 1815 to 1845 in colonial spheres, rather than these ideas having shaped the actions taken by those who had the power to act.<sup>728</sup> Such a pragmatic and flexible adherence to ideals could have also been behind Buxton striving to form the Aborigines Committee to further his personal interests, rather than to undertake an objective survey into the state of colonies and indigenous peoples.

But it is also possible, and even compatible with the above perspective, that all the bias was not deliberately constructed though intentional selection of evidence. In Livingstone's theorisation of the geographies of reading, the reception of information through reading is a creative process. He further notes that reading always involves located hermeneutics. This, and what Livingstone calls 'a situated dialogue, a sited engagement between text and reader',<sup>729</sup> incorporates hermeneutic influences and the impact of preconceptions and earlier understandings that an actor has to the processes of receiving information and to processing it into knowledge. The selection of sources used for supporting the presented argumentation could have been influenced by how Buxton and others in his inner circle understood the evidence before them. Thus, it is possible they did not intentionally seek to confirm their preconceptions with the evidence they sought, but what they heard as evidence was in concert with their perceptions of the contact between Europeans and indigenous peoples. Therefore, this evidence would have confirmed their beliefs and it would have accordingly been raised in the report. The Committee did, notably, omit pro-settler perspectives from the report that were brought up in the witness testimonies. This appears to have been intentional and adds a further dimension to understanding how the report was tailored to present specific knowledge claims.

<sup>728</sup> Laidlaw 2005, 5.

<sup>729</sup> Livingstone 2005, 395.

These two perspectives as to why certain pieces of evidence were used in the Committee's report, the active selection of sources in order to instrumentally support preconceived conclusions, on the one hand, and the less intentional situated reception of information that was based on one's preconceptions, on the other, are not completely mutually exclusive. Aspects of both could have influenced the use of sources and evidence in the Committee's report. As I have identified before, evidence with its seemingly empirical nature was used to supposedly prove knowledge claims that were presented in the report and to foster a sense of credibility for the knowledge. But this evidence was not necessarily the origin for what was argued. The contents of the argument themselves seem to have been at least influenced by Buxton's preconceptions on the subject. Whether this was intentional or not is difficult to ascertain, but from the perspective of the history of knowledge, what appears evident is that invoking pieces of evidence or testimony did not guarantee any clear objectivity on the matter. But what is particularly significant here is that in either case, whether Buxton and the Committee mainly sought and used evidence that was illustrative of their ready-made preconceptions or whether their preconceptions influenced how they viewed the evidence they received, the preconception was transferred over to apply to New Zealand and other places, not only the Cape Colony. The preconceptions of contact between Europeans and other peoples that Buxton had come to have in the early 1830s and around 1835 from his correspondence with Philip and other missionaries from other colonies, such as Jamaica, were in no way related to New Zealand. But the same conceptions of the nature of contact were also evident in relation to New Zealand in the Committee's report. Therefore, intentional selecting or biased reading of sources could have the effect of transferring views related to one topic over to discussion of another topic.

Similar consideration could also be afforded to Wakefield and Ward's editing and writing of *The British Colonization*. While the NZA's plans and goals in founding 'systematically' formed colonies in New Zealand appear quite clear and straightforward, the roles the presented evidence and claimed knowledge played in their more general argumentation were indicated in Wakefield's letter to Dr Evans, the secretary of NZA. In the letter, dated five months before *The British Colonization* was printed, Wakefield expressed his view of how the forthcoming book should be outlined. In this letter, which Temple has viewed as giving the impression of 'nervous haste, of a half-formed scheme' in writing the book,<sup>730</sup> Wakefield noted that 'setting to work in earnest this morning' he had 'done the plan part of the pamphlet'. This most assuredly refers to the early chapters of the work in which were presented the practicalities and principles for colonisation that were based on

<sup>730</sup> Temple 2012, chapter 13.

Wakefield's colonial theories. Wakefield further noted of the other parts of the work that evidence relating the specific topics should be divided into their own parts in the work:

‘[t]he facts relative to 1° the proportions of unoccupied land  
2° the inclination of the natives to sell land & encourage foreigners[sic] English Settlers.  
3 the evils which they suffer through the permanent or temporary residence of foreigners, should be classed under separate heads [...] Any satisfactory proofs of conversion to Christianity, especially amongst the young, should appear under the head of capacity for civilization.’<sup>731</sup>

Beyond these three main points, *The British Colonization* also consisted of extensive descriptions and knowledge claims of the state of Māori. However, the three points of unused land, the willingness of Māori and the evils suffered by Māori appear as central to the argumentation of the NZA's plans. It is difficult to ascertain the process through which Wakefield came up with this outline and these contents for the book, but in the argumentation of *The British Colonization*, these topics appear as the most central ones that were used to argue for the need and the feasibility of the NZA's plans of action. However, what is clear is that evidence and the argumentation it was used to present could have had complex relationships. In an argumentative process it cannot be assumed that there was a simple path beginning with collecting evidence or testimony continuing to drawing justified conclusions from those. This could seem quite self-evident, but it is also worth stating explicitly.

Altogether, this examination of the argumentation employed by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward on the need to act shows that in a historical examination of argumentation it is necessary to be mindful of what aspects of the argumentation are in question. It is a different matter to examine the centrifugally presented argumentation that was disseminated by an actor or a group, which was then received within a certain context by its audience, than to examine argumentation from the perspective of what was known by those disseminating the argumentation or what the objective real-world situation was. For example, tying the theoretical considerations of the argumentation by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward to the situation in New Zealand, Belich has been sceptical about the accuracy of the fatal impact that was presented in Britain, in contrast to the ‘real world’ situation in New Zealand. He argues that the Colonial Office eventually

<sup>731</sup> Letter from Edward Gibbon Wakefield to Dr Samuel Evans, 11 May 1837, New Zealand Company Micro-MS-0460 Records 1836-1840, ATL, crossed out text in the original.

accepted the fatal impact. The Colonial Office came to accept, for example, what was in Belich's words a 'low-key feud' between two Māori chiefs as evidence of fatal impact and that Kororāreka in the Bay of Islands was seen as a hellhole of vice, while a witness had admitted that it was no worse than an average English seaport. But there was a built-in tendency to exaggerate these vices, because in Belich's view the sense of superiority Europeans had over indigenous peoples meant that how Europeans acted in lands foreign to them was seen as necessarily having had an impact on the people there. European actions, with their supposed superiority, had to have an effect on others.<sup>732</sup> On the one hand, whether or not these were accurate descriptions of the situation in New Zealand could be approached as a question in its own right. But as Roque and Wagner state concerning colonial knowledge, whether it was accurate, truthful or fictional, it can be seen as real since it had, for example, potential to generate action.<sup>733</sup> In this way, in invoking ideas of fatal impact both the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward strove to argue that the conditions in New Zealand were such that action was needed. On the other hand, my examination of these two sides together shows how processes of transfer of knowledge and the use of sources allowed them to form different argumentation from empirical sources, here to justify their different suggestions for New Zealand. In this, an objective sense of accuracy was not guaranteed since the processes of transfer and use of sources were creative processes.

While both the Aborigines Committee in their report and Wakefield and Ward in *The British Colonization* used the harmful effects of European contact on Māori to argue for the necessity of action in New Zealand, there was a distinct difference in what the two sides inferred from that claimed knowledge of situation in the islands which the two sides actually shared. The Aborigines Committee sought to highlight the dichotomy between 'bad settlers' and 'good missionaries' to justify and argue for delimiting European contact with Māori to only encompass missionary work. In turn, Wakefield and Ward expressed that colonisation was already taking place in New Zealand and ought to be merely replaced with the NZA's 'proper and methodical plan' for colonisation. While the contexts and the emphases in presenting harmful European actions differed between the works, it is notable that the form of constructing their argumentation on evidence and proof that appeared empirical in nature was very similar in both works. It appears that similarly to the Committee having based its findings on a mass of gathered evidence from which they constructed their claimed knowledge of Māori and the impact of contact with European, in *The British Colonization* there is at least an appearance of following a similar form of argumentation that grounded the conclusions they presented. The

<sup>732</sup> Belich (1996) 2007, 127 & 186–187.

<sup>733</sup> Roque & Wagner 2012, 14–15.

logical and temporal coherence in the presented evidence and the conclusions presented with them was on occasion somewhat questionable, but the processes of gathering, processing and referencing sources allowed for argumentation to be formed with the use of seemingly appropriate sources.

As the guilt of European settlers was a subject that was heavily emphasised by both the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward, it is somewhat understandable that Māori did not appear as particularly prominent actors in the examination of the conflicts and the proclaimed European evils in either of the works. This was also typical of the Aborigines Committee's report in general, whereas Wakefield and Ward utilised Māori opinions about colonisation prominently to support their arguments for systematic colonisation of New Zealand. In the next section, I turn to another side of arguing for justification for action in New Zealand. I will analyse the different ways that Wakefield and Ward, in contrast to the Aborigines Committee, presented Māori agency in their argumentation.

### 3.1.2 Differences in Alleging Māori Desire for Improvement

Humanitarian ideals calling for the protection of indigenous peoples were central in arguing for action in New Zealand. Both the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward presented what they called European evils perpetrated against Māori, which were given as necessitating urgent action. The perceived idea of a British duty to act in New Zealand, however, was related to more than just the protection of Māori from harmful Europeans. Another significant aspect of this argumentation, with a strong basis in humanitarian thinking, was the view of improvement. Māori were presented, both in the Aborigines Committee's report and in *The British Colonization*, as capable of improving from savagery towards European civilisation. This was seemingly proven with empirical evidence of change that had taken place in Māori. These knowledge claims of the Māori capacity for improvement were further used to construct justification for British action in New Zealand for the two sides' plans. The view of a British duty to impart civilisation to others provided further justification to act in New Zealand, since the goal of both the missionary work, supported by the Aborigines Committee, and the systematic colonisation of the NZA was to civilise Māori and help them 'improve' when viewed from a European perspective.

While seemingly sharing the idea of European civilisation as a goal and something to be promoted among Māori, there were significant differences in how the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward argued justification for action in New Zealand that was intended to provide that civilisation to Māori. In British, and more generally European, 19<sup>th</sup>-century ideals civilisation and Christianity connected to it were presented as desirable improvements. Perceptions of the

inherent value of civilisation and Christianity have often been identified as justification for Europeans colonial actions. This framed so-called savagery as something from which other people should be rescued.<sup>734</sup> However, beyond these principles, there were further apparent justifications in the two sides' argumentation for why it was possible and justified to take action specifically in New Zealand. This was part of the adaptation of general colonial discourses to specific cases, which Roque, Wagner and Clayton note took place in colonial practices.<sup>735</sup> Ballantyne further notes that colonial ethnography specifically has been identified as having created cultural difference between Europeans and Māori that authorised colonialism. However, he notes that more work is needed in exploring how these knowledge traditions were harnessed.<sup>736</sup> The argumentation for British action in New Zealand in the Aborigines Committee's report and *The British Colonization* provide two distinct illustrations of just how views about imparting civilisation and improving Māori were used to justify colonialism in New Zealand.

Here, I argue that, on the one side, the spread of civilisation in the Aborigines Committee's presentation was given as an objectively true and *a priori* desirable goal for the British. This was indicated by the promotion of mainly missionary action without much justification for why such action of supposedly improving Māori would have been justified. Whereas, on the other side, Wakefield and Ward placed a large focus on an apparent and alleged Māori perspective in their argumentation. They argued that not only was civilisation and improvement considered desirable from a European perspective, but Māori themselves also supposedly desired this. The argumentation by Wakefield and Ward was far more connected with showing the practical aspects of why their plans were possible than the Aborigines Committee's more spiritual approach to indigenous peoples.

To elucidate my argument here, I will first examine how the justification for civilising endeavours in New Zealand was argued by Wakefield and Ward and the Aborigines Committee beyond a supposed need to protect Māori from European evils or the more general perceived duty to impart civilisation to those that were perceived as having been less civilised. Here the appearance of the supposed willingness or desire of Māori for contact and improvement provided an argument for colonial action for the two sides. This was more emphasised in *The British Colonization* than the Aborigines Committee's report, as indigenous voices were very much hidden in the latter's report. Then at the end of this section, I expand my view from these two sides' argumentation to examine how different arguments could

<sup>734</sup> Burns 1989, 68–71; Buchan 2005, 3; Ballantyne 2012, 242–243; Belmessous 2013, 66–68; Boisen 2013; Buchan & Andersson Burnett 2019, 5.

<sup>735</sup> See Clayton 2000, xii–xiii.; Roque & Wagner 2012, 3.

<sup>736</sup> Ballantyne 2012, 242.

co-exist alongside and in connection to each other. In order to gain a greater understanding of the interplay between this kind of argumentation and the transfer of knowledge to which both these sides were connected, I raise to the fore one narrative that circulated in the networks of communication between New Zealand and Britain. Namely a letter in which two *rangatira*, Hongi Hika and Waikato, were quoted as wishing that more British people would come to stay in New Zealand. A look into the use of this narrative in different texts illustrates how the processes of intertextual citations could affect the use and significance a single narrative of Māori and their willingness for contact with the British. It also brings up differences that the different contexts could have on one narrative that was repeatedly presented.

There were various views presented in Britain in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century about how Māori should have been perceived as a party in their interactions with Europeans. The differences between the Aborigines Committee's report and *The British Colonization* in how Māori appeared as proactive actors are further accentuated by contemporary questions of Māori sovereignty and independence. In the British colonial administration of the early-19<sup>th</sup>-century, at least in principle, a policy was held that matters, such as sovereignty, trade and land, should have been negotiated with the indigenous peoples. Evangelical lobbying pushed the administrations further in that direction. Attwood, however, also contends that such general factors and individual strands of imperial logic do not fully explain action relative to New Zealand. Instead, he argues that there were also contingent historical forces and events that, for example, influenced the eventual drafting of the Treaty of Waitangi.<sup>737</sup> But these more general strands of imperial logic point to the political climate in which the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward functioned.

Furthermore, in 1835 Busby drafted and persuaded 35 Māori chiefs to sign a declaration of independence as a response to French adventurer Baron de Thierry's announced plans to become the sovereign of New Zealand. In the declaration, these signatories were named 'the United Tribes of New Zealand' and the declaration was written to appeal to King William IV as 'the parent of their infant state', although Adams contends that this union was merely Busby's superficial creation.<sup>738</sup> The question of Māori sovereignty and independence persisted in discussions in the 1830s. Of the sources used by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward, the view of Coates and the CMS, for example, was that Māori independence and sovereignty were to be preserved.<sup>739</sup> Viewing how Māori sovereignty was

<sup>737</sup> Attwood 2020, 96–97.

<sup>738</sup> Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 44–45; Samson 1998, 22; Attwood 2020, 114–115; For the contemporary questions on Māori independence see also Attwood 2020, 112 & 144–145.

<sup>739</sup> Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 81–82.

approached by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward provides another avenue to examine attitudes towards Māori agency and thus acts as a foil against which their use of Māori willingness for British action can be examined.

### Legitimizing Colonisation through Consent

A significant aspect of arguing why action was justified and applicable in New Zealand arose in Wakefield and Ward's work from the apparent perspective of Māori themselves. This was a significant focus in their book, with one section of it having been entitled 'Views of the natives as to the settlement of an English colony in New Zealand, &c.'. Herein were gathered references to various sources detailing reported opinions from Māori individuals on British settlements being set up in New Zealand. The texts appeared to illustrate an apparent willingness of these individuals to have increased interaction and contact with British people. Māori were given as having been willing and even desiring of the change and improvement, which the British could supposedly provide them.<sup>740</sup>

This presentation of Māori consent was significant in many ways in arguing for the NZA's plans. First, it provided a way to fit together contemporary calls for Māori sovereignty with the NZA's plans. While this appears that discussing apparent Māori consent was significant for Wakefield and Ward, their arguments in *The British Colonization* on the subject do not appear to have been sufficient. As late as December of 1837, after there had been extensive talks between the NZA and the British colonial administration, Lord Glenelg still objected to the NZA's plans on the basis that Britain did not have legal or moral basis for establishing colonies in New Zealand without consent from Māori.<sup>741</sup> Yet, Wakefield and Ward attempted to pre-empt such counterarguments with their presentation of supposed Māori willingness in *The British Colonization*. Second, the presentation of supposed Māori consent appears as an attempt to show that it was possible to receive land from Māori, thus making the NZA's plans appear more feasible. Lastly, it was meant to assuage any concern among prospective settlers regarding whether setting up a colony among Māori was safe and practically achievable. In this argumentation of feasibility and justification for the NZA's plans the claims of Māori character and arguments relating to their willingness for contact came together to form consistent argumentation as to why the NZA's plans could be achieved.

Māori consent appeared to have been in a significant role in the discussions between the NZA and the British government. The extent and the content of Wakefield and Ward's discussion of Māori views of colonisation differed

<sup>740</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 252–301.

<sup>741</sup> Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 71.

significantly from the Aborigines Committee's report, the Committee having given the matter far less attention. Wakefield and Ward's expansive examination of the Māori perspective in the section 'Views of the natives' spanned close to 50 pages and included various passages and quotes from different sources. In contrast, in their section on the 'Effects of fair dealing and Christian Instruction', the Committee devoted much attention to the achievements of the missionaries in imparting improvement among indigenous peoples. Yet, neither the active role in achieving this improvement for themselves nor the presence of these indigenous peoples in any source material was distinctly acknowledged by the Committee. From their perspective, the improvement appears to have been achieved through British action and it was presented as an intrinsic goal to be striven for. Conversely, in *The British Colonization*, Māori views on possible colonisation were acknowledged. Furthermore, Māori individuals were given a seemingly active role as they were directly cited to provide evidence of their opinions.

The argument of Māori willingness and desire for British contact, or even colonisation, is notable in the context of British expansion in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. Belmessous states that it was typical that European expansion was legitimised by indigenous consent. Treaties with indigenous peoples were a formalised way of providing such legitimation for these actions. Furthermore, Belmessous connects the colonial aspiration of acquiring consent from to-be-colonised peoples to 17<sup>th</sup>-century liberal philosophy of social contracts, according to which individuals consented to surrender their right to the state. Such philosophical ideas of morality and judicial consideration persisted in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, although lack of consent did not necessarily constrain European colonialism.<sup>742</sup> Nevertheless, in early-19<sup>th</sup>-century British political thought some desirability of indigenous consent appears to have existed, and Wakefield and Ward's argumentation drew on this thinking. Justification through indigenous consent was applied by Wakefield and Ward in their argumentation. Yet, indicative of the multifaceted nature of British colonialism and the different approaches that were taken to it, no such argumentation of indigenous consent appeared necessary for the Aborigines Committee's argumentation.

The content of Wakefield and Ward's presentation of Māori opinion was exemplified at the beginning of their section on the matter by a quote from Yate. Without much context, it was stated that in answering a question of whether Yate '[imagined] that they [Māori] are not averse to a fair system of civilized government', he replied in the affirmative:

<sup>742</sup> Belmessous 2015, 12–14.

I think from all I know of them, they are desirous of it. They are continually applying to us to give them rules and regulations, by which they should conduct themselves in their intercourse with Europeans, and with each other.<sup>743</sup>

This statement from Yate set up Wakefield and Ward's position for the whole section of the book that dealt with how Māori would supposedly have been favourably inclined towards further contact. Here Māori willingness was given as a major reason and justification for setting up colonies in New Zealand. In addition to Yate, the supposed Māori opinions on a British settlement in New Zealand stated in this section were mainly voiced through other European sources. The section consisted of passages from various travellers' accounts of their interaction with Māori, as well as missionary correspondence and sources. These included a letter from one Mr Oakes from New Zealand, which was published in the Sydney newspaper *The Colonist*, extract from Busby's *A Brief Memoir*, extract from Augustus Earle's travel account and shorter passages from other travellers, such as Nicholas, Lieutenant Breton, John Savage and Major Cruise.<sup>744</sup>

Further references by Wakefield and Ward to William White's communications are also particularly notable among these European sources, which supposedly provided Māori views. One of the questions from Dr Hinds to White on behalf of the NZA was whether White had 'any reason for believing that a settlement, from England, would be well received, or approved by the natives'.<sup>745</sup> In the section 'Views of the natives' in *The British Colonization*, White's answer to this question was quoted over five pages. In this quote White stated his view that coming from an honourable and Christian nation 'such a settlement would be hailed by the natives generally, if not universally, as the greatest boon which the British people could confer upon them'. In the quote from White following this statement, he referenced conversations he and other missionaries had had with Māori chiefs, which supposedly proved the willingness of Māori to have Europeans reside among them. Although White noted that the possibility of founding a colony as planned by the NZA was not discussed with Māori chiefs, he did suggest that chiefs in Kaipara had told him that if 'at least a hundred families' were to settle in Kaipara from Britain, 'wars and rumours of wars would cease'.<sup>746</sup>

Curiously, though, while White's reflections on Māori were raised to a very visible role, John Liddiard Nicholas received relatively little attention. Nicholas's

<sup>743</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 253.

<sup>744</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 259–300.

<sup>745</sup> Letter from Robert Roy to Rev. William White, 1 September 1837, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Letter book 1837, ATL.

<sup>746</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 254–259.

published travel account was cited as a description of the suitability of New Zealand to be a British colony. He noted that based on what he had observed of Māori and their willingness to have British people living among them, he ‘[did] not believe there would be any cause for apprehension in this respect’.<sup>747</sup> Nicholas was also present at the NZA’s meeting on May 31, 1837 and according to the minutes he approved of the Association’s plans for New Zealand. According to the minutes he ‘was satisfied, and could bear testimony from his own observations and experience, that it [the NZA’s statement of objects] contained no exaggerations, that it was borne out by facts on every point, entered cordially into the objects of the Association and would promote them by every means in his power’.<sup>748</sup> Yet, he was not cited in *The British Colonization* beyond references to his book. The use of White’s answers to the NZA is, however, very significant. Not only did White provide Wakefield and Ward with possible evidence to support their claims and arguments. Furthermore, the fact that this was one of the five questions presented to White by the NZA shows that Māori views were valuable to the Association, whether it was as argumentative tools for justifying colonisation or as genuinely considered reasons for promoting civilisation for New Zealand.

However, the idea of Māori desire for contact as warranting colonisation, which was seemingly supported by the quote from Yate, was not as straight forward as it appeared from Wakefield and Ward’s presentation. For one, it can be questioned how well the views that were presented of Māori actually reflected their interests at the time. What is more, there was inconsistency between Wakefield and Ward’s presentation of Māori desires and the sources from which these were gleaned even in terms of contemporary British argumentation.

Aside from what was argued in London regarding the situation in New Zealand, real life in New Zealand was a tangle of interpersonal relationships. Māori ideas relating to land title and rights were predominant in the late 1830s. European technology, Christianity and literacy were adopted and adapted to this worldview by Māori at the time. There were cultural differences in understanding interactions, but personal relationships between *rangatira* and individual Europeans rested on their need to trade and interact with each other.<sup>749</sup> Relating to the interests of the different parties concerned with New Zealand, Ballantyne has noted that Marsden’s friendship with the northern *rangatira* Te Pahi and Ruatara at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and the arrangements for founding the first mission station in New Zealand led

<sup>747</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 295.

<sup>748</sup> ‘At a meeting held at the rooms of the New Zealand Association’, 31 May 1837, fr. 306–308, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Minutes etc 1837, ATL, underlining in the original.

<sup>749</sup> Belgrave 2013, chapter 1.

Marsden to think that there was a congruence between his interests and those of the Māori chiefs. But while spiritual matters might have been of interest to Te Pahi and Ruatara, their initial interests were in gaining European technology and farming tools and techniques that were of economic and social importance to them. Thus, there was interest among Māori to receive European trade and missionary contacts in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, but according to Ballantyne these interests were driven mainly by the political balance and contestation between rival *hapū*.<sup>750</sup>

In British, and particularly missionary eyes, it was, however, typical that Polynesian people's curiosity towards European institutions was confused with a willingness to submit to British control. This appears as a projection of the values of the British themselves without seeing how Polynesians used their contacts to serve their own purposes. The historian Alan Ward has viewed this overestimation of Māori willingness as a serious long-standing misperception that informed the decision making by British officials.<sup>751</sup> But that view of Māori willingness was specifically agitated by Wakefield and Ward in their argumentation. This interest in contact was translated into an interest in the supposed spiritual improvement provided by Christianity. Furthermore, in Wakefield and Ward's argumentation this was tuned into a general desire for contact and even colonisation.

On the perspective of the transfer of knowledge from the sources that Wakefield and Ward used to the argumentation they presented with the use of those sources, following the trails of the transfer of knowledge it is notable here that the quote from Yate presenting Māori as wishing 'rules and regulations' was not annotated in any way. It originated from Yate's testimonies before the Aborigines Committee. The question about Māori aversion to civilised government was posed to Yate among a series of questions as to whether expanded powers to the British resident would potentially have had a positive impact on misconduct by Europeans in New Zealand. Thus, contextually the question most probably related to possible Māori reactions to expanding the powers of the resident rather than to any further colonisation.<sup>752</sup> But as was also done in other parts of *The British Colonization*, the questions regarding the possibility of beneficial effects from the British resident were omitted. Out of this context, Yate's testimony appears to have promoted Māori willingness to have some form of British government in New Zealand. The disparity in the implications of Yate's testimony, which is evident in the actual testimony before the Committee and in what was cited in *The British Colonization*, strengthens the view that the

<sup>750</sup> Ballantyne 2015, 60–63.

<sup>751</sup> See e.g. Ward, A. 1974, 15–16 & 31.

<sup>752</sup> See *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 198, question 1741.

presentation of Māori as desiring colonisation arose largely from the perspective and interests of the NZA and Wakefield and Ward.

Further examination of the differences between what Yate stated relating to the British Resident and what the NZA proposed illuminates this matter further. Considering that Busby's role as Resident in the 1830s was mainly an exercise in informal influence by the British government to New Zealand without proper colonial rule,<sup>753</sup> such an informal approach to New Zealand would not have suited the NZA's colonisation plans. Here Wakefield and Ward's omission of the Committee's context of questioning is particularly significant and its effect is evident. Wakefield and Ward's use of Yate's testimony to show Māori as willing to have British colonisation in New Zealand would have been undercut by the very next answer he gave to the Aborigines Committee. In this following answer Yate noted that Māori would supposedly have accepted expanded British government when it was specifically directed at Europeans. However, on the issue of more expansive colonial action Yate stated that 'the natives would, I believe, resist to the death any attempt to take possession of their country'.<sup>754</sup> Yet, with this surrounding context omitted Yate's statements seemed to imply an endorsement of British expansion even from the Māori point of view. As Robert Grant notes, later on in 1840 John Ward used similar argumentation to play down suggestions that Māori objected to British occupation of their lands by stating that they wished to receive the benefits of colonisation. Ward wrote that Māori viewed it almost as an insult that Australia should be colonised but not New Zealand and '[t]hey [Māori] are offended that we do not colonize their country; and with good reason, for they see the substantial benefits that would accrue to them' from British laws and other aspects of British civilisation.<sup>755</sup> The alleged Māori desire to have contact, and specifically settlement by the British in Wakefield and Ward's use of sources, was then a central point in justifying the NZA's plans.

Not all of the supposed Māori opinion on further contact was presented singularly through European sources. Māori willingness for contact was also made evident through means similar to the anecdotes about individual Māori and the apparent Māori voices that were presented by Wakefield and Ward in their formation of claims on Māori character. In the section 'Views of the natives', there was a relatively brief reference to and quotation of the wishes of two Māori chiefs, Hongi Hika and Waikato, for more Europeans to come to settle among them. This was just over a page long. Notably though, the views of Hongi and Waikato were written

<sup>753</sup> See e.g. Belich (1996) 2007, 181.

<sup>754</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 198, question 1742.

<sup>755</sup> Grant 2003, 23; see also Ward, J. 1840, 78–79.

down by the CMS missionary Thomas Kendall when the chiefs were visiting Britain with Kendall in 1820. Thus, again there was a clear European mediation of this message.<sup>756</sup> According to this statement quoted by Wakefield and Ward, Hongi and Waikato wished to meet the King and ‘the multitude of his people’. Moreover, they wanted to see what British people had done with their land and on returning to New Zealand they wished to be accompanied by 100 British people. These Britons were to go to New Zealand to work among Māori as blacksmiths, carpenters, preachers and people looking for iron. There were to be an additional twenty soldiers to protect the settlers and three officers to keep the soldiers in order. Hongi and Waikato also reportedly wished for the settlers to bring cattle with them, and the settlers would have readily received land, which there was to spare in New Zealand. Although these views from Hongi and Waikato were again mediated through a British missionary, Wakefield and Ward emphasised as part of their argumentation that the views were the two Māori’s own wishes by explicitly stating that the text was written down by Kendall from Hongi and Waikato’s dictation. Wakefield and Ward also argued that this opinion was ‘a very concise but very explicit, declaration by Honghi and his friend Wykato, of their wishes and views of colonization in New Zealand’.<sup>757</sup> In this way, consistently with their other use of sources, Wakefield and Ward used alleged Māori opinion to argue their case alongside other views.

Some further Māori voices were also cited to a similar effect in the section preceding ‘Views of the natives’. Printed transcriptions of several letters from Māori individuals to the CMS missionary James Kemp featured in the section entitled ‘General character of New Zealanders’. These letters were written in response to the possibility of the Kerikeri mission station being shut down, and they represented the wishes of Māori individuals to have Kemp and other missionaries remain in Kerikeri to teach them.<sup>758</sup> The letters from Rewarewa, Tupe and Oka, ‘Honghi (old Honghi’s son)’ and Tuauru had been printed in *Church Missionary Record* for the year 1836 and copied in the exact same form in *The British Colonization*. In the *Record*, it was stated that these letters were written to Kemp and translated by Yate when he was in England.<sup>759</sup> In Wakefield and Ward’s book’s section on the ‘General character’ of Māori, these letters appeared as part of a section that presented Māori improvement and were given as ‘specimens of the correspondence of the natives’ indicating Māori willingness to receive instruction from missionaries. The extent to which Wakefield and Ward presented Māori willingness for contact indicates a notable focus on Māori consent in their argumentation.

<sup>756</sup> On Hongi Hika and Waikato’s visit to Britain see e.g. Ulrich Cloher 2003, 120–121.

<sup>757</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 263–264.

<sup>758</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 240–242.

<sup>759</sup> *Church Missionary Record for the Year* 1836, 163–164.

As notable as this acknowledgement of Māori perspective is, it is again worth asking why Wakefield and Ward acknowledged Māori to such an extent? Following Attwood's remarks, there were contemporary political principles that could have affected Wakefield and Ward's argumentation, but equally there were also contingent contextual aspects at play. Attwood suggests that Wakefield and Ward's respect towards Māori sovereignty was due to the NZA's attempt to win backing from the Whig government. As support for this, Attwood notes that Dr Hinds stated in 1838, as a witness to the House of Lords Select Committee on New Zealand, that the NZA was ready to adopt either view on Māori sovereignty if the Queen viewed Māori as sovereign or not.<sup>760</sup> Whether this shows disingenuity on the part of the original statement of the NZA's plans or Wakefield and Ward in claiming to acknowledge Māori sovereignty is rather unclear from the 1837 papers of the NZA and up to interpretation. There could have been, for example, differences of opinion within the NZA or this change in stances could have been the effect of changing circumstances with the NZA's negotiations with the government. However, in terms of Wakefield and Ward's argumentation, it is clear that there was at least an attempt to reconcile the humanitarian concern for Māori, which could have been either simply adjusting to outside pressure or genuine humanitarian thinking. As the historian Rachel Standfield suggests, Māori voice was co-opted for the processes of dispossession after the signing of the Treaty. She points out that calls for protecting Māori did not fall aside immediately after the signing of the Treaty, but George Clarke, who was appointed the Protector of Aborigines in New Zealand and was expected to simultaneously buy land from them, and other colonial actors in the early 1840s used Māori consent to reconcile practiced of dispossession and protection.<sup>761</sup> This same strategy was also used by Wakefield and Ward. But alongside these considerations there were also more concrete matters that influenced Wakefield and Ward's presentation of Māori willingness.

The outset of the section on 'Views of the natives' in *The British Colonization* was in fact not framed primarily as a consideration of Māori feelings or their rights. Wakefield and Ward instead approached the subject at the very beginning of the chapter from the perspective of the prospective settlers' concerns for the colonisation plans:

The manner in which the New Zealanders would regard the settlement of a colony amongst them, forms a subject of leading consideration with settlers. All

<sup>760</sup> Attwood 2020, 119–120; see also *Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords appointed to inquire into the Present State of the Islands of New Zealand 1838*, Minutes of Evidence, 129–133.

<sup>761</sup> Standfield 2018, 58, 69–74.

serious anxiety on the subject we hold as removed, by their conduct towards the missionaries during the last twenty years, and by their willing and cordial intercourse with European settlers, and the other persons engaged in shipping and mercantile speculations.<sup>762</sup>

The chapter thus carried the message that Māori were willing and even desirous of having further contact with Europeans, in which case there should have been no anxiety in prospective settlers' minds for settling in New Zealand.

Among Wakefield and Ward's humanitarian-leaning language in *The British Colonization*, it is easy to lose sight that a major goal for the book was to facilitate setting up a settler colony in New Zealand. Much of the language on Māori and justifications for the need to act were framed through the veil of humanitarian concern for their well-being. Yet, *The British Colonization* and other forms of communication from the NZA were written with the goal of gaining support and enacting their colonial plans, even though alongside these goals they presented the supposed capacity of their plans to achieve moral and beneficial effects on Māori. Wakefield and Ward did stipulate that Māori sovereignty was to be respected,<sup>763</sup> and they also stated early on in their book that not long ago the British would have disregarded indigenous rights when colonising new lands. Instead, they stated it was necessary to treat Māori with justice to which end the NZA proposed their systematic colonisation plans.<sup>764</sup> Adams points out that by the mid-1840s after the NZC was active in the practical colonisation of New Zealand, the stipulation of Māori sovereignty was forgotten and supporters of the NZC demanded assertions of sovereignty over New Zealand based on right of discovery.<sup>765</sup> But in the context of the earlier debates the humanitarian perspective was prominent alongside trying to gain support for the NZA's plans.

This humanitarian lens should not however be confused as the primary driving force behind Wakefield and Ward's writings. Pursuant to the NZA's goal of founding new colonies, *The British Colonization* was published to make the Association's plan generally known. The NZA was at the time looking for applications from prospective settlers for New Zealand. With these plans in mind, one intended audience for the NZA's communication of their plans were prospective settlers to enact their plans, as well as their seeking governmental and monetary

<sup>762</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand 1837*, 252–253.

<sup>763</sup> Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 150; See *The British Colonization of New Zealand 1837*, 52–53.

<sup>764</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand 1837*, 52–53.

<sup>765</sup> Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 150.

support.<sup>766</sup> Considering the savage reputation and stories circulating in Britain in the 1830s about Māori, it is reasonable that there might have been apprehensions among this audience over relocating to New Zealand, where they would have lived close to Māori of whom they had heard such stories. For example, Belich notes that in the 1780s early British plans for a penal colony in New Zealand were squashed due to the dangerous and bloodthirsty reputation of Māori.<sup>767</sup> Therefore, while Wakefield and Ward did bring up Māori perspective, a major reason for this appears to have been to assuage prospective the concerns of prospective settlers about settling in New Zealand. This kind of tension between humanitarian language and colonial audiences constantly raises questions about how genuine the humanitarian concern was in Wakefield and Ward's argumentation. Moreover, how compatible that concern was in British thought of the 1830s with colonisation plans, such as those the NZA proposed.

There was also some evolution in how Wakefield presented the role of Māori in their interactions with Europeans in relation to his theories. He had previously commented on New Zealand as having already been undergoing British colonisation along with a certain notion of Māori willingness to accept colonisation. Wakefield had appeared as a witness for the Select Committee on the Disposal of Lands in the British Colonies in 1836. This committee was very sympathetic to Wakefield's ideas about colonialism and the committee consisted of several members of the South Australian Association and future supporters of Wakefield. The committee heard much evidence from Wakefield and ended up endorsing his colonial theories.<sup>768</sup> He was asked whether there were 'any parts of the world, subject to our dominion now, in which you imagine that new colonies might be founded advantageously under this proposed system'. To this Wakefield answered that there were many such areas in Australia and from Australia he proceeded to describe New Zealand as a space for colonisation. According to his testimony, New Zealand was already being colonised by British settlers:

<sup>766</sup> On Wakefield's intentions for disseminating the NZA's plans with *The British Colonization* see e.g. 'At the meeting of the Committee & other members of the New Zealand Association', 21 November 1837, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Minutes etc 1837, ATL. Receiving applications for settlers to New Zealand was discussed by Wakefield in a letter to E. B. Hopper of the NZA. See letter from E. G. Wakefield to E. B. Hooper, 24 November 1837, MS-Papers-3124 Wakefield, Edward Gibbon, 1796–1862: Letter to E B Hopper concerning progress and plans for colonisation, ATL. The NZA also used similar pamphlets with some exact same textual passages as appear in *The British Colonization* to advertise New Zealand directly to possible settlers. See e.g. Ward, J. 1840.

<sup>767</sup> Belich (1996) 2007, 129.

<sup>768</sup> Temple 2012, chapter 11.

New Zealand is coming under the dominion of the British Crown. Adventurers go from New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land, and make a treaty with a native chief, a tripartite treaty, the poor chief not understanding a single word about it; [...] for a few trinkets and a little gunpowder they [the British] obtain land.<sup>769</sup>

According to Wakefield, this uncontrolled settler movement would have been followed by sending a governor, which would have resulted in those parts of New Zealand becoming a British province. Thus, the whole process of colonising New Zealand would have been done 'in a most slovenly, and scrambling, and disgraceful manner'.<sup>770</sup> The on-going spread of British settlers and sailors to New Zealand was a central argument here for Wakefield in advocating that New Zealand had already been undergoing colonisation. Here there was no mention of physical harm having been caused to Māori by the allegedly uncontrolled and on-going colonisation, but the whole process in which this colonisation was supposedly taking place appeared as flawed in Wakefield's view. Although in this testimony before the Committee on the Disposal of Lands, Wakefield did not yet spell out his possible plans for systematic colonisation, the argument of uncontrolled and 'disgraceful' colonisation as having taken place was already present.

*The British Colonization* and Wakefield's testimony before the Committee on the Disposal of Lands shared many of the same basic concepts of Wakefield's argumentation for colonisation. Yet, in these two different arguments on New Zealand by Wakefield, which were presented one year apart, the role given to Māori carried strikingly different implications. This is particularly apparent in the stark differences in the rhetoric and argumentative manners in which Māori were presented as actors. In Wakefield's testimony before the Committee on Disposal of Lands, Māori appeared as people who were being cheated out of their lands for not understanding the interactions with Europeans. Based on this Wakefield's narration, Māori appeared as willing to trade land to Europeans, but the manner in which such a trade was carried out was presented by Wakefield as problematic. Contrasting that view to the role of Māori in the argumentation present in *The British Colonization*, a major part of the section on the 'Views of the Natives' was devoted to gathering various pieces of evidence expressing the desire of Māori to have further contact with Europeans. Here this desire appeared as an argument as to why British colonisation was supposedly justified, and no question of Māori possibly not

<sup>769</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on the Disposal of Lands* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 108, question 961.

<sup>770</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on the Disposal of Lands* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 108, question 961.

understanding the interactions or being cheated out of their land remained in connection to the NZA's plans. It is of course very possible that after further research into New Zealand Wakefield had adjusted his view of Māori. Yet, what this evolution in his centrifugal argumentation shows is that an argument, such as Māori willingness to sell land, could be adapted into various different contexts and various implications with slight variations.

Another aspect of Wakefield and Ward's justification for colonising New Zealand involved land, its use and its acquisition. Land was central to Wakefieldian theories, and it was also central for the NZA. The acquisition of land from Māori remained one of the main requirements for the NZA for the realisation of their colonisation plans. This requirement was even carried over to the NZC's further planning for New Zealand.<sup>771</sup> Land was also tied closely to Māori consent. Arguing the existence of Māori consent for selling land to the British was very advantageous to the NZA. As there were views in British political thought that indigenous peoples were, at least to some degree, sovereign and owners of their lands,<sup>772</sup> any acquisition of land from Māori needed to be presented as legitimate and likely to be achieved.

The question of land actually tied the presentation of Māori character and supposed Māori consent for contact together to suit Wakefield and Ward's argumentation for why colonisation was possible and justified in New Zealand. A significant part of the presentation concerning 'waste land' in New Zealand was contained in the section 'Views of the natives'. Alongside the argument that Māori supposedly wanted colonisation was the complementary argument that '[t]here is abundance and to spare of unoccupied territory, without encroaching on what is required by the native population,—a surplus which they are most desirous to sell'. Even if that land was by some political principles considered as having belonged to Māori, in Wakefield and Ward's argumentation this land, having been 'waste', meant that Māori would have been willing to sell it. In further support of this argumentation, Wakefield and Ward's claims of the character and population of Māori supposedly proved that there was plenty of waste land, since this section also contained the examination of Māori 'superstitions' and polygamy as supposed causes for a low Māori population in New Zealand.<sup>773</sup> This was a point Wakefield also expressed in NZA meetings. In a meeting on May 31, 1837, he stated that the Māori population in New Zealand had been exaggerated and that 'it would be a very long time, many generations, before the natural increase of the native population

<sup>771</sup> Belich (1996) 2007, 179.

<sup>772</sup> Attwood 2020, 96.

<sup>773</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand 1837*, 271–276.

could bring it into a fair proportion to the great extent of fertile territory'.<sup>774</sup> Even the quote from Hongi and Waikato about their apparent wish to have Britons reside among them was given as illustrating Hongi and Waikato's view that there was plenty of land that could be provided to the settlers. Thus, Māori consent and the supposed existence of waste land worked together towards Wakefield and Ward's argument that colonisation was possible.

Land in general was a significant subtext for Wakefield and Ward and it was closely connected to Wakefieldian colonisation plans relating to the sale of land to settlers. Yet, the concept of waste land does not appear to have necessitated extensive argumentation on behalf of Wakefield and Ward. It was covered in a relatively brief space in *The British Colonization*. Instead, the presentation of alleged Māori opinions was far more prominent in *The British Colonization*. As Wakefield wrote to Dr Evans about the outline of the book, 'the inclination of the natives to sell land' appears in it as a part of their argumentation. However, the presentation of Māori willingness came to include a wider range of justifications than merely willingness to sell land.

Even though the presentation of supposed Māori consent in *The British Colonization* did not stave off criticism towards their plans from the likes of Lord Glenelg, argumentatively Wakefield and Ward provided a neat package that tied different aspects of their claims about Māori together to form justification and proof of the feasibility of the NZA's plans. Wakefield and Ward argued that Māori wished for further contact, whilst at the same time their character and customs meant that there was plenty of waste land that they were willing to sell. What is more, Māori were given as capable of improving from their contact with Europeans, which they supposedly wished for, and all in all this civilising was one of the NZA's goals. Together with the presentation of New Zealand's climate and geography, all this worked to depict New Zealand as a suitable space for colonisation, with interactions between Europeans and Māori that were supposedly beneficial to both sides. The idea of the supposedly beneficial effects of colonisation for Māori in fact persisted in the thinking of the NZA's personnel. A few years later in the NZC, the successor of the NZA, it was believed that Māori land could be bought with something of a trifle and the actual reward for the land for Māori would have been the civilisation that arose from social and commercial interactions.<sup>775</sup> This view of civilising as a reward could have also reconciled slight disparities between Wakefield's earlier apparent condemnation of cheating Māori out of their lands with trinkets and the NZA's plans for colonising New Zealand by acquiring land from them. The NZA,

<sup>774</sup> 'At a meeting held at the rooms of the New Zealand Association', 31.5.1837, fr. 306–308, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Minutes etc, ATL.

<sup>775</sup> Grant 2003, 23.

after all, proposed a systematic and ‘civilising’ colony rather than the uncontrolled colonisation that it viewed negatively. As an argumentative work for presenting the NZA’s plans, there was a clear internal logic and cohesion in *The British Colonization*, which was achieved through more-or-less creative citing and selection of different sources.

In direct contrast to Wakefield and Ward’s arguments of the existence of Māori consent to have contact and to sell their waste land, Māori activity and questions of waste land received far less attention from the Aborigines Committee. This appears consistent with the two sides’ interests. Waste land and Māori consent for colonisation was of more concern to Wakefield and Ward due to the NZA’s colonisation plans having rested on access to land, whereas the Committee was more concerned with the conduct of European settlers. In the Committee’s humanitarian argumentation waste land was not discussed in a significant capacity, but there was a brief condemnation in the report based on Coates, Beecham and Ellis’s evidence of ‘disposing lands without any reference to the possessors and actual occupants’.<sup>776</sup> In the humanitarian thinking evident in the Committee’s report, the disposal of indigenous peoples’ land was denounced. But Wakefield and Ward’s emphasis on *waste* land not used by Māori in New Zealand gave them at least the appearance of honouring Māori sovereignty, which the authors had outlined as necessary. As opposed to Wakefield and Ward’s acknowledgement and even argumentative use of supposed Māori opinion of colonisation, the Aborigines Committee, consistently with their general discussion of New Zealand, gave little attention to Māori desires. This bypassing of Māori interests, however, appears as an indication of how the Committee viewed the justification of Christianisation and intervention that they proposed for New Zealand. I will look more closely at this Committee’s view next.

### The Self-Affirming Value of Improvement

The emphasis on indigenous views by Wakefield and Ward stands in stark contrast to the Aborigines Committee’s report, in which indigenous voices in general were nearly non-existent. Even the above-mentioned testimony from Yate, in which he stated that Māori would resist anyone taking possession of their country, was not included in the report proper. This statement would appear to have supported the Committee’s argument of any European actions, apart from missionary work, not having been desirable for New Zealand. Nonetheless, little such acknowledgement of Māori opinion appeared in the report. The views of Māori themselves were nearly

<sup>776</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 4; See also *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1836*, Minutes of Evidence, 515, question 4267.

completely disregarded in relation to plans for their improvement. Amid discussion of missionary work in the Pacific islands generally, only one general remark appeared in the report that stated that ‘the natives are very desirous of having Europeans to reside among them’ because of the trade they acquired from this contact.<sup>777</sup> Beyond this comment, very little attention was given to Māori either having been for or against contact with Europeans. In contrast to Wakefield and Ward’s clear and explicit argumentation of Māori as willing and desirous of contact with Europeans, the approach taken by the Committee raises questions of why they viewed their suggested line of action as justified, or whether they had any such considerations at all.

From the Committee’s humanitarian and missionary-minded approach to indigenous peoples, it is consistent that Christianity and civilisation were perceived as unobjectionable goals in little need of justification. Foreign missions were seen, at least from inside the mission, as manifesting Britain’s moral and divine obligation towards ‘others’.<sup>778</sup> Jeffrey Cox describes sceptical and hostile attitudes that were faced by missionary enterprises in Britain and gives an example of how the need of missionary work in the Pacific and the Caribbean was presented by Wesleyan missionaries. This justification rested on the idea of the universality of human depravity in order to show that missionary work was needed to redeem people from this condition. Cox notes that the argument did not involve valuations of western cultures as good and non-western cultures as bad but was focused on the beneficial effects of Christianity.<sup>779</sup> The argument was not about whether spreading Christianity was morally good or bad, indicating that this, and by extension civilisation, were not seen as moral dilemmas.

British views of an obligation to civilise others is in this sense entangled with the contemporary ideas of British trusteeship as discussed by Andrew Porter and Camilla Boisen. British conceptions of trusteeship signified that actions were to be taken in order to help or protect indigenous or other non-European peoples. Porter points to two differing conceptions in late-18<sup>th</sup>-century Britain of trusteeship; one in which laws were to be implemented to restrict actions by British subjects in order to preserve indigenous freedom and the other in which laws would be used to ‘channel the activities’ of the people under consideration.<sup>780</sup> Boisen further presents another view of trusteeship in which land in colonies was held in trust by Europeans until the indigenous peoples had reached a stage of civilisation viewed appropriate for

<sup>777</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 57.

<sup>778</sup> Jensz & Acke 2013, 369.

<sup>779</sup> Cox 2008, 118–120.

<sup>780</sup> Porter 1999, 198–201.

them to achieve self-determination.<sup>781</sup> What such conceptions of trusteeship held in common was a view of justification for European action. As Boisen notes, ‘[t]he moral, political and epistemic authority of trusteeship was [...] based on the promise of self-determination’. In British minds it promised benefit for those governed and it embodied Enlightenment-inspired concern for the condition of indigenous peoples by facilitating their civilising. In all this, indigenous welfare and the civilising progress were central factors in justifying British action. If justification depended on the benefit the European actions supposedly conferred on the governed, as Boisen points out,<sup>782</sup> the basic principle of Christianising and civilising indigenous people would not in the Committee’s context have necessarily required further justification beyond the perceived fact that Christianisation was justification in itself. This could explain why little focus was given to indigenous views of the matter, since whatever their view at that moment was, from a British paternalistic perspective Christianisation and civilising were desirable in their own right. Furthermore, in the Committee’s argumentation there appears to have been a view that improvement in indigenous peoples would have resulted in a desire in them for further improvement.

From the Committee’s perspective there might not have appeared a need for an indigenous people to desire improvement or civilisation. This viewpoint arose from a belief that such people might simply not have been sufficiently civilised to understand that they wished for civilisation. This might not have been a universally accepted view, and the philosopher John Locke, for example, viewed that even though all peoples had not developed to the same level of reason as the English, they could still perceive and understand the necessity to convert to Christian civility.<sup>783</sup> Yet, in the Committee’s practical argumentation for Christianising indigenous peoples, the arguments of Christianisation and improvement as providing new wants and new understanding can be seen throughout their report. This was not only related to Māori or Polynesian peoples, but also based on the Committee’s understanding of the example of Native Americans.

The Committee’s examination of the ‘effects of fair dealing’ featured many references to indigenous peoples in North America, even though it did not examine North America extensively. They stated that there was on-going correspondence between the Government and the lieutenant-governor of Upper Canada. Hence, the Committee did not wish to interfere in questions relating to North America without having been in possession of all the information that would have derived from this correspondence.<sup>784</sup> Yet, these references to Native Americans appear as examples of

<sup>781</sup> Boisen 2013, 336.

<sup>782</sup> Boisen 2013, 344–345.

<sup>783</sup> See Belmessous 2013, 63.

<sup>784</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 86.

past missionary contact and perceived improvement in indigenous peoples. The examples of allegedly beneficial missionary action in North America were based on the testimonies of Coates, Beecham and Ellis, and to a large degree again emphasised the beneficial effects of missionary work, which was a running theme in the whole report.<sup>785</sup> More relevant to the role given to indigenous peoples themselves was the Committee's summation and interpretation of this evidence. The Committee stated that Christianity that was preached to Native Americans had had the effect of making them desire further improvement:

Christianity was preached to them by resident missionaries; and no sooner did they become converts to its doctrines, than they exhibited that desire for the advantages of civilized life, and that delight in its conveniences, which have hitherto been supposed to belong exclusively to cultivated nations, and to be utterly strange and abhorrent to the nature of the savage.<sup>786</sup>

A similar view of Christianity creating a desire for improvement was also raised in the report from the testimonies of the three secretaries relating to Pacific missions. A long passage from Ellis's evidence was quoted in the report in which he stated that '[w]hen the natives adopted Christianity they were willing to become pupils in school; but until Christianity supplied a motive, by producing a desire to read the Scripture, they never had a motive sufficient[...]'.<sup>787</sup> Furthermore, very brief remarks were quoted by the Committee from Dyani Tshatshu on how Xhosa often questioned why British missionaries would preach to them instead of their British countrymen in the Cape. But this remark was followed by promises of missionary success despite the doubts of Xhosa.<sup>788</sup> This again indicated a view that even if indigenous people had doubts about missionary endeavours, this would not present an obstacle to missionary influence.

The inclusion of some indigenous voice, such as the reference to Tshatshu, in the report is notable. However, this is also indicative of the Committee's use of indigenous voices and opinions more generally. Tshatshu was visiting London and was interviewed by the Committee, yet the extent he was used explicitly as a source was limited to this short remark. Lester views that Tshatshu's calls for metropolitan disowning of British actions in the Cape were drowned out by the existing

<sup>785</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 48–49. See also citations to Coates, Beecham and Ellis's testimonies in *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1836*, Minutes of Evidence, 527–531.

<sup>786</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 49–50.

<sup>787</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 50.

<sup>788</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 72–73.

preoccupations of humanitarian discourse, including a need to show the feasibility of missionary instruction.<sup>789</sup> As Tshatshu was featured in the report only in such a brief remark as a witness to the Committee on the Cape Colony, which was a major focus of the Aborigines Committee, it would appear consistent with the Committee's use of sources that no Māori opinions or voice reached the report.

These pieces of evidence from the missionary secretaries and the Committee's reading of the evidence emphasise the role of Christianity and missionary work in their argumentation for action among indigenous peoples. They also provide an indication of why the perspectives of the indigenous peoples themselves were very much absent from the Committee's argumentation, especially when contrasted to that of *The British Colonization*. If Christianity created a desire for further civilisation and improvement, the desire of the indigenous peoples themselves was not necessarily considered necessary for a contemporary justification for British action in the way it was presented by Wakefield and Ward. This seems almost contradictory to British missionary ideals on indigenous people adopting Christianity. Cox argues that in missionary work, in contrast to other forms of British imperialism, there was a recognition of the need for a voluntary consent from the people to whom missionary work was directed. Especially against the backdrop of slavery, consent for adopting Christianity was considered important.<sup>790</sup> The Committee did, however, indicate that Christianity would lead to a desire for civilisation. Thus, a lack of consent for other colonial actions, such as selling land, did not necessarily mean a lack of consent for adopting Christianity. Rather, the Committee's knowledge claims of Māori as having been continually improving through missionary work seem to have suggested that they were in fact adopting Christianity quite consensually, irrespective of how accurate to the real life that view might have been. This adoption of Christianity would then have supposedly led directly to desiring and adopting civilisation. Thus, on a general level it could have been viewed, based on this argumentation, that if the indigenous peoples did not explicitly wish for civilisation or improvement, this could have supposedly been due to them not having been improved enough to desire that improvement.

This stance from the Committee clearly implies that the appraisal of the indigenous peoples in question influenced how interactions with them were considered. In Boisen's examination of trusteeship, a similar appraisal is also evident since the theoretical aspects of trusteeship meant that land was to be held in trust until the indigenous people had reached a stage of civilisation at which self-determination was appropriate. This, in turn, required continuous judgements of the

<sup>789</sup> Lester 2002b, 289.

<sup>790</sup> Cox 2008, 16 & 66–67.

capabilities and potential for civilisation of these peoples.<sup>791</sup> This judgement was evident in the Committee's report. It can be questioned whether these kinds of evaluations were ever intended to be used in practice to release land back to indigenous peoples once they reached a supposedly proper stage of civilisation. Michael Mann, for example, suggests that a complete similarity with those colonised was never admitted by Europeans since equality would have resulted in the eradication of the basis for colonial rule.<sup>792</sup> Views of indigenous peoples and justifications that were in line with the concept of trusteeship do, however, show how the evaluation of indigenous peoples was used to legitimate colonial action, even if only on a theoretical level.

The practice of how and the extent to which European perceptions of indigenous people's character can have influenced justifications of European action towards them can be further problematised with the example of treaty making. The connections between treaty making and European perceptions of indigenous peoples have been linked together in historiography. Belmessous points to conventional ideas in historiography that have suggested that treaty making was promoted or dismissed with different indigenous groups based on anthropological assessments of their capability to take part in treaties. She criticises this view pointing out that the British entered into treaties in North America with different groups regardless of their level of cultivation or complexity of political structures. Instead, she argues that the stadial perceptions of the groups' advancement were used as *post hoc* justifications and, instead, Europeans made treaties when the balance of power was favourable to indigenous peoples. While Europeans did hold prejudices against different peoples, she views that just as these prejudices could have been used to justify colonial action, they could also be disregarded if it was strategically expedient.<sup>793</sup>

Generally, this argument has merit. Yet, without further specification and tying to specific contexts, it also runs the risk of trivialising how indigenous peoples were perceived in connection to European action in the face of the very multifaceted history of European colonialism. While it is possible that in keeping with Belmessous's point treaties were also made with peoples who were not considered advanced enough from a stadial perspective when it was useful for the European side, it can be too simplistic to state that anthropological assessments were only, or even in most cases, used as justifications after the matter. For the Committee the claim that Māori were not sufficiently improved provided an argument that treaties should not be entered into. On the other hand, in concert with their presentation of

<sup>791</sup> Boisen 2013, 336.

<sup>792</sup> Mann 2004, 5.

<sup>793</sup> Belmessous 2015, 9–10.

Māori as proactive participants in their interactions with Europeans, Wakefield and Ward depicted treaties as a proper way to define the respective rights of the British in the proposed colony and those Māori who were not part of the colony.<sup>794</sup> I do not mean to imply that stadial or anthropological assessments of indigenous peoples were the only factor in how interactions with indigenous peoples were viewed. Belmessous's point about practical reasons, rather than anthropological assessments, having been of central importance in some cases for entering into treaties is also valid. But neither were these considerations regarding the level of improvement or civilisation always inconsequential or only retrospective. In terms of argumentation and the use of knowledge, these kinds of assessments could have been used as argumentation and justification contemporaneously, and, as such, they could be valuable indications of what types of arguments were considered credible and useable in different places and at different times. The use of knowledge claims by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward concerning Māori character indicates clearly that in at least the humanitarian inspired context of the early-19<sup>th</sup>-century Britain, assessments of indigenous peoples were practicable arguments for presenting justification for action. Belmessous is right to point out that there has been no clear-cut distinction that treaties were made only with peoples that were perceived as sufficiently civilised. However, closer examination of different contexts in which anthropological assessment of indigenous peoples was or was not used can give a valuable window into what argumentation was considered appropriate at different times and in varied contexts.

The claimed Māori incapacity to stand up to Europeans was argued as necessitating the implementation of solutions other than treaties and also inferred a need for trusteeship and civilising through other means. It appears, thus, as a recurring view of the Committee that indigenous people, while having been the objects for protection by early-19<sup>th</sup>-century humanitarians, did not appear civilised enough to stand up or speak for themselves and therefore were considered, from a humanitarian perspective, to require help from Europeans through mechanisms similar to trusteeship. As Penelope Edmonds characterises early-19<sup>th</sup>-century British humanitarianism, its advocates were inclined towards protective paternalism to such a degree that they did not countenance indigenous sovereignty.<sup>795</sup> While the humanitarian perspective towards New Zealand within the British administration and even in the Aborigines Committee, to a certain degree, upheld Māori sovereignty as something to be protected, Edmonds's observation of protective paternalism over acknowledging sovereignty is also accurate in the debates on New Zealand. This approach by the Committee to Māori and other indigenous peoples gives some

<sup>794</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand 1837*, 57.

<sup>795</sup> Edmonds 2018, 5.

indication as to the question posed by Lambert and Lester regarding how beliefs by individuals, who were in their time progressive in their views towards indigenous peoples, translated into a failure to identify and to listen to the perspective of those indigenous peoples.<sup>796</sup> It appears that through the paternalistic views of the supposedly civilising and transformative influences of Christianity, which were evident in the Committee's discussion in their report, it was possible to form a certain internal logic regarding how the Committee argued for intervention in New Zealand while at the same time supposedly upholding what was seen or presented as the best interests of Māori.

All this does not, however, mean that indigenous perspective was absolutely disregarded by the Aborigines Committee in favour of their own theoretical perspectives. In comparing the approaches to indigenous peoples by Wakefield and Ward and the Aborigines Committee, it is necessary to take into consideration not only the disparity in acknowledging Māori and indigenous perspective in their argumentation on British action, but also the difference in the textual styles of their works, in which these arguments were made. The Aborigines Committee's report strongly emphasised missionary evidence over other testimonies that they were gathered. With the emphasis on missionary evidence and the expansive pro-missionary stance taken in the Committee's report, it is to be expected that views would have been highlighted that reflected the missionary values of spreading Christianity and thereby intending to improve others. The lack of naming sources was also consistent with the report's whole textual style. Only a few missionary sources were specifically named in the report and other sources, although active in the networks between New Zealand and Britain, were often neglected to be mentioned. As seen before, this not only applied to Māori but also to missionaries who originally communicated their views from New Zealand to the mission secretaries. In terms of textual genres, this could signify the difference between a parliamentary committee report, in which the detail was presented in the Minutes of Evidence and detailed notes were given referring to it, as opposed to a book like *The British Colonization*, which consisted of extensive extracts and quotes from seemingly a multitude of sources.

In fact, indigenous perspectives were on occasion raised in the proceedings of the Committee when gathering the witness testimonies. The Committee questioned witnesses on indigenous responses to attempts at Christianising or civilising them. Yet, these testimonies were not raised in the report proper. The Committee asked a number of witnesses, whether Aborigines in New South Wales were 'averse to cultivating' soil as a reason for them not settling down to live in one place. They also

<sup>796</sup> Lambert & Lester 2004, 337.

enquired how willing local people in southern Africa were to receive instruction from missionaries, as well as whether those people showed any desire to improve their dwellings. Moreover, there was the above-mentioned question to Yate of Māori's willingness to have 'a fair system of civilized government'.<sup>797</sup> While this kind of questioning was dwarfed in its extent by the Committee's other focuses, for example on missionaries' perceptions of how indigenous peoples had supposedly improved through their instruction, it is notable that the responses and perspectives of these indigenous peoples were not absolutely neglected in the Committee's proceedings. Rather, it appears that, consistently with other use of sources for the report, only limited lines of argumentation and specific types of evidence were used in the report proper.

Curiously, one passage in which indigenous desire or aversion to British action was raised as a topic was in reference to the Cape Colony in the section concerning the 'Effects of fair dealing'. The Committee referenced the *Report of the Commissioners of Inquiry upon the Hottentot population of the Cape of Good Hope, and of Missionary Institutions* of 1830, according to which 'the inhabitants of the Cape may be considered to have been averse to their receiving moral or religious instruction of any kind'. Following this remark, it was noted by the Committee that little had been done by the Colonial Government, according to this earlier report, to promote such instruction, other than missionary work. But it was further stated that missionaries had reportedly done 'a great deal of good'.<sup>798</sup> These brief remarks appear somewhat contradictory; they stated that there was an aversion to 'moral and religious instruction of any kind', yet missionaries had achieved good outcomes. The message is, however, clear and in keeping with the Committee's report: Even in this case the reference to apparent indigenous unwillingness to receive British instruction was used to contrast the achievements and promises of missionary action with other non-religious actions. Thus, it gave more voice to missionaries than the indigenous peoples.

There were distinct differences in how Māori opinion and activity were considered in relation to action in New Zealand in the Aborigines Committee's report and *The British Colonization*. This was alongside the different argumentative strategies that the two sides employed, for example, in how sources were used and cited to present credibility in argumentation, and how Māori were acknowledged as

<sup>797</sup> These questions were posed to William Broughton, archdeacon of New South Wales, Rev. William Shaw, Captain Spiller of the British military and William Yate respectively. See *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 16–17, question 234; 60, question 690; 70, question 852; 198, question 1741.

<sup>798</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837 60.

sources of information. Whereas Wakefield and Ward used alleged Māori opinions in favour of their argumentation, the Aborigines Committee appears to have not deemed it necessary to discuss indigenous willingness from their perspective. However, simply looking at what the two sides argued in attempting to justify their proposed action provides only a limited view into the interconnectedness of communication and different colonial projects within a certain context. For a deeper understanding of how these knowledge claims, colonial projects and lines of argumentation existed alongside each other, it is worthwhile to look at the connections that existed between further different colonial projects and how differences arose in them despite those connections. Examining here how knowledge claims that were communicated in these networks were influenced and changed by different contexts and interests along these networks can shed more light on the complexity and multitude of voices in networks spanning between New Zealand and Britain.

### Changing Significances across Networks

The Aborigines Committee's report and *The British Colonization* were inherently tied into networks of communication, which, among other mechanisms, provided the two sides with sources to form and support their argumentation. It has so far become evident that interests, goals, intentions and other aspects of receiving and forming new knowledge influence the content of that knowledge. Equally, these aspects influence how claimed knowledge can be used for presenting argumentation. But in order to more fully understand how these differences are able to emerge in different but interconnected contexts, it is worthwhile looking at how transfer of knowledge within networks facilitated individual narratives gaining new significances. Mapping out nodes and connections in networks between New Zealand and Britain and how the information or knowledge claims changed within these networks provides valuable ways of understanding how networked communication could facilitate such diverging lines of argumentation as those in the Aborigines Committee's report and *The British Colonization*.

A text's significance is not static but subject to being made and remade, as Livingstone's geographies of reading indicate. Moreover, Alexander Maxwell and Evan Roberts describe that a text's circulation among publications and between different contexts can uncover 'the range and flexibility of European attitudes towards New Zealand's Indigenous peoples'. In their examination of various European accounts that circulated of the Whangaroa incident of 1824, in which a European ship was held captive by Ngāti Pou Māori, Maxwell and Roberts highlight the changes and omissions in different accounts spanning from 1824 to 1878. They note that in recounting this one incident there were significant variations in different

versions. For example, critical parts of the story were omitted or invented. The significance of recounting the stories also changed across decades; from depicting Māori as ‘barbarians’ who could be saved to relying on caricatures of them to demonstrate European piety and virtue. There was also significant difference between evangelical approaches to the incident, which emphasised missionary potential in interactions with Māori, and secular adventure stories or ethnographic depictions.<sup>799</sup> In a similar way, a look into the movement of knowledge within networks spanning across the antipodes gives a wide contextual perspective on how Māori voices and opinions were communicated from New Zealand onward. Thus, these were available to be used in Britain by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward. All the while in this communication the relayed material gained new significances and eventually reached the very different perspectives of the Aborigines Committee’s report and *The British Colonization*. Kendall’s message from Hongi Hika and Waikato is an excellent example of how Māori experiences and their voices circulated across textual representations of their opinions and various contexts within networks of communication. Here I examine a cross-section of this text’s circulation in the 1820s and 1830s and the contexts in which this narrative was discussed in order to illustrate the impact these changing contexts had on the text’s uses.

This perspective to changing significances within networks of communication is particularly important in relation to indigenous voices. As indigenous voice, such as the alleged Māori desire and consent for British action in New Zealand, was used in colonial argumentation, what was presented in Europe as Māori opinion could have been far from what was originally stated or intended by these Māori. Considering the processes of transfer of knowledge between these Māori opinions having been voiced and eventually having been printed by Wakefield and Ward, the significance of these opinions could have changed significantly as their contexts changed. For this kind of examination of indigenous voices, Driver argues that recovering indigenous agency is necessary. However, it is not sufficient to merely place them in the networks. Instead, in examining Driver’s topic of exploration, emphasising the vulnerability of European explorers and their reliance on local knowledge can help place guides and interpreters in their proper places in history.<sup>800</sup> In the context of how Māori took active part in the transfer and formation of knowledge between New Zealand and Britain, the case of Hongi and Waikato makes it evident that simply noting the presence of Māori voice in *The British Colonization* does not reveal their actual activity or intentions. Taking into account different processes of communication, such as the selective quoting by Wakefield and Ward, Hongi and

<sup>799</sup> Maxwell & Roberts 2014.

<sup>800</sup> Driver 2015, 24–25.

Waikato's voices could have been distorted. Rather than having indicated their perspectives, these processes can instead have resulted in what appears as their voice merely echoing colonial argumentation.

This narrative of Hongi and Waikato having wished for Britons to live with them received a great deal of attention in British writing concerning New Zealand due to intertextual referencing in different contexts. Before having been quoted by Wakefield and Ward, the text by Kendall that provided the alleged opinions of Hongi and Waikato had already made some rounds in Britain in various published texts. Originally, it was part of a letter written by Kendall and sent to the CMS secretary, which was usual for such missionary communications.<sup>801</sup> From the mission society, the letter began to circulate in print as it was published among other media in the *Missionary Register*, *The Asiatic Journal* and Craik's *The New Zealanders*. This repeated use and citing of this narrative also further accentuates the Aborigines Committee's silence on acknowledging Māori voices. All these publications had their own goals for printing this letter and looking at them as an intersection of how this one narrative was transferred from one context to another shows similar texts' and narratives' flexibility and adaptability in colonial discourses.

*The Missionary Register* was the CMS's monthly periodical that was established in 1813. It had a moderate sized audience among evangelicals and middle-class readers. New Zealand was featured prominently in these kinds of periodicals in the early decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> century based on missionary correspondence.<sup>802</sup> Kendall's visit to Britain with Hongi and Waikato was covered over nearly two pages of the *Register* for August 1820, detailing among other matters their passage to Britain and Kendall's work with *te reo Māori*.<sup>803</sup> The promotion of missionary achievements, such as Kendall's work, was a typical theme for such missionary periodicals, which were used to create a patriotic Christian identity and to seek the support of their reading communities.<sup>804</sup> A large portion of the text, however, also focused on describing and characterising Hongi and Waikato. Hongi was presented as one of the principal chiefs in New Zealand and it was noted that he had sold 13,000 acres of land to the Church Missionary Society. Waikato was characterised in less detail as a chief from Rangihoua in the Bay of Islands, where one CMS station was located. It is also notable that in addition to these introductions Hongi and Waikato were differentiated from earlier Māori travellers, named as Tooi and Teeterree, meaning Tuai and Titere. The latter were two young chiefs from the Bay of Islands who had travelled to England in 1818 and had been hosted by the CMS. Hongi and Waikato

<sup>801</sup> See Ulrich Cloher 2003, 121 footnote 7.

<sup>802</sup> Ballantyne 2011, 242–243.

<sup>803</sup> *The Missionary Register* 1820, 326–328.

<sup>804</sup> Johnston 2003, 32–33; Jensz & Acke 2013, 369; Jensz 2013, 374–376.

were mentioned as having been of different kin groups than Tuai and Titere.<sup>805</sup> The British perception of Tuai and Titere as Māori visitors who had been immersed in English culture and who had thus absorbed British civilisation so early on in missionary contact with Māori had caused great interest in British humanitarian circles.<sup>806</sup> Therefore, as Tuai and Titere were known in some British circles, referencing them in Hongi and Waikato's introduction placed the more recent travellers in a familiar context for British readers.

In addition to introducing Kendall's work with *te reo Māori*, this narrative in *The Missionary Register* highlighted the goals and hopes of missionaries and the mission society in spreading Christianity. Hongi and Waikato appeared here as examples of Māori people who had 'little notion of' Christianity and were 'subjects of a subtle and deeply-rooted Superstition'. It was noted that with the help of Kendall these Māori 'superstitions' could be understood in Britain and Māori's 'finest natural dispositions' could possibly be released from having been 'abused and held in bondage' by their so-called superstition. Kendall's letter was quoted as a portrayal of Hongi and Waikato's 'views and wishes' to receive help and instruction from the British. Their desires were further reinforced by stating that these views were written down by Kendall and were expressed 'without any prompting from his part'.<sup>807</sup> The presentation of Hongi and Waikato in a missionary journal is significant in a contemporary context. Jessie Mitchell has noted, in relation to missionary texts sent to Britain from Australia in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, that while missionaries themselves recorded and paraphrased indigenous individuals' views and opinions, such matters were usually not mentioned in published missionary texts, such as *The Missionary Register* and *Church Missionary Paper*. As the only clear exception, Mitchell notes that direct quotations and detailed conversations were highlighted in missionary journals when they concerned religious affairs.<sup>808</sup> This is also somewhat reflected in *The Missionary Register*'s reporting on New Zealand, since a majority of it was done from the perspective of the missionaries writing about their conversations and interactions with Māori, rather than using direct quotations from Māori.<sup>809</sup> Hongi and Waikato's opinions appeared as close to direct quotations, since it was emphasised in the *Register* that the text was written 'down from their mouths, without any prompting'.<sup>810</sup> Considering Mitchell's description of quotes used from indigenous

<sup>805</sup> *The Missionary Register* 1820, 327.

<sup>806</sup> O'Malley 2012, 83–85.

<sup>807</sup> *The Missionary Register* 1820, 326–328.

<sup>808</sup> Mitchell 2011, 23.

<sup>809</sup> For contemporary discussion of New Zealand in *The Missionary Register* see Early New Zealand Books Online: 1814–1853 - *The Missionary Register* [Sections Relating to New Zealand].

<sup>810</sup> *The Missionary Register* 1820, 326.

peoples, it is notable that Hongi and Waikato's opinions were not directly related to conversations about religion. Yet, they can be seen as having been of similar use in showing apparent Māori interest in British ways of life and Christianity. The reported views and wishes of Hongi and Waikato appeared as further support for this as they were portrayed wishing for more Europeans to live with them and preach for them.

It is also notable here that the use of Hongi and Waikato's views in the *Register* was closer in argumentative style to Wakefield and Ward's use of Māori willingness to have contact and improvement than the Committee's near disregard for indigenous desires as an argument. This underlines Wakefield and Ward's use of language closely resembling early-19<sup>th</sup>-century humanitarian thinking in their argumentation. It is also indicative of some divergence in how the case for intervention in New Zealand was presented by the Aborigines Committee in contrast to more typical missionary language. While the Committee's suggestions for limiting colonisation and supporting missionary work were generally in line with the views of mission societies, in terms of argumentative strategies Wakefield and Ward appeared closer to the writings in missionary journals.

The hopefulness and optimism of missionary writing towards what was seen as possible through missionary work and influence was central in the argumentative use of Māori voices in the *Register*. Writings on Tuai and Titere are a good example of this. Resembling the way Hongi and Waikato were presented as showing promise in how missionary influence could be spread among Māori, much had also been published about Tuai and Titere. In July 1820, letters from Tuai upon his return to New Zealand, dated December 1819, were published in the *Register*. In these, Tuai bade farewell to his friends in England and stated his conviction that he would tell others in New Zealand of Britain, 'where true God is worshipped'.<sup>811</sup> However, Vincent O'Malley indicates that the hopes of British humanitarians that Tuai and Titere had adopted Christianity and British refinement in their travels were soon dashed. After Tuai's return to New Zealand, it was reported that he considered it impossible for him to retain what he had learned in Europe after his return.<sup>812</sup> These perceived bad news of Tuai and Titere were acknowledged briefly in February 1821 in the *Register* by stating that 'no very favourable accounts can be given' of them since they had gone to war, which was attributed to 'their friends, who are still living under the influence of their native superstitions'. Directly after this, however, with an optimistic tone it was noted that another Māori, who was named as Mayree, had declared Jesus as his friend when he died. This proclaimed to the readers that there was hope in New Zealand.<sup>813</sup> This illustrates Ballantyne's note that fears and doubts

<sup>811</sup> *The Missionary Register* 1820, 309.

<sup>812</sup> O'Malley 2012, 84–85.

<sup>813</sup> *The Missionary Register* 1822, 93.

about British civilising influences were generally kept out of metropolitan texts.<sup>814</sup> Even when negatively perceived news of Tuai and Titere were printed, they were alleviated with other optimistic views.

From *The Missionary Register*, the letter circulated to other prints. For example, in the same year a copy of the *Register*'s text on Hongi and Waikato, including the quote from Kendall's letter, was printed in *The Asiatic Journal* as a description of Kendall, Hongi and Waikato under the heading 'Arrival of Two New Zealand Chiefs in England'. *The Asiatic Journal* was sponsored by the East India Company and it began publication in 1816 to cover political, literary, economic and cultural issues in territories related to the Company. Due to its close association with the East India Company, matters of imperial security were among its main concerns, including questions of governance in colonies.<sup>815</sup> The *Journal* also covered stories of various places with British connections under the heading 'Missionary intelligence'. In October 1820, for example, the journal included stories from Hawai'i and about Hongi and Waikato. The text in the *Journal* was attributed as having been copied from the *Register* and it was printed in whole, apart from the last paragraph. The text in the *Journal* ended with the statement '[a]t present, these interesting strangers have little notion of our holy religion'.<sup>816</sup> In this copy the *Register*'s notion of Kendall and other missionaries' work of spreading Christianity to replace Māori 'superstition' was omitted. This divergence underlines the differences that selective copying had in editing out the missionary perspective of spreading Christianity and leaving the focus on a narrative of Māori customs and their interest in British society.

The excerpt from Kendall's letter was also copied from the *Register* into Craik's volume on Māori in the *Library of Entertaining Knowledge*. In one chapter, Craik presented the 'impression produced on savages by an introduction to civilised life', for which he discussed a number of Māori travellers who had visited Britain, including Hongi and Waikato as well as Tuai and Titere.<sup>817</sup> In this chapter, Hongi was prominently featured. Craik provided general characterisations of Hongi, for example, describing him as 'in battle ferocious and blood-thirsty as a beast of prey, at other times all equability and gentleness'. These characterisations were very closely related to European views of Māori 'savagery', as discussed in the previous chapter of this thesis. Craik proceeded to recount narratives of Hongi, including his visit to Britain with Waikato. In this he also quoted the extract of Kendall's letter

<sup>814</sup> Ballantyne 2011, 242 footnote 22.

<sup>815</sup> Freitag 2009, 132–133.

<sup>816</sup> *The Asiatic Journal for October 1820*, 380–381.

<sup>817</sup> Craik 1830, 288–312.

from the *Register* as an example of Hongi and Waikato's impressions of seeing British civilisation and desiring to replicate it in New Zealand.<sup>818</sup>

Geoffrey Sanborn has characterised *The New Zealanders* as 'imperialist propaganda',<sup>819</sup> and it was more focused on impressing to British audience the supposed superiority of British culture rather than providing fine ethnographic detail on Māori. A notable difference between Craik's 'imperialist propaganda' and the perspective of the *Register* can be found in how Tuai and Titere were again discussed alongside Hongi and Waikato. Citing British army Major Richard Cruise's journal, Craik candidly noted that after returning to New Zealand 'they got back among their savage countrymen, neither would long remain much the better for their intercourse with the civilized world'. Craik further recounted Cruise's later meeting with Tuai, during which Tuai spent time 'boast[ing] of atrocities he had committed', according to Cruise.<sup>820</sup> This reporting of discarding manners that were supposedly learned during visits to Britain was carried out in a far more direct manner than in *The Register*. Craik specifically emphasised the supposedly savage 'atrocities' that appeared in his book as a part of Māori ways. He did not give much thought to any possible view of attempting to civilise Māori, which was a major focus for missionary journals as well as *The British Colonization* and the Aborigines Committee's report.

In addition to the differences in approach illustrated by Tuai's case in comparison to *The Register*, Craik's narrative of Hongi also included further qualifications that gave his account very different significances than those that appeared in *The Register* or even in *The British Colonization*. Craik further emphasised themes related to British views of Māori savagery in how Hongi was presented. Referencing writings of the CMS missionary John Gare Butler, who was stationed in Kerikeri in the Bay of Islands,<sup>821</sup> Craik stated that Hongi had had no interest in Britain other than British weaponry. According to Craik, upon returning to Australia Hongi had allegedly exchanged many gifts he had received for weapons and ammunition. Moreover, he had told Butler that he was not impressed with his interactions in the CMS missionary house in London since '[t]he people at the missionary house, and the preaching, no good for New Zealand man'. Altogether, Craik dismissed Hongi as 'a rude and unskilful chief of a barbarous people possessed with the desire of being a conqueror', although also noting him to have been of 'quick

<sup>818</sup> Craik 1830, 289–294.

<sup>819</sup> Sanborn 2005, 229–230.

<sup>820</sup> Craik 1830, 302–303.

<sup>821</sup> Butler joined the CMS mission in New Zealand in 1819 and was appointed superintendent but was withdrawn in 1823 for misdemeanours. See Honoré 2013, 375.

and vigorous intellectual powers'.<sup>822</sup> This kind of dismissal of Hongi stands in great contrast to all the other texts that had some interest in highlighting or convincing readers of the perceived possibility of Māori improvement towards European civilisation. Unlike missionary texts, *The British Colonization* and the Aborigines Committee, Craik's work does not appear to have harboured such an interest, which can be seen as having influenced how Māori were discussed in it in contrast to the other works.

In terms of how the accounts of Hongi and Waikato's visit were used, the differences in the narrative's significance in many missionary-minded texts and Craik's *The New Zealanders* is clear. There is a stark contrast between the different perspectives that include the missionary ideals of spreading Christianity and civilising 'the less improved others', the humanitarian-resembling argumentation of Wakefield and Ward pointing to Māori desire to have contact and Craik's use of Hongi and other Māori travellers to Britain as examples of how a lack of civilisation caused misery in contrast to the supposedly superior British life. Craik summarised the chapter of his book by bemoaning 'to what miserable ends must even the highest talents and the noblest natures be directed' without civilisation.<sup>823</sup> To Craik, Māori appeared not as people to be improved and civilised, if even capable of that, but as a people to be learned from about the supposed greatness of British civilisation.

It cannot be stated with any certainty, but it would appear most likely that Kendall's letter about Hongi and Waikato was copied by Wakefield and Ward into *The British Colonization* from *The New Zealanders*. Craik's *The New Zealanders* was included in the appendix of *The British Colonization* in the 'List of Publications Relating to New Zealand' while *The Missionary Register* was not. Craik's volume was also often referenced as a source in *The British Colonization* while there were no references to the *Register*.<sup>824</sup> It is naturally possible that there were other lines of transfer through which this textual passage, originally from Kendall, ended up coming in the attention of Wakefield and Ward. However, based on available intertextual and metatextual information, this would appear as the most likely route. Nonetheless, Hongi and Waikato's letter is a stellar example of a text passing through various contexts with altering significances for the given text. The above discussion of the letter's circulations is not intended by far as a comprehensive list of how the text travelled, but it illustrates the various types of contexts in which the text was featured. The transfer of this text perfectly exemplifies the multitude of contexts through which a simple textual passage could travel, each defined with

<sup>822</sup> Craik 1830, 293–296 & 299.

<sup>823</sup> Craik 1830, 312–313.

<sup>824</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 423.

particular interests, goals or horizons of expectation that effected the significance of the text in that given context.

This appears particularly noteworthy in terms of the significance the recounting of Hongi and Waikato's visit had for Craik in contrast to Wakefield and Ward. Whether or not Kendall's text was copied into *The British Colonization* from Craik, *The New Zealanders* was much used by Wakefield and Ward as a source. Yet, the recounting of Hongi and Waikato's visit was used in *The British Colonization* to highlight the supposed Māori willingness for contact. This has a closer resemblance to the *Register's* use of the same narrative to promote missionary work than to Craik's promotion of British superiority. In terms of argumentation, there appears to have been a definite utility for Wakefield and Ward in raising Hongi and Waikato to an active role in stating their wishes for further contact with Europeans. As Māori individuals who had actually seen Britain, in addition to having been in contact with British settlers, the text written by Kendall and the notions presented from Hongi and Waikato would have served as strong expressions and evidence of Māori desirousness for what in the letter sounds like systematic settler colonialism similar to what the NZA planned for New Zealand. Wakefield and Ward even further commended Hongi and Waikato's view of how such expanded colonisation should take place and noted that they were 'shrewd' to understand that there would have been a need to have soldiers for the protection of the colony and officers to control the soldiers among the other settlers.<sup>825</sup> Such a commendation would have further strengthened the impact of Wakefield and Ward's statement that Māori 'explicitly' wished for colonisation in New Zealand since they were given credit as shrewd and authoritative observers.

This emphasises how a text could travel from one use to the next and the same text could be quoted in different contexts. But the original significance of the text, or any other significances it had picked up along the way, do not necessarily follow. Also, paralleling this examination of the movement of Kendall's text of Hongi and Waikato to Maxwell and Roberts's study of stories of the Whangaroa incident provides a further observation about movement of text and knowledge. Maxwell and Roberts note that there were changing attitudes and diverse audiences that influenced recounting accounts of the incident over the course of fifty years. However, the reiterations of Kendall's text on Hongi and Waikato shows that similar differences in attitudes were also very much present even in parallel colonial projects in the 1820s and 1830s. As the same passage of text passed across and circulated among different colonial projects and contexts it continuously gained new significances as it was used for depicting or arguing for different coexisting British perspectives.

<sup>825</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 264.

The Aborigines Committee, in turn, provides another flip side to this discussion. Considering the significant absence of Māori voices from the Aborigines Committee's report, the prominence of indigenous voices in missionary texts provides a marked contrast. Hongi and Waikato's opinions appeared in *The Register's* argumentation as endorsements for missionary work, but similar use of Māori voices was not in the Aborigines Committee's report, despite the Committee's close connections to missionary societies and missionary perspectives. With this in mind, it would appear that the invisibility of Māori perspectives in the Committee's argumentation could be prescribed, at least partly, to the Committee's general style of argumentation in naming only very few sources in their report despite having gathered a mass of evidence as well as their apparent lack of need for justifying action for Christianising and civilising Māori. Nevertheless, the difference in bases for argumentation in *The British Colonization* and the Aborigines Committee's report is particularly clearly illustrated by the fact that a prominent argument used by Wakefield and Ward for presenting Māori as desirous of contact originated from the Aborigines Committee's witness interviews but was not included or mentioned in their report.

Considering all the referencing of Māori and their activity in receiving or wishing for contact, this transfer through networks of communication also raises the question as to how the use of this text corresponded with the contexts in which it was produced in the first place. The historical geographer Dorothy Urlich Cloher has, in fact, come to a similar conclusion as Craik vis-à-vis the subtext of Hongi's interest in visiting Britain. Based on Kendall and Samuel Marsden's correspondence, Urlich Cloher points to Hongi's interest in British weaponry. For example, Marsden criticised Kendall for colluding with Hongi in his pursuit of weaponry. Hongi was also successful in his visit to Britain in this regard, since he returned to New Zealand with a supply of muskets and ammunition. Vincent O'Malley, however, also suggests that the acquisition of armaments might not have been the sole or primary interest for Hongi. He posits, that the visit could have also been related to wishing to see at first-hand what he had heard of England from Tuai and Titere, as well as the authority he could have received back in New Zealand for having met the King of England.<sup>826</sup>

Hongi had his reasons for visiting Britain, but Urlich Cloher has also argued that Kendall himself also had distinct reasons for writing the letter. Kendall did not have permission from the CMS or his colleagues to leave his post in New Zealand to visit England but he had personal reasons for the voyage, including loneliness in New Zealand, his long habitation there and his wish to further his chances of publishing

<sup>826</sup> Urlich Cloher 2003, 124; O'Malley 2012, 63–65; see also Honoré 2013, 375.

his work on *te reo Māori*. Ulrich Cloher argues that particularly having Hongi accompany him was crucial for Kendall to show that his visit, while unauthorised, was necessary. This was needed to make the visit appear justified as official business. Thus, providing his letter with the statements from Hongi and Waikato, according to Ulrich Cloher, was part of Kendall's intention to explicitly show the unobjectionable objectives of his visit to Britain.<sup>827</sup> The criss-cross of interests and goals here is significant, not only in why certain actions were originally taken, but it also reflects the multitude of interests at play that point to the necessity of approaching such moving texts in reference to the multiple contexts they passed through.

This perspective can be further expanded on to examine how these networks of communication can be approached in relation to indigenous perspectives more generally. While it is notable that Māori appear to have been given distinct and active roles by Wakefield and Ward in their argumentation, the significance of indigenous voices in European colonial texts requires further consideration. In their discussion of 'Indigenous networks', Jane Carey and Jane Lydon note that whereas placing indigenous people in transnational and imperial networks is necessary for uncovering their often-hidden roles in history, Indigenous networks can also 'signal somewhat romantic notions of resistance and a triumphant transcendence of Western culture'. Instead, it is necessary to consider the complexities in the interactions and mobilities that took place in colonial cultures. They further point out that there are interpretive tensions in the meaning of this kind of indigenous agency since '[m]obility does not signify freedom, nor does participation in networks always imply power'.<sup>828</sup> This concept is perfectly illustrated by the fact that the part of *The British Colonization*, in which Wakefield and Ward most extensively brought up the supposed Māori desire for contact, was framed as assuaging the possible concerns of British settlers as to whether Māori might allow colonisation. Considering the extensive and far-reaching networks of communication between New Zealand and Britain in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, as well as the many differing contexts in-between, it cannot be assumed that transcriptions of indigenous voices carried all the significances that the individual originally intended.

These kinds of changing significances are illustrated by Ballantyne's examination of moving texts. As Ballantyne notes about the power of paper and writing to distribute information, neither Māori as the subjects of the writing nor the original authors of the texts could control what he terms 'the disembodied mobility' of the texts.<sup>829</sup> Alongside the mobility of texts across contexts and through intertextual transmission, the original writers and subjects of the writing had no

<sup>827</sup> Ulrich Cloher 2003, 121–125.

<sup>828</sup> Carey, J. & Lydon 2014, 2–3.

<sup>829</sup> Ballantyne 2016.

control over how publishers or later writers presented the texts or represented Māori. The change from one context to another could be even very drastic within a short span of transfer within networks between the missionary perspective of Kendall, to the dismissiveness of Craik's *New Zealanders* and further to the humanitarian-leaning arguments for settler colonialism pronounced by Wakefield and Ward. Similar processes can be seen with regards to Yate's testimony, which originated from the Aborigines Committee discussing the possible powers of the British resident without further need for British colonial action and was later used by Wakefield and Ward in their promotion of a private land company. In terms of how actual contemporary Māori interests might have been expressed by the use of opinions attributed to and even originating from them, Ballantyne's description is very illustrative: 'Maori—like other Indigenous peoples—were less able to shape how publishers, editors and writers represented them in the pamphlets, periodicals and newspapers produced in Britain'.<sup>830</sup>

It can, however, be questioned whether Wakefield and Ward's presentation of Māori willingness for contact could be read in ways other than as instrumental narratives to support the NZA's colonial plans. The problem of what can be read and revealed from colonial texts has also been pondered by Anna Johnston. In her self-reflective consideration, she perceives that in her reading of missionary writing, in terms of colonial discourse, texts appear laden with ideological baggage to such a degree that she has considered it difficult to retrieve colonised people's histories from them and that pursuing an 'unmediated native voice' can do violence to researching colonial situations.<sup>831</sup> Jessie Mitchell also notes that the often propagandistic nature of philanthropic sources limits our capacity to reach indigenous perspectives from these texts.<sup>832</sup> In this way, it is clear that there are many aspects of the true Indigenous interests, goals and activities that can be nearly impossible to uncover from colonial texts, particularly those as charged with argumentation as *The British Colonization*. From this difference in contexts it is also possible to ponder, what if Wakefield and Ward did not intentionally use the reporting of Hongi and Waikato's opinion as rhetoric devices but considered them genuinely in the manner printed in *The British Colonization*? This view does lead to dissonance between their view that, on the one hand, Māori needed to be civilised as objects of European action, and, on the other hand, the possibility of viewing Māori as proactive actors whose opinions would have been taken seriously. But it is possible to imagine that Wakefield and Ward could have been genuine in their belief that Hongi and Waikato and other Māori truly wished for systematic colonisation.

<sup>830</sup> Ballantyne 2016.

<sup>831</sup> Johnston 2011, 102–103.

<sup>832</sup> Mitchell, J. 2011, 8.

Hence, the dissonance arose from Wakefield and Ward's cultural context in which they viewed European life as superior to others, thus resulting in an 'innocent' view of needing to civilise Māori. However, the argumentative and lobbying focus of *The British Colonization* as a whole and the lack of any significant proactive role for Māori in their own civilising to some degree diminishes the feasibility of such an interpretation. Instead, it points to an argumentative use of Māori voices in an instrumental way. Furthermore, even if genuine acknowledgement of Māori agency was also present in the presentation of their willingness in *The British Colonization*, it is unlikely that passing through networks of communication the original Māori individuals' perspective could be completely uncovered from colonial texts like these.

The ways in which the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward argued not only for the need but also for the justification of the British to act in New Zealand reflects how empirical sources and claimed knowledge could be used and adapted to different perspectives, despite some core similarities between these perspectives. Differences in implications and emphases in how the sources and knowledge claims were presented in support of and proof for certain lines of argumentation allowed for divergences to arise out of similar source material and claims. The presented argumentation existed in a complex crossroads of different political and ideological contexts, available sources and interests of those presenting the argumentation. This is true, whether the blame for harm caused to Māori was placed on nearly all non-missionary settlers or simply some ill-disposed individuals, or whether Māori consent was needed as an argument, a legitimate basis for justification or barely at all from the two sides' perspectives. It is clear that the context and goals of the argumentation played a large part in affecting how sources and knowledge claims could be adapted to suit specific argumentation, resulting in divergences from similarities. This also involved fitting the argumentation into a form that was, for example, sufficiently in line with surrounding contemporary political values in order to be accepted. How this adaptation to form argumentation was achieved through the use of sources resembles how similar sources could be used to form different knowledge claims. By selecting, emphasising and omitting pieces, for example, it was possible to form different knowledge claims either intentionally or due to the processes of the geographies of reading. The same processes could continue further when knowledge claims were used to support or validate different lines of argumentation. This makes the mutability of mobiles a central aspect of communication. This forms, for example, debates such as the one on New Zealand into intricate webs of significances, interests and presentations. This in turn underlines how it is necessary to keep in mind the multifaceted nature of colonialism in order to avoid making too sweeping general classifications of even rather specific cases, such as early-19<sup>th</sup>-century discussions of British views on New Zealand.

Having examined formation of knowledge claims of Māori character and different aspects of why action was to be taken in New Zealand according to the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward, I will now aspire to draw these different perspectives together to analyse what all this argumentation was for. In the following part of this chapter on centrifugal argumentation, I examine more specifically the proposals for the supposedly proper lines of action that the two sides presented and why and how emerging from all this use of sources and knowledge claims of New Zealand differing actions were argued as preferable and feasible in practice.

## 3.2 Arguing for ‘Correct’ Action

### 3.2.1 Emerging Arguments for Specific Lines of Colonialism

So far it has become evident that presenting knowledge claims about Māori character and the effects of various kinds of European interactions with Māori played significant parts in the arguments of the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward on the possible colonisation of New Zealand. These arguments were used as bases and justifications for differing approaches to British action and intervention in New Zealand. Empirical evidence was presented in the Aborigines Committee’s report and *The British Colonization* in order to, on the one hand, articulate that Māori character had already improved. Thus, it was posited that Māori were capable of improving through European contact in comparison to what was seen as their ‘savage’ state. On the other hand, empirical evidence was given to show that this improvement was not only needed and justified but even desired by Māori, or simply for their best.

In this final part, I draw together these strands of argumentation on Māori character, as well as the European effects on them and the need and justification of British action in New Zealand. I discuss how the two different lines of action arose out of these bases and why the differences in emphasis in *The British Colonization* and the Aborigines Committee’s 1837 report could have been used to promote very opposite plans, despite their entangled and intertwined sources and arguments. Altogether, this provides insight into the relationship between the space given to presenting claimed knowledge about Māori and their state with what the two sides argued as the preferred course of action for New Zealand. In the following examination, I first focus on the practical colonisation plans presented by Wakefield and Ward, followed by the mission-focused suggestions by the Aborigines Committee. After this, I will also analyse how the two sides and individuals connected to them responded to the propositions and argumentation of the opposing side in order to gauge the responses to these different plans. I finally conclude my

examination with a look into the differences in premisses on which the two sides based their argumentation concerning New Zealand, and how this sheds light to the coexistence of differing lines of argumentation despite convergences in formation of knowledge.

When it comes to colonial plans, James Belich has identified five main agencies based on which the NZC, the NZA's successor, envisaged in 1839 to convert New Zealand into a new promised land for British colonists. These provide a background for understanding what was presented in the late 1830s as suitable action for New Zealand:

[M]issionaries, of whom some were already in place; civilisation by land sale and proximity to European settlers; the detribalising and commercialising effect of engagement with European economics; the judicious application of European laws and government; and a treaty that was to transfer sovereignty by consent as well as facilitate the purchase of Maori land.<sup>833</sup>

Belich defines these agencies specifically as those of the NZC. The NZA was eventually reformed into the NZC in 1839 after negotiations took place between the NZA and the British Government after the publication of *The British Colonization*. Therefore, Belich's analysis is not directly transferable to the NZA. But it is evident that many of these agencies and the grounds for colonising New Zealand were also present in Wakefield and Ward's argumentation in *The British Colonization*. The Aborigines Committee, then again, opposed any such plans for colonisation and mainly promoted missionary work over other British civilising action. As Claudia Orange has pointed out, by 1838 all parties interested in New Zealand were convinced that British intervention in New Zealand was necessary, but the extent of this intervention differed in different parties' views.<sup>834</sup> Examining here the argued effectiveness and feasibility of what the opposing sides of the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward proposed in the way of action in New Zealand, alongside the earlier-discussed knowledge claims of Māori and the justifications for the need to act by the two sides provide a deeper understanding of British approaches to New Zealand at the time. This shows how the presentation of knowledge claims of Māori, as well as their character and improvement, worked alongside the presentation of the plans by Wakefield and Ward and the Aborigines Committee to form the comprehensive totalities of their centrifugally presented argumentation.

<sup>833</sup> Belich (1996) 2007, 179.

<sup>834</sup> Orange (1987) 1997, 26–27.

## Plans for Solving the Given Problems

The practical aspects of colonisation in the NZA's plan that were discussed by Wakefield and Ward were inherently entangled with the knowledge claims about Māori and justifications for action that were presented throughout *The British Colonization*. The proposed actions were coherently tied to aspects of how Māori were presented as a people and as parties in their interactions with the British. They were also connected to other aspects of how the problems that were presented as having existed in New Zealand could have supposedly been remedied. In Wakefield and Ward's proposed plans, the central motor for providing solutions for New Zealand was interaction between Māori and the proposed colony. This would have functioned through controlled colonisation, the amalgamation of Māori into the proposed colony and the certification of these mechanisms through treaties. This was in clear opposition to the Aborigines Committee, which opposed any treaties. Instead, it advocated the need for the general protection of Māori from nearly all contact with Europeans, apart from further supposedly civilising missionary work.

The fundamental practical basis for colonisation in the NZA's plans was the Wakefieldian concept of buying land from Māori and selling it to colonists at a fixed price. This was envisaged as an incentive for colonists to work and improve the land, rather than facilitating a few individuals to become large landowners. The presentation of these principles took up a large majority of Wakefield and Ward's outline of the practical mechanisms for colonisation.<sup>835</sup> In this presentation of colonisation, Māori were taken into account as a party in this trade, whose dues were explicitly considered. In addition to the money that was to be paid to Māori for their land, Wakefield and Ward stated that they would have also received in exchange 'all the rights of British subjects' and 'the fostering care of a power deliberately exerted with a view to placing them, as soon as possible, on terms of intellectual, moral, and social equality with the colonists'.<sup>836</sup> This concept of providing civilisation to indigenous peoples in exchange for land had already been discussed earlier in relation to the colonisation plans for South Australia. George Fife Angas, a shipowner who was closely connected to the colonisation of South Australia and who was also a supporter of missionary ventures and had philanthropic interests, wrote to Wakefield regarding this idea of civilisation as compensation for land in South Australia. In connection to South Australian colonisation, this idea also received the support of the Colonial Office's Lord Glenelg with his evangelical views.<sup>837</sup> However, this idea was not used as an argument in Wakefield's *The New*

<sup>835</sup> See *The British Colonization of New Zealand 1837*, 1–26 & 59–63.

<sup>836</sup> Burns 1989, 52–53; Ballantyne 2014, 32. See also *The British Colonization of New Zealand 1837*, 54–55.

<sup>837</sup> Hall, C. 2002, 32.

*British Province of South Australia*, in which Aborigines were barely acknowledged. Nonetheless, the idea lived on in Wakefield and Ward's humanitarian leaning argumentation on New Zealand.

The claims of Māori capacity for improvement were argumentatively central for this conception of civilisation as compensation for Māori. As Wakefield and Ward noted early on in their book, the success of such plans depended on the capacity of Māori to improve,<sup>838</sup> which they proceeded to supposedly prove in their presentation of the claimed knowledge about Māori. As the claimed knowledge of Māori capacity for improvement supposedly fulfilled this basic condition of the NZA's plans, they could argumentatively proceed further to discuss how this improvement in Māori was to be practically achieved after the colony was established. Wakefield and Ward itemised some concrete tools for this, including the office of Protector of Natives. The Protector would 'manage all causes on behalf of natives', which included encouragement of Māori to engage in military and civil employment, as well as schooling and religious instruction to Māori youth and generally 'the ultimate amalgamation of the two races'.<sup>839</sup> As has been noted in previous research on New Zealand, this amalgamation was a central feature of these colonisation plans.

As Damon Ieremia Salesa observes, even if Māori were to sell their lands willingly, it would still have left them as a population that was in close contact with would-be settlers in the event of the colonisation of New Zealand. For this reason, as Salesa points out, racial amalgamation was a necessary aspect of the colonisation plans for New Zealand.<sup>840</sup> However, what was called amalgamation in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century was often, in Cole Harris's words, essentially assimilation through acculturation and miscegenation.<sup>841</sup> Even though from the perspective of knowledge and its use it is possible to ponder whether Wakefield and Ward and the NZA were sincere in their concern for Māori, it is also notable that, as Alan Ward has noted in his examination of British policies of amalgamation in New Zealand in general, even altruistic conceptions of amalgamation could become as oppressive as the self-interests of settlers.<sup>842</sup>

The NZA in practice proposed assimilating Māori into a newly-formed British society by transforming them into British subjects with British ways of living. This view was in line with contemporary British ideas regarding their culture's superiority

<sup>838</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand 1837*, 28.

<sup>839</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand 1837*, 55–56.

<sup>840</sup> Salesa 2013, 30.

<sup>841</sup> See Harris 2004, 174.

<sup>842</sup> Ward, A. 1974, 36. Ward in his classic work examines the colonisation of New Zealand with a long temporal perspective and identifies how racial amalgamation was not only present in different policies in reference to the NZA, but also in missionary and governmental attitudes.

over others. This same conception was also apparent in Wakefield's thinking more generally. In his book *England and America*, Wakefield proposed that the people of China would 'gain incalculably' from English government,<sup>843</sup> reflecting the very idea of spreading British influence to other lands. Salesa's point about this practical aspect of needing to amalgamate Māori into the new colonial society also provides some further indication as to why they might have been acknowledged to the extent that they generally were by Wakefield and Ward. If Wakefield and Ward recognised Māori as active participants in interactions with Europeans, they could have successively considered that in colonising New Zealand there was a need to consider what would have subsequently happened to them after that colonisation. In light of the question of why Māori were discussed to such a great extent in *The British Colonization*, this is, however, only one aspect. Acknowledgement of Māori interacting with settlers after colonisation would not alone have necessarily required also justifying colonisation with their consent.

The acknowledgement of Māori as active participants in these kinds of interactions also differed significantly in the perspectives of Wakefield and Ward and the Aborigines Committee. In turn, this can be seen as having influenced the differences in these sides arguments about what were supposedly the proper actions to take. As noted earlier, in line with the contemporary humanitarian perspectives, Wakefield and Ward on behalf of the NZA also emphasised the importance of respecting Māori sovereignty. Accordingly, they stated that those parts of New Zealand that would not have been ceded to the British Crown for the new colony would have been considered independent and sovereign. As these areas were to be independent, 'all British intercourse with the tribes inhabiting such lands, must be regulated by treaty'.<sup>844</sup> This was a major divergence from the Aborigines Committee's suggestions, which recommended as a general rule that treaties should not be entered into with indigenous peoples.

In terms of the two sides' argumentation, this difference arose from diverging perspectives regarding how indigenous peoples were perceived, or at least presented. The Aborigines Committee considered that treaties were to be discouraged due to a disparity between all indigenous peoples and the British. As a result of this disparity, the British were allegedly to such a degree superior that even with a treaty, if at some point the British wanted to violate the treaty, they could find a pretext in order to nullify the treaty. Hence, the indigenous people, as the supposedly weaker side, could not do anything about it.<sup>845</sup> According to this logic, any treaty with indigenous people would have been nearly null, since it would have only been enforced as long

<sup>843</sup> Burns 1989, 68–70.

<sup>844</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 57; see also Attwood 2020, 119.

<sup>845</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 80.

as the British side wanted to enforce it. Thus, the perceived or outwardly presented weakness of one side would have made treaty-making pointless. This perception and presentation of indigenous peoples appears as a significant cause for the difference between the two sides.

In contrast to this, Wakefield and Ward presented Māori as a capable side in treaty-making. Moreover, as Māori were given to be desirous of contact, they also appeared as willing to enter into treaties with the British. This difference in the two sides' views of the feasibility of treaties is, thus, perfectly in congruence with how they viewed Māori as actors. It appears argumentatively perfectly coherent that the Committee, in whose report Māori appeared mainly as reactive and passive, viewed treaties as inappropriate, whereas alongside the more proactive presentation of Māori Wakefield and Ward also presented Māori as competent parties for treaties.

The treaties with Māori who had not sold their land and their contact with the colony, as proposed by the NZA, also appeared as a solution to the fatal impact that Wakefield and Ward built up as a major reason and justification for intervention in New Zealand. Wakefield and Ward proposed that following the terms that would have been agreed to in the treaties with those who had not ceded their lands 'the crown of England, might, indeed, exert a persuasive influence amongst the yet independent tribes, for the repression of native wars, and also for regulating commercial intercourse between natives and British subjects in general'. This was also meant to have allowed colonial officials to punish British subjects for crimes committed in the independent territories and to seize runaway convicts there. These were, after all, given as the main reasons and justifications for colonising New Zealand.<sup>846</sup> In this way, Wakefield and Ward proposed that their colonisation plan would have solved the problems that they had presented as afflicting New Zealand. One problem that could have been pointed to in this argumentation was that they did not provide any concrete reason to believe that even if some Māori would not sell their land, they would still enter into such treaties with the British. This possibility was not acknowledged further than the general argument that Māori supposedly desired contact with the British. In Wakefield and Ward's presentation of the situation in New Zealand and their knowledge claims of Māori, a lack of Māori willingness for contact was not noted as a cause for concern for the NZA's colonial plans.

Such treaties were, of course, connected to the different perspectives of the different parties involved in drafting them. Entering into treaties would have also required active participation from Māori. The legal scholar Carwyn Jones notes that the Treaty of Waitangi did not appear in a landscape without a constitutional tradition

<sup>846</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand 1837*, 57; See also *A Statement of the Objects of the New Zealand Association 1837*, 4.

by Māori. By constitutional tradition he means ‘the collection of rules, principles and practices that shape the way in which public power is exercised within a political community’. He indicates that in treaty negotiations Māori applied their own views of this constitutional tradition to how interactions between Māori and Europeans were to take place. Jones further suggests that treaties were used to connect and sustain distinctive constitutional communities and that thus ‘treaties become instruments of connection and association, not assimilation or amalgamation’.<sup>847</sup> As legal instruments, treaties might not, therefore, appear solely as tools for colonisation, as Jones proposes. However, from the practical, historical perspective of the British early-19<sup>th</sup>-century views of indigenous peoples and what were considered the ‘proper’ civilisation and ways of living, it is clear that for the NZA treaties played a significant part in their intentions to amalgamate Māori. Such attitudes towards Māori in turn eventuated into dispossession in the following decades, despite any possibly altruistic intentions by Wakefield and Ward and the NZA.

Wakefield and Ward’s argumentation was essentially tied to claims of what were the root causes of the perceived problems in New Zealand. In their section on the ‘Existing state of British colonization in New Zealand’, they argued that colonisation was supposedly under way in a haphazard manner in New Zealand, and that the evils caused by uncontrolled settlers and sailors appeared as symptoms of this colonisation. The division between ‘good’ and ‘bad’ settler colonialism provided Wakefield and Ward with a basis for justifying the NZA’s plans. Furthermore, it provided a basis for claiming what was to be done to remedy the problems. This colonisation could not supposedly be stopped. Thus, in Wakefield and Ward’s argumentation a logical step for remedying this uncontrolled colonisation would have been their systematic, ‘good’ colonisation. This happened to also be the main goal of the NZA. The claims that Māori had improved through interactions that were viewed as proper civilised contact provided a further mechanism for the NZA’s suggestions for solving the given problems also outside the actual colony. British influence and Māori exposure with the colony supposedly would have prevented European evils and served to provide a civilising influence to the Māori groups outside the colony. This would have fulfilled the NZA’s goal of a civilising colony whilst bringing British law to Māori and the ‘lawless’ settlers.

The spiritual and religious instruction among Māori gave a different perspective to New Zealand. The approaches of the two sides to religious instruction were consistent with what they presented as necessary among Māori, but also with their more general approaches to spiritual matters. As noted earlier, in addition to more

<sup>847</sup> Jones 2018.

practical proposals for colonisation, *The British Colonization* included some more details on action towards Māori written from an evangelical perspective. Chapter 7 was entitled ‘Religious establishment’ and it was written by Dr Hinds. The Appendix entitled ‘Exceptional Laws in favour of the Natives of New Zealand’ was in turn composed by Rev. Montague Hawtrey, a member of the NZA.<sup>848</sup> In the very brief chapter on the religious establishment of the colony, Hinds noted that establishing churches and other religious organisations was not only considered necessary for the moral condition of the settlers, but also due to the express goal of civilising and Christianising Māori. However, beyond acknowledging the influence missionaries had exerted among Māori in converting them, and the opposite influence of corrupting settlers, the only more specific recommendation in Hinds’s chapter was that a bishop be appointed in New Zealand.<sup>849</sup> Despite the NZA having sought to enlist a clergyman for realising the more spiritual aspects of their plan, this chapter in its brevity was in line with the whole of *The British Colonization* in briefly acknowledging missionary and religious influence on Māori. As a whole, however, the religious side of the intervention in the NZA’s plans for New Zealand was largely overshadowed by other aspects of the Association’s colonisation plan.

Hawtrey’s Appendix provided some more concrete details of interactions with Māori. It rested on the perception, similar to that of the Aborigines Committee, that in founding a new colony one side, that having been Māori, were ‘immeasurably inferior to the other’. However, instead of acceding to the Committee’s recommendations that contact should have been limited, Hawtrey drew up principles that were meant to ensure fair interaction and Māori improvement despite their supposed disparity with the British. These included an idea of having British families ‘adopt’ Māori families as friends and allies so that the close interaction arising from this would spread the civilisation of the law-abiding settlers to those Māori. These Māori families would also have been given land among the British settlers to ensure the continuing influence. He also suggested, inferring to the perceived inferiority of non-European peoples generally, that it would be unjust to enforce British criminal law too strictly on Māori. Instead, early on some leniency was to be given to Māori, as would have been given to a guilty child.<sup>850</sup> This again reflected the contemporary conception of indigenous peoples as juvenile in contrast to Europeans.

<sup>848</sup> These parts of the NZA were also anonymous and Hawtrey’s appendix was explicitly anonymised since it was entitled in the book as: ‘Exceptional Laws in Favour of the Natives of New Zealand [By —, M.A., of Trinity College, Cambridge]’. See *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 399.

<sup>849</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 68–72.

<sup>850</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 399–422; See also Burns 1989, 52–53.

This same interaction as a practical way in which civilisation was to be disseminated among Māori was later more specifically defined in the NZC's instructions to William Wakefield. It was defined that one tenth of the land sold by Māori was to be reserved by the Company for 'chief families of the tribe by whom the land was originally sold'. Such a scheme would have interspersed Māori among British people and the interactions would have supposedly provided civilisation to those Māori. It would have also, as Salesa points out, amalgamated them into the colonial society.<sup>851</sup> This specification was not yet articulated in *The British Colonization*, but the principle of contact providing civilisation was clear and exemplified by Wakefield and Ward's claims of trade having civilised Māori.

Hawtreys also noted the significance of the position of chiefs in Māori society. He suggested that those chiefs who were willing to sell their lands to the colony were to be allotted a tract of land proportional to the size of the land they owned and the number of slaves they liberated in selling their land. According to Hawtreys, this would have allowed the chiefs to maintain their dignity and to maintain a high social standing in the new colony.<sup>852</sup> In a curious way, this acknowledgement of the chiefs' status within Māori society and some intent to allow them to maintain that status was a recognition of some value or significance that was attached to a non-British way of life. This was a very rare acknowledgement in contrast to any of the other lines of argumentation on New Zealand in either the works of Wakefield and Ward or the Aborigines Committee. Alan Ward has indicated, however, that this was part of the amalgamation of Māori and Britons in New Zealand. He suggests that the Māori rank system was to be made to fit the British class structure, with chiefs being linked to British peers and fitting into the upper house of the legislature.<sup>853</sup> Even this perspective would acknowledge Māori societal systems, but practically as something to be adapted to British systems and something that made colonisation more practicable rather than as valuable to be preserved in and of itself.

Altogether, even with the sections by Hinds and Hawtreys, the main focus in *The British Colonization* in terms of how this systematic and civilising colony was to be established, was on the extensive contact between the British settlers who were considered good and law-abiding, in contrast to the corrupting and uncontrolled settlers and sailors. What is notable as a whole, is that little practical consideration was given to religious instruction or the role of missionaries in the colony. Belich, after all, notes that missionary work was one of the main agencies of the NZC's plans only a few years later. Missionary work and religious instruction were not

<sup>851</sup> *Instructions to Colonel Wakefield, Principal Agent of the Company* 1839. See also Salesa 2013, 30–32.

<sup>852</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 404–406.

<sup>853</sup> Ward, A. 1974, 35–36.

completely disregarded by the NZA,<sup>854</sup> yet, the religious aspect of contact with Māori was not the leading edge of the NZA's argumentation. The general supposed colonising influence of contact was emphasised, which was consistent with Wakefield's own theoretical focus in his colonial writing.

In contrast to the argumentation and plans presented for the NZA, religious instruction and missionary work were, unsurprisingly, the main aspects of the Aborigines Committee's recommendations. The Committee placed their argumentation about the appropriate ways of dealing with indigenous peoples generally in stark contrast to the harmful effects and what they called calamities which European settlers had caused in different parts of the world.<sup>855</sup> In the general remarks at the beginning of the report, the Committee stated that European contact with indigenous peoples had typically resulted in territory having been usurped, property seized, the numbers of indigenous peoples having diminished, as well as their character having been debased and the spread of civilisation impeded. These were specifically stated as the effects that occurred when there was no missionary presence.<sup>856</sup> The same argument about European contact was again repeated at the end of the report after presenting supposed evidence about the 'Effects of fair dealing and Christian Instruction'. The Committee began their 'Conclusions' with an extract from the witness testimonies of Coates, Beecham and Ellis in which the three secretaries all concurred that European contact, without a missionary presence, introduced European vices, disease and caused demoralisation and other general calamities. Against this backdrop and 'all the bulky evidence before us', the Committee concluded that there were two options to avoid destruction of indigenous peoples who had come into contact with Europeans. There needed to be either 'an overwhelming military force with all its attendant expenses, or a line of temperate conduct and of justice towards our neighbours'. Therefore, the Committee stated that taking more generally beneficial lines of action in New Zealand would have been both for the benefit of the British Empire as well as fulfilling a sense of duty to help

<sup>854</sup> For examples of religious considerations in the NZA's internal communication see Letter from Edward Gibbon Wakefield to Rev. Charles Torlesse, 12 May 1837, fl. 9, Micro-MS-Coll-20-1887 Wakefield family Papers 1815-1853, ATL; Letter from Major Campbell to Samuel Hinds, 13 July 1837, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Letter book 1837, ATL; 'At a meeting held at the rooms of the New Zealand Association, 31 May 1837, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Minutes etc 1837, ATL; 'At a meeting of the Committee & other members of the New Zealand Association, held at their chambers', 21 November 1837, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Minutes etc 1837, ATL.

<sup>855</sup> For previous discussions of these general views and suggestions by the Committee see e.g. Lester 2002a, 26–29; Elbourne 2003a; Laidlaw 2004, 3–4.

<sup>856</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 5.

other peoples.<sup>857</sup> This humanitarian and evangelical perspective in argumentation is comparable to arguments by German Lutheran missionaries in 1840 in South Australia, who viewed that contact with a European colonial society was harmful to indigenous peoples and an impediment to proper Christian civilisation. In their view, this was also related to a need to civilise indigenous peoples in segregation from Europeans other than missionaries.<sup>858</sup> This was also the crux of the arguments articulated by the Aborigines Committee.

To outline how such ‘temperate conduct’ could be achieved the Committee proposed general suggestions for contact with indigenous peoples, including the protection of indigenous peoples by the British executive government rather than local legislatures, as well as a prohibition against selling ardent spirits to indigenous peoples and the promotion of religious instruction, missionary work and education.<sup>859</sup> There had been calls to protect Māori from maltreatment by lawless British subjects since the 1810s, when Samuel Marsden had begun planning a mission in New Zealand. Attwood views that the Committee’s attitude of presenting Māori as weak resulted in viewing them as subjects in need of protection.<sup>860</sup> Despite the Committee’s description of the warlike strength of Māori, their adherence to the view of British superiority and disparity between Māori and Europeans was a major driving factor in their argumentation which was coloured by humanitarian concern.

Attwood also suggests that the NZA’s use of similar language of protection was used to win governmental support.<sup>861</sup> Whether this implies disingenuity on the part of the NZA or not, in contrast to the Aborigines Committee, views of protection provided both sides with argumentation for action in New Zealand. Protection by European empires of both its subjects and other people was not limited to the humanitarian thought of the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. So-called protection talk was used to indicate protection of the Empire’s own subjects as currency in interpolity relations and also to pledge protection over newly encountered groups. In European colonial expansion, it also occasionally allowed for expanding European influence elsewhere, without immediately seizing land or authority in newly encountered places.<sup>862</sup> For imperial intervention in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, the idea of protection was found to be convenient since it combined an acceptable degree of action with minimal expense and little commitment to long-term responsibilities.<sup>863</sup> In this sense, the Committee’s

<sup>857</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 74–75.

<sup>858</sup> Scrimgeour 2006, 7.

<sup>859</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 77–81.

<sup>860</sup> Attwood 2017, 155–156 & 163. See Attwood’s entire chapter for a run-through of the evolution of protection talk relating to New Zealand.

<sup>861</sup> Attwood 2017, 163–164.

<sup>862</sup> For an examination of protection talk more generally see Benton & Clulow 2017.

<sup>863</sup> Porter 1999, 199.

presentation of the need for intervention in New Zealand to protect Māori was consistent with their view that only limited action was to be taken. The idea of protection as limited in extent and expense fit well together with the Committee's argument that sufficient protection could have been achieved with limited intervention. But as Wakefield and Ward also used humanitarian language to indicate the usefulness of their suggestions, it is evident that this argumentation could be adapted to fit different perspectives.

The Committee also presented more detailed suggestions for individual areas of concern. Regarding Pacific islands and New Zealand, the Committee suggested that since 'the natives have none of the methods of preventing or punishing crime which are in use in the civilized world' and these areas were outside the jurisdiction of courts in Australia, Consular Agents were to be appointed in principal islands. The role of these Consular Agents was to arrest and try British subjects who committed crimes, and they would have been supported by British ships of war that were to visit these islands regularly.<sup>864</sup> In the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, following various treaty negotiations, consuls and consular agents were used among European and even non-European nations, such as North American nations. They served as agents with legal oversight over subjects in foreign territories.<sup>865</sup> The reasons for suggesting these Agents were based on a balance between preventing the harmful effect of contact that the Committee extensively documented, yet avoiding 'any further interference with the internal affairs of the South Sea Islands' and not exerting Great Britain's 'power to destroy the political rights of these comparatively feeble and defenceless people'.<sup>866</sup> Thus, this would have been a preferable way of limiting Māori contact with Europeans in the Committee's view and therefore preferable to colonisation. The Committee viewed the latter as the cause of the aforementioned problems of indigenous peoples losing their lands and property, among other problems, and conversely appointing Consular Agents appeared as an acceptable degree of action for protecting Māori.

The Aborigines Committee's stance that Māori were in need of protection by the means of limited intervention was very coherently based on the general themes of the report in terms of presenting claimed knowledge of Māori and other indigenous peoples. According to Attwood, the focus on indigenous peoples as having been 'weak' gave a new cast to previous views of British protection of indigenous peoples. Attwood contrasts this notion of protection with older conceptions of indigenous peoples as more or less sovereign or capable of being allies of the British Empire.<sup>867</sup>

<sup>864</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 85–86.

<sup>865</sup> Pennell 2009; Benton & Clulow 2015, 94.

<sup>866</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 85–86.

<sup>867</sup> Attwood 2020, 118.

This older conception appears as having been closer to Wakefield and Ward's approach to Māori. Equally, it is comparable to Boisen's examination of trusteeship. Many contemporary theorists considered, along the lines of stadial views of civilisation, that less civilised peoples were not 'sufficiently developed and robust enough to sustain a fully functioning system of rights in which self-realisation is a priority'. Therefore, trusteeship until sufficient civilisation had been reached through the aid of the supposedly more civilised nations would have been seen as necessary.<sup>868</sup> Following the evangelical and humanitarian concern and language of wishing to spread Christianity to Māori, on the one hand, and European settlers causing harm to Māori, on the other hand, the suggestions presented by the Committee for New Zealand were clearly consistent with this presentation of Māori character. Moreover, as Māori were presented as 'feeble' and incapable of protecting themselves, again they were reduced to a rather passive role. Yet, there appeared a general will in the report to uphold their sovereignty instead of extensive British colonial action, even though this sovereignty was not extensively or explicitly discussed by the Committee. Missionary work was not specifically detailed in relation to New Zealand or Polynesia, but the general suggestion of supporting missionaries, religious instruction and education applied and was overtly publicised across the report.

The concept of placing British consular agents in New Zealand was not new, invented by the Committee when it came to New Zealand. It was consistent with the views of the CMS, as presented by Coates a few years earlier. In August 1835, the Colonial Office asked Coates's opinion of James Busby's continuation as the British Resident in New Zealand. In his answer, Coates stated that 'the residence of a British Consular Agent is required in New Zealand'. As reasons for this need, Coates pointed to the need to check the evils caused by British sealers and whalers and the possible commercial benefits that might arise from New Zealand. According to Coates, these commercial benefits would have also required some control from an official British Agent.<sup>869</sup> In comparison to the Aborigines Committee's report, a notable difference in this argumentation for Consular Agents was that the Committee did not place much emphasis on the commercial prospects of the Empire as a reason to appoint such officials. While matters relating to commerce were briefly noted in the Committee's other presentations relating to New Zealand, the matter of Consular Agents focused almost entirely on preventing the effects of European sailors and settlers on Māori. Coates's response and reference to a Consular Agent was also given in the context of the discussions related to Busby as the British Resident in

<sup>868</sup> Boisen 2013, 351.

<sup>869</sup> Letter from Dandeson Coates to Lord Glenelg, 29 August 1835, fl. 361–363, CO 209/1, TNA.

1835. The Consular Agents suggested by the Aborigines Committee differed from the post of the British Resident mainly in that the suggested Agents were to have more judicial power and, more crucially, the support of the power of British ships of war behind them, in contrast to Busby.

One major problem with Busby's post as the Resident was that he had had no real power over British settlers and sailors to enact his post. When Busby's role as the Resident was originally considered in the Colonial Office it was planned that a warship was to be permanently stationed in New Zealand, but the Admiralty refused to provide one. Furthermore, when Busby was appointed, it was considered by the Parliament that he could not have judicial power because New Zealand was a foreign power.<sup>870</sup> In comparison to the discussions about the British Resident, it is evident that the Aborigines Committee largely tried to rehash ideas that had been considered and had come up against opposition earlier. According to their Minutes of Evidence, the Committee did not officially seek testimonies on the question of Consular Agents in New Zealand. It is, however, presumable that the Committee would have been aware, at least through personal communications with Coates, of the discussions relating to Busby and Consular Agents that had taken place previously. The Committee's new recommendations appear to have been intended to correct problems that had made Busby's post as Resident insufficiently powerful to prevent these very problems that were presented by the Aborigines Committee in their report as reasons for acting in regard to New Zealand. The Committee's suggestions fell in line with considerations of New Zealand that Coates and the CMS had presented a few years previously. This emphasises the interconnected relationship of the Committee and missionary parties.

Relating to the Aborigines Committee's recommendations generally, Alan Lester notes that while the Committee presented a litany of colonial abuses, it still called for greater, not less, colonial intervention. This colonial intervention was directed at preventing indigenous genocide, and even if genocide was not a threat, moral corruption of indigenous peoples was enough to call for this intervention.<sup>871</sup> This is true particularly in terms of the Committee's support for missionary work. The humanitarians' views of the legitimacy of European culture and the European understanding of what was supposedly best for non-European populations points to their Eurocentric conceptions of the world. As Susan Thorne suggests, these imperialist assumptions among Britain's socially progressive factions indicate that 'few if any Victorian could have been inured to the temptation of imperial identifications'.<sup>872</sup> Here, however, in contrasting the Aborigines Committee's

<sup>870</sup> Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 42.

<sup>871</sup> Lester 2001, 114–115; Lester 2002b, 281–282.

<sup>872</sup> Thorne 1999, 21.

suggestions with Wakefield and Ward's plans for New Zealand, the charged concepts of colonialism and colonial intervention are shown to be somewhat problematic.

From our current perspective, the 19<sup>th</sup>-century missionary work can unquestionably be considered colonial in nature. Whereas Wakefield and Ward were explicit about their planned goal of amalgamating Māori into the planned British colonial society, the Aborigines Committee's support for missionary activity was also premised on 'civilising' Māori in the model of British ways of life. Despite these differences between the two sides, the Committee's proposals did have a similar implication as Wakefield and Ward in their practical intention to turn Māori communities into a British-style society. These notions were grounded in forms of benevolence and humanitarian protection that ultimately enabled Indigenous dispossession. As Penelope Edmonds observes, this was a real tragedy that humanitarians did not intervene in.<sup>873</sup> In terms of knowledge and knowledge systems that influenced action, this perception or understanding of action as colonial is however also a matter of perspective. For an early-19<sup>th</sup>-century reader or author, were they humanitarian-inclined advocates or colonial prospectors, the questions of colonial action and its scale would have appeared more nuanced. From the British evangelical conception of civilising missionary work as having been *a priori* beneficial to all, missionary work would not have appeared as comparable colonial action to the atrocities that were presented as having taken place in New Zealand or the settler colonialism that the NZA was proposing. Indicative of this is the Aborigines Committee's recommendation that treaties with indigenous peoples, as a general rule, were to be discouraged. This view did not arise from any place of respect for indigenous peoples, but rather as paternalistic protection whereby contact between indigenous peoples and the British should be diminished.<sup>874</sup> Therefore colonial actions, such as treaties for acquiring land from indigenous peoples, were not considered proper. However, the Committee promoted missionary work as they viewed it as able to provide improvement to indigenous peoples that was desirable from an early-19<sup>th</sup>-century British point of view. This distinction between different strands of colonialism does not imply any justification or excuse for action one way or another. It simply points out the complexities and multiple sides of European colonialism and the debates around it.

<sup>873</sup> Edmonds 2018, 2 & 10.

<sup>874</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 80.

## Debate between the Two Sides

The different conceptions of what constituted beneficial or colonial action in the respective perspectives resulted in direct back-and-forth debates between the NZA and the Aborigines Committee along with networks surrounding it. In their suggestions about promoting limited colonial intervention in New Zealand, the Committee took aim at the NZA's plans. In the final paragraph of the report's suggestions for the South Sea Islands the Committee noted that '[v]arious schemes for colonising New Zealand and other parts of Polynesia have at different time been suggested, and one such project is at present understood to be on foot'. In a rather constrained way, the Committee recommended that no such ventures should be engaged in 'until an opportunity shall have been offered to both Houses of Parliament of laying before Her Majesty their humble advice as to the policy of such an enlargement of Her Majesty's dominions'.<sup>875</sup>

Again, the suggestion by the Committee against any formal colonisation reflected Coates's earlier opinions from 1835. These were presented by Coates two years before the founding the NZA, but it had not been the only British venture for colonising New Zealand in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>876</sup> In 1835, when Coates responded to the Colonial Office about the expediency of Busby's post as British Resident, he included in his promotion of a Resident in New Zealand also a general opposition against colonisation. He opined that

I most earnestly deprecate the Colonization of New Zealand by this Country. That would inevitably be destructive to the Natives. [...] All that is required is that the Government should permanently establish such a friendly relation with the Chiefs as would protect the Natives from the wrongs of British subjects.<sup>877</sup>

The underlining of the word 'colonisation' suggests that Coates saw a distinct difference between colonisation plans similar to those that the NZA would propose a few years later and appointing a Consular Agent as a means that was not equal to this kind of colonisation. Instead of colonisation, Coates also suggested the

<sup>875</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 86.

<sup>876</sup> In 1825, for example, there had been an attempt at planning a systematic colonisation of parts of New Zealand by the first establishment that was named New Zealand Company. However, its poor planning, intelligence and limited financial resources prevented its success. See Burns 1989, 18–22; Moon 2013. Also, a vocal supporter of the CMS, Rev. Andrew Cheap had suggested planting a small colony in New Zealand for aiding missionaries. This idea received Marsden's endorsement but was not supported by the CMS. See Ballantyne 2015, 56–57.

<sup>877</sup> Letter from Dandeson Coates to Lord Glenelg, 29 August 1835, fl. 363, CO 209/1, TNA, underlining in the original.

promotion of Christianity among Māori, since ‘already is its influence to civilise, and to impart temporal blessings abundantly manifest’.<sup>878</sup> The exact same themes of Christianity and mission together with what was viewed as limited governmental action, rather than colonisation, in New Zealand carried over from Coates’s answers to the Colonial Office and to the Aborigines Committee and their recommendations. These matters were discussed widely in the interviews with Coates, Beecham and Ellis before the Committee. In his testimonies, Coates repeated his opinions from a few years earlier, stating that ‘though I do not conceive colonization to be necessarily productive of destructive consequences, it has so generally led to that result, that there is nothing that I should deprecate more than the colonization of New Zealand by this country’.<sup>879</sup> The Committee’s stance of opposing colonisation was thus consistent with many other intertwined humanitarian perspectives on New Zealand.

Indicative of his view of the Aborigines Committee’s work, Buxton felt that the final report undercut the NZA’s plans and forestalled possible colonisation of New Zealand.<sup>880</sup> His optimism was based on both his satisfaction with the report as well as his personal communications with the Colonial Office. Writing to his brother-in-law, Joseph John Gurney, Buxton asserted that ‘[t]hat report embodies all that I have to say both about passed delinquencies, & their remedies, & I shall tomorrow present the report’. He also recounted an occasion in the Colonial Office that had pleased him. He wrote that as he visited the Colonial Office to inform officials of the completion of the report, ‘they replied “just in time, we have been sorely pressed by a deputation of influential persons, who want to make a settlement at New Zealand. Your report slays that mischievous project.”’<sup>881</sup> This anecdote reveals Buxton’s confidence in the Committee’s work, but also serves as a reminder of the personable relationships that existed in the background of the official papers in British colonial government. Lester, Boehme and Mitchell’s description of the Colonial Office also illustrates its connections and nature in colonial policymaking in the 1830s. They present Colonial Office as an exceedingly busy place with ‘Papers! papers! papers!’ flooding in as James Stephen once wrote. Their attention was split juggling the 30 to 40 colonies under their consideration with limited staff.<sup>882</sup> This difficulty in being

<sup>878</sup> Letter from Dandeson Coates to Lord Glenelg, 29 August 1835, fl. 363, CO 209/1, TNA.

<sup>879</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, 512–513, question 4366; See also *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 490, question 4290, 491, questions 4298–4300, 492, question 4306 & 515, question 4367.

<sup>880</sup> Ballantyne 2011, 254.

<sup>881</sup> Letter from Thomas Fowell Buxton to Joseph John Gurney, 25 June 1837, MSS. Brit. Emp. s. 444 Papers of Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton 1st Baronet (1) Vol. 2 Family Letters 1812–1851, BLOU.

<sup>882</sup> Lester, Boehme & Mitchell 2021, 2 & 12–19. See also Attwood 2019, 101.

able to concentrate on individual matters gave more extensive examinations and personal connections, such as the Aborigines Committee and their report, the chance to interject with their views on colonial matters.

However, Buxton's confidence in the report 'slaying' the NZA's plans proved premature as demonstrated by the continued debates about colonising New Zealand following its publication. The NZA continued its pressure campaign directed at the British colonial government.<sup>883</sup> The Aborigines Committee had weighed in on the potential colonisation of New Zealand as destructive in order to undercut the plans of the likes of the NZA. However, Wakefield and Ward shot back in the very beginning of *The British Colonization*. While not directly referencing the Aborigines Committee, Wakefield and Ward drew on their claims of Māori character to argue why suggestions closely resembling those of the Committee were not advisable in contrast to the NZA's proposals.

The comparison between the Committee's suggestions and the NZA's plans was presented in the second chapter of the book after a very concise outlining of Wakefield and Ward's main points about alleged Māori savagery, the harmful effects of uncontrolled sailors and settlers as well as the supposed Māori capacity for improvement. The more extensive supposed evidence for these claims was provided in the later sections of the book. In their argument, Wakefield and Ward noted that as a solution for New Zealand's situation 'it has been suggested that the Church missionaries [...] have obtained a sufficient influence with the tribes there, to induce them to form some sort of *native* government' in the northern parts of New Zealand, which was the centre of European-Māori contact.<sup>884</sup> Building on their claimed knowledge of New Zealand, Wakefield and Ward proceeded to dismantle this idea by drawing conclusions on the nature of contact between Māori and Europeans. They deduced that 'the natives could not preserve, or even form such a government, except under the guidance of a higher degree of intelligence than they at present possess' and that Māori did not have sufficient physical force to control European sojourners.<sup>885</sup> These arguments drew on both the supposed savagery and incapacity of Māori in their 'original' state to argue that they were not capable of governing themselves in the face of European settlers arriving in New Zealand. In this argument, European conceptions of indigenous 'savagery' supported the idea that Māori would not have been able to form a 'native government'. Yet, curiously, here Māori also appeared as 'enfeebled', to borrow Ballantyne's term, in their interactions with Europeans. Somewhat conflictingly, despite the supposed warlike character of Māori, which was also used by Wakefield and Ward to indicate their supposed

<sup>883</sup> Ballantyne 2011, 254–255.

<sup>884</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 40, italicisation in the original.

<sup>885</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 40–41.

savagery in their state before contact with Europeans, here Māori were simultaneously depicted as lacking physical force to stand up to Europeans.

More generally and as a part of the conception of fatal necessity, this kind of view of the incapacity of Māori to stand up for themselves has been identified as having had a particularly strong impact on attitudes towards New Zealand. Adams argues that Busby's report of the situation between Europeans and Māori, which was received at the Colonial Office in December 1837, was influential in tipping Lord Glenelg's scales towards abandoning his opposition to the NZA in the Colonial Office. Previously, Glenelg had favoured the missionary-driven arguments, whereby colonisation was seen as harmful to indigenous peoples, but, according to Adams, Busby's reporting convinced him that destructive colonisation was already underway in New Zealand.<sup>886</sup> Busby's detailed reporting included accounts of the relations between different Māori groups, but also detail in matters that Busby viewed as injurious to Māori in more general terms. These were very familiar topics. On the one hand, Māori wars and retaliations were mentioned, and, on the other hand, he noted the introduction of European vices such as liquor, tobacco and venereal diseases among Māori. Due to these causes and the resulting reported decrease in population, Busby concluded that British intervention was necessary. Although, it is notable that in 1837 Busby himself did not propose colonisation as a solution. Instead, he suggested that a treaty could be made with the 'Confederation of Chiefs' in northern New Zealand so that Britain could act as a 'protecting state' to New Zealand without taking possession of it. In Busby's view this would have also served to facilitate providing instruction to Māori chiefs regarding 'the duties required of them'.<sup>887</sup>

Attwood has argued that Busby's reporting was not the watershed moment as has been suggested by Adams, for example. He points out that the NZA's bill was still defeated after the reception of Busby's reporting. Moreover, James Stephen in the Colonial Office still recommended the establishment of trading stations in several locations in New Zealand, which he considered to have been sufficient and not too far-reaching to provide protection to Māori without taking over their land.<sup>888</sup> Whether a clear moment of change in attitude within the British colonial administration is discernible or whether the road to the Treaty of Waitangi was a result of haphazard events, the argumentation that centred on the need to extend some British governance in New Zealand was applied from different directions in the debates on New Zealand. By the end of 1837, the view that more comprehensive

<sup>886</sup> Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 77–78; Orange (1987) 1997, 26.

<sup>887</sup> Letter from James Busby to the Colonial Secretary of New South Wales, 16 June 1837, fl. 38–58, CO 209/2, TNA.

<sup>888</sup> Attwood 2017, 164–165.

action had to be taken above and beyond establishing consuls in New Zealand in order to avoid fatal effects of colonisation on Māori became more widespread in Britain. This was despite some individuals, such as Stephen, not having been convinced of its fairness towards Māori.<sup>889</sup> The idea of Māori incapacity to govern themselves without British intervention, which was in the background of Busby's reporting, was also exactly the argument that was reinforced by Wakefield and Ward with their presentation of New Zealand in *The British Colonization*. Furthermore, this message by Wakefield and Ward was not only directed towards governmental officials, but also at prospective supporters, missionary societies and other audiences, whom they strove to reach with their book.

Continuing their reasoning in *The British Colonization*, Wakefield and Ward maintained that if Māori could not govern themselves, a government that would have been advised by missionaries or supported with the force of a British ship of war would not have been an indigenous government. Rather, they argued, it would be 'both guided and upheld by a foreign authority; it would be really and truly a British government, though in a native garb'. In conclusion, Wakefield and Ward contended that government was required to prevent Māori destruction at the hands of European uncontrolled settlers, and that the government could not have been achieved without British help. Therefore, if British governance was needed, it should have been utilised through an allegedly beneficial 'deliberate and methodical scheme for leading a savage people to embrace the religion, language, laws, and social habits of an advanced country'. For this, the NZA's plan for a systematic 'civilising' colonisation was presented as the only other beneficial alternative.<sup>890</sup>

In this argumentation, Wakefield and Ward dismissed any lines of action towards New Zealand, whether they were suggested by the Aborigines Committee or Busby, that could have been considered as constituting a form of trusteeship as discussed by Andrew Porter and Camilla Boisen. They did not consider feasible measures that were theoretically based on limiting European contact or in some sense keeping land in trust until Māori had reached a perceived proper level of civilisation through missionary education. This was basically what the Aborigines Committee's argumentation was based on. Wakefield and Ward viewed these measures insufficient. Since a mode of government in New Zealand that was partially supported by Britain was unacceptable to Wakefield and Ward, their solution was a fully-fledged colonial government being founded by the NZA in New Zealand. The reasons Wakefield and Ward gave for this model having been supposedly better were mainly based on the alleged protective and civilising influence of their colonisation

<sup>889</sup> Ward, A. 1974, 30.

<sup>890</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand 1837*, 41–42.

model on Māori. They also argued that Māori desired further contact, which would have been cemented by entering into treaties with Māori.

The view that the Aborigines Committee's suggestions were not sufficient to prevent the evils that were reported from New Zealand was often repeated as criticism towards the Committee's suggestions. It was utilised by the NZA, and later on by the NZC. Even during the NZA's negotiations for governmental support for their scheme in December 1837, Lord Glenelg wrote to Lord Durham, who was at the time leading the NZA, and noted that the proposals by the Aborigines Committee were considered inadequate to counteract the existing evils and the injurious acts committed against Māori.<sup>891</sup> This is indicative of Glenelg's change of opinion in late 1837. Discussion and debates of this kind continued even after the publication of the Aborigines Committee's report and *The British Colonization*. As argumentative and lobbying publications, these two works presented in detail arguments for the respective plans of the two sides. They provided a starting point for individuals connected to the two sides to continue pamphleteering against each other. The pamphlets from each side presented further points of criticism against the other, providing a window into how the respective arguments were received and supposedly countered.

### Successive Counters to the Opposing Arguments

There was a clear division between the NZA's plans and the evangelical-humanitarian side of Buxton and the mission societies. Many missionaries, particularly from the CMS, maintained along the lines of the Aborigines Committee's suggestions that colonisation was not to be undertaken in New Zealand. Dandeson Coates and the CMS, in particular, continued active campaigning to the Colonial Office about their opposition to the NZA's proposals and tried to present suggestions similar to those of the Aborigines Committee on limited missionary-led intervention.<sup>892</sup> These contrary opinions on New Zealand between mission societies and the NZA led to a flurry of pamphlets having been printed in 1837 and 1838, with each side presenting their objections to the arguments of the other side. In 1837, Coates had a pamphlet printed entitled *The Principles, Objects, and Plan of the New Zealand Association Examined, in a letter to the Right Hon. Lord Glenelg, Secretary of State for the Colonies*, after he had heard incorrectly that the NZA was about to

<sup>891</sup> Letter from Lord Glenelg to Lord Durham, 29 December 1837, New Zealand Association MSI-Papers-7551 New Zealand Association Letterbook 1837–38, ATL. On Glenelg's opinion see also Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 74.

<sup>892</sup> Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 56–57 & 81–82; Hickford 2006, 130; Ballantyne 2011, 256–257.

receive support from Lord Melbourne for their Bill for colonising New Zealand. After correspondence with Buxton, Coates decided to write a pamphlet as a short and forcible response to combat the NZA's propositions.<sup>893</sup> Coates followed this pamphlet with another in 1838 entitled *The Present State of the New-Zealand Question Considered, in a letter to J. P. Plumptee, Esq., M.P.* Furthermore, in 1838 John Beecham of the WMS wrote two further pamphlets entitled *Colonization: being Remarks on Colonization in General, with an Examination of the Proposals of the Association which has been formed for Colonising New Zealand* and *Remarks upon the Latest Official Documents relating to New Zealand*. Wakefield, in turn, responded to Coates's criticism of the NZA with his printed pamphlet *Mr. Dandeson Coates, and the New Zealand Association; in a letter to Right Hon. Lord Glenelg*.<sup>894</sup> Both works by Coates and Beecham in his pamphlet emphasised the views that the NZA's plans would not succeed in their expressed goals of eliminating the evils caused to Māori by uncontrolled Europeans or in providing Māori with a sufficient level of improvement.<sup>895</sup> Beecham focused especially on the lack of Christian instruction, and that the most fair and prudent line of action to correct the problems in New Zealand would have been to follow the suggestions of the Aborigines Committee.

Print, particularly in the form of pamphlets, was commonly employed in political lobbying in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. These kinds of prints that were distributed cheaply, or even unsolicited, were used to disseminate views on a variety of political topics, such as pro- and anti-slavery argumentation. These kinds of publications were often directed at influential individuals, such as members of both houses of Parliament, but were also mass-produced in cheaper form for popular distribution. Quakers were particularly prominent in their use of print to promote their abolitionist views in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century, but the same strategies were also adopted by their opponents.<sup>896</sup> The same use of print is also evident in how the NZA sent copies of *The British Colonization* to different evangelical societies to gain their support, and equally in the production of the pamphlets for the successive debates following the publication of *The British Colonization*.

Both Coates and Beecham argued against colonialism, in their cases specifically signifying settler colonialism, and raised objections to the NZA's plans in ways that appear very much congruent with the contemporary writing and argumentative style of the report of the Aborigines Committee as well as *The British Colonization*. With

<sup>893</sup> Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 69. See Coates 1837a. On missionary campaigning against the NZA see also Orange (1987) 1997, 25–26.

<sup>894</sup> Coates 1838; Beecham 1838a; Beecham 1838b; Wakefield 1837.

<sup>895</sup> See e.g. Burns 1989, 51.

<sup>896</sup> Raven 2000, 11 & 14–15; Wood 2000, 67–69.

frequent intertextual references and quotes they presented what the NZA proposed in their plans as published in *A Statement* and *The British Colonization*. Based on these references to the NZA's works and counterarguments to the NZA that arose from references to the Aborigines Committee's report, Coates and Beecham argued against NZA's proposed plans. They both also began their works with empiricist-leaning introductions that outlined the harm colonisation had caused to indigenous peoples in North America, Australia and the Cape Colony. With these introductions they clearly indicated their views that settler colonialism could not have been successful in promoting fair and beneficial interaction with indigenous peoples since, as Coates put it, '[a]gain and again must it be repeated, that these direful effects are not insulated cases, but the one, uniform, unvarying, terrible result of the system, however and by whomsoever administered'.<sup>897</sup> Therefore, colonisation was not to be advanced in New Zealand.

The objections Coates and Beecham presented were related to the feasibility of the NZA's plans. But even more crucially they questioned the accuracy of how the NZA presented interactions between Māori and prospective settlers. Coates, in particular, set forth details about the NZA's proposed plans, which he dissected and claimed were unrealistic or too impractical to be functional. He questioned, for example, the NZA's capability to create a fair and functioning colonial administration that would have been unlike many other attempts in British colonial history, which Coates noted was full of 'faults and irreparable evils'. He also questioned whether too much power would have been vested in the colonial corporation, which was meant to govern the initial stages of colonisation according to the NZA's plans.<sup>898</sup> His more forceful comments, however, were related to how Māori and their possible interactions with British colonists were presented. These counterarguments related more closely to Māori character and nature and emphasised the centrality of the considerations of Māori and their purported best interests in these discussions. But they also show that there was much mixing and entanglement between different conceptions of Māori. This ranged from acknowledgements of their sovereignty and their role as active participants in any interactions with the British, such as land sales and treaties, to Eurocentric views of inferiority of non-European 'uncivilised' peoples.

Both Coates and Beecham questioned the relevance of Māori consent as proposed by the NZA. This paralleled the differences between how the Aborigines Committee considered Māori willingness and consent for British action in contrast to *The British Colonization*. The two secretaries argued that the NZA's plan of basing the acquisition of land in New Zealand on Māori consent, while supposedly

<sup>897</sup> Coates 1837a, 9 & *passim*; Beecham 1838a.

<sup>898</sup> Coates 1837a, 12–18.

maintaining Māori sovereignty, was not a sufficient basis for securing the interests of the indigenous people. They argued that Māori in their ‘savage’ state could not understand how entering into agreements or treaties with the NZA would have impacted them, or even functioned in general. Coates argued that in ‘[t]he very state of barbarism in which the Natives are found, would [...] render it quite impossible to make them fully comprehend the ultimate consequences to themselves of such an arrangement’. Therefore, negotiations, such as those proposed by the NZA to acquire land for colonisation, were not to be entertained. Dealing with Māori was to be left to the British government, and even then ‘perhaps only to a limited extent’.<sup>899</sup> Beecham continued along the same lines, maintaining that while the NZA’s plans might have appeared fair to someone ‘with a superficial view of things [...] can thinking persons really believe that barbarous, uncivilized people are in a condition to make a “perfectly-understanding” bargain for the transfer of their lands?’<sup>900</sup> These arguments of Coates and Beecham provided a different view of the supposed inferiority of indigenous peoples than what had been presented by the Aborigines Committee. The Committee had argued that treaties were inexpedient because indigenous peoples would have been incapable of enforcing them. But Coates and Beecham claimed that Māori would not even have been able to understand them fully. As such, the arguments by Coates and Beecham appear as fundamental expressions of missionary hubris relating to the superiority of British culture, civilisation and Christianity over others.

It would be easy to put these remarks about Māori down to a general European colonialist dismissal of indigenous peoples as somehow insignificant or of little importance. However, in the context of the Aborigines Committee and the humanitarian side of the debates on New Zealand, the presented views of Māori and their level of civilisation appear here as the main source for the dismissal of their capacity. In the Aborigines Committee’s report, while Māori sovereignty was considered necessary to be respected, their willingness to receive civilisation did not appear as equally necessary. This was because a lack of civilisation could have implied a lack of desire for civilisation. Missionary work, in turn, was given as capable of correcting this and providing Māori with ‘new wants’. Similarly, this dismissal of Māori as incapable of understanding consequences did not signify that they were dismissed as insignificant in terms of what should be done with New Zealand. Instead, the dismissal here appears related to Māori having been perceived as uncivilised, and therefore incapable of fully participating in any negotiations. In the views of Coates and Beecham, this lack of civilisation would again have been corrected through missionary work with the aid of protection from limited action by

<sup>899</sup> Coates 1837a, 17, 28–29.

<sup>900</sup> Beecham 1838a, 28–29.

the British government. Thus, Māori were not bypassed here as having been insignificant to be considered, but rather as not sufficiently improved to stand up for themselves and therefore as requiring protection from excessive contact with European forces.

To underline these kinds of nuanced perceptions and arguments regarding Māori and their alleged character and capacities, it is necessary to highlight that in Coates and Beecham's arguments against the NZA, Māori in fact appeared as very proactive parties in their interaction with Europeans. This is something that from a modern perspective of colonialism and its history might not be expected alongside such a damning-appearing dismissal of their capacities. Both Coates and Beecham were highly critical of the NZA's premiss that Māori would consensually provide the required land for the proposed colony. Beecham was critical of the general idea that 'spare land' could have been bought from Māori, as he viewed that even if they were convinced to do this it would only eventually lead to the taking over of all their land.<sup>901</sup> Coates, citing his knowledge of missionary interactions with Māori, argued even further that it was wrong to assume that land sales to the extent that was necessary for the NZA were possible with Māori:

Knowing, as I do know, that it is not without difficulty that the Missionaries have been able [...] to obtain a sufficiency of land for their objects, [...] I hold it to be in the highest degree improbable that tracts of sufficient extent and entireness could be acquired by the Association for their Settlements; [...] a "cession of sovereignty" will not be voluntarily made by the Chiefs of New Zealand.<sup>902</sup>

This was a curious remark on Māori agency and a surprisingly candid appraisal of the power relations between missionaries and Māori. As noted earlier, early missionaries in New Zealand relied heavily on the acquiescence of Māori chiefs in terms of having been able to settle near Māori settlements. The missionaries were forced to accept lands that were allotted to them by the chiefs. Ballantyne has examined in detail the ways in which early missions had to accommodate to economic dependence on Māori and Māori cultural organisation, which was related to the different interests of the missionaries and Māori in their interactions.<sup>903</sup> However, such troubles were typically glossed over in published missionary writing. However, here, in arguing against purchasing land from Māori, Coates raised the problems faced by missionaries as it served to underline his opposition to the NZA's plans.

<sup>901</sup> Beecham 1838a, 32–33.

<sup>902</sup> Coates 1837a, 16.

<sup>903</sup> See Ballantyne 2015, 61 & 64–137.

Not only did this emphasis on the possible, and allegedly certain, Māori resistance put into doubt the practicality of the NZA's plans, Coates also argued that colonisation and questions of land and sovereignty would lead to conflicts similar to those that the intervention in New Zealand was aimed at solving. He argued that petty squabbles, misunderstandings and strife over ownership would lead to incidents, retaliations and conflicts in which the more advanced British were likely to demoralise and even exterminate Māori.<sup>904</sup> Alan Ward has observed that Coates was acutely aware of the dilemma of imperialism, whereby even if there was some good intention, as presented by the NZA, the powers of government with coercive power would have inevitably been used to subjugate Māori. This would have resulted in further resistance from Māori.<sup>905</sup> Every now and then acknowledgements of such colonial practicalities arose in discussions about colonisation in the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. For example, Harris remarks that in 1840 Herman Merivale, a professor of political economy and later a permanent undersecretary at the Colonial Office, concluded that the interests of settlers and indigenous peoples were fundamentally opposed and could lead to wars of extermination. Thus, Merivale considered intervention necessary. Harris notes that from this partly altruistic basis assimilation was the only solution, which was similar to the NZA's arguments.<sup>906</sup> In Coates's view, such assimilation was, however, not possible in the way proposed by the NZA. He considered petty squabbles and worse arising even in the colony proposed by the NZA. For Coates, missionary work, with limited other contact with Europeans, was the best means for civilising Māori. This could possibly have led to some form of eventual 'assimilation' with the British once Māori had improved further.

On a general level, Coates questioned the possibility of the NZA's central tenet of civilising colonisation. He attempted to undercut their argumentation by specifically questioning their knowledge of Māori and colonial interactions: 'Are these Gentlemen so little acquainted with the native character, or have they so ill read human nature, as not to know that the attempt to execute such a scheme as this [...] must inevitably give rise to those discussions, broils and conflicts, which Colonization invariably draws after?'<sup>907</sup> Here Coates also invoked the very same theme of conflict causing harm to Māori that was presented as a problem requiring action in New Zealand in both the Aborigines Committee's report and *The British Colonization*. Coates drew upon the perceived character of Māori in stating that 'the natural character of the New Zealanders leads to the inference, that these causes

<sup>904</sup> Coates 1837a, 17 & 19–20.

<sup>905</sup> Ward, A. 1974, 28–29.

<sup>906</sup> Harris 2004, 174.

<sup>907</sup> Coates 1837a, 29.

would operate with peculiar force in this case'.<sup>908</sup> Here, Māori were not all that enfeebled, but rather their character and physical force would have led to escalating problems. The proactive role of Māori in these interactions was highlighted as Coates noted that Māori were aware of the effects of colonisation because they knew what it had caused to Australian Aborigines.<sup>909</sup> The acknowledgement of Māori agency is notable here and it diverged significantly from the Aborigines Committee's report. This was also slightly contradictory to Coates's statement that Māori were too barbaric to comprehend consequences of treaties with the NZA.

There are many possible explanations for this difference in how the Aborigines Committee and Coates presented Māori. For example, it can be somewhat cynically interpreted that Māori agency was acknowledged when it suited the given argumentation, reflecting Belmessous's view of Europeans engaging in treaty-making when it suited them. On the other hand, the Aborigines Committee's report was of a different genre than Coates's pamphlet, and this difference in textual styles and different uses of Māori agency could be considered to have participated in causing this difference to some extent. Also, one explanation for the different acknowledgement of Māori agency can be found in the mechanisms within networks of knowledge. Coates had a more direct line of inquiry into relations between missionaries and Māori as the recipient of a great deal of missionary correspondence. This proximity within the networks and his greater access to information from New Zealand can to some degree explain his more extensive acknowledgement of Māori agency. For Coates, sources and information of Māori agency had not been filtered through another node and through further interests or had not become as flattened, which is apparent with the Aborigines Committee in their writing up their report.

Wakefield, in turn, responded to Coates's criticism in a pamphlet directed to Lord Glenelg. He stated that Coates's pamphlet was 'so well calculated, however unintentionally on his part, to mislead your lordship and the public as to the principles and objects of the Association'. Wakefield discussed in his pamphlet many minor details that he argued were inaccurate in Coates's presentation. The most significant arguments on the debate at hand, however, focused on the impact and possibility of colonisation in New Zealand. Continuing the argumentative style of *The British Colonization* Wakefield did not repudiate assertions made by Coates, and also later made by Beecham, that colonisation had been harmful to indigenous peoples. Instead, he proceeded to point out that Coates had not mentioned New Zealand as a place that had suffered from colonisation, even though it had. Here, Wakefield again quoted a passage from Lord Goderich's letter on the 'shame and

<sup>908</sup> Coates 1837a, 17 & 19–20.

<sup>909</sup> Coates 1837a, 17.

indignation' that was the result of the treatment of Māori.<sup>910</sup> This same passage had been quoted in the Aborigines Committee's report and from there it had been copied as part of a longer extract in *The British Colonization*.<sup>911</sup> In this way Wakefield maintained a close connection to humanitarian concern and rhetoric in his support of the NZA's plans.

Wakefield further expressed the central argument of *The British Colonization* that while official colonisation had not taken place in New Zealand, what was taking place was colonisation that was uncontrolled, or as Wakefield here stated, 'the most disorderly, the most licentious kind'. This, he claimed, was more injurious than other instances of colonisation that had taken place elsewhere.<sup>912</sup> This distinction between the NZA's 'systematic colonisation' and other instances of colonisation, including the alleged on-going uncontrolled colonisation in New Zealand, was one of the main points of the position taken by Wakefield and the NZA. Wakefield argued that Coates's reasoning was flawed in stating: 'Because measures different from yours have failed, therefore will your measure fail.' He thus drew a clear distinction between the NZA's plan and other colonial plans that had failed or were seen as harmful in the past. In this defence, Wakefield stringently blamed Coates for 'not rely[ing] wholly upon argument' but hiding 'secure from the assaults of reasoning' behind his assertions that a beneficial form of colonisation was not possible.<sup>913</sup>

On Coates's criticisms of Māori willingness and Māori character not facilitating the NZA's plans, Wakefield did not go into any detail about his or the NZA's claims of Māori character but simply pointed to the 'great mass of facts' that were presented in *The British Colonisation*'s section 'Views of the Natives as to the settlement of an English Colony'. He then proceeded to list occasions on which CMS missionaries had bought land from Māori.<sup>914</sup> Wakefield also pointed to two sections of *The British Colonization*, the chapter entitled 'Religious establishment' and the appendix on exceptional laws on behalf of Māori, as having been bypassed by Coates and as showing how the colonisation plan by the NZA was to work in civilising them.<sup>915</sup> Beecham, however, continued this back-and-forth the following year as he discussed these sections of *The British Colonization* in greater detail. He implied that they contained contradictions and were 'too extravagant to awaken any serious apprehensions'.<sup>916</sup> However, as the main crux of his arguments regarding Māori,

<sup>910</sup> Wakefield 1837, 1–3.

<sup>911</sup> See *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 17; *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 39–40.

<sup>912</sup> Wakefield 1837, 5.

<sup>913</sup> Wakefield 1837, 5.

<sup>914</sup> Wakefield 1837, 19–20.

<sup>915</sup> Wakefield 1837, 21–23.

<sup>916</sup> Beecham 1838a, 34–39.

Wakefield repeated the view from *The British Colonization* that they had ‘a high capacity for civilisation’ and had supposedly already acquired new wants from their interactions with missionaries. He also noted that Coates had contended the same in his support for missionary work. From this and the claim that colonisation in New Zealand could not be stopped, he argued that the NZA’s plans were the most prudent, since appointing a Consular Agent would not have been adequate.<sup>917</sup>

This again raises to the fore the empirical and proof-driven argumentation that was central in the debates on New Zealand. The appearance of empirical evidence and proof were central in presenting argumentation on both sides of the New Zealand case and suggestions and plans were, at least seemingly, drawn through ‘reasoning’ from those. Since *The British Colonization* seemingly proved with empirical sources that improvement in Māori was possible and achievable, Wakefield appears to have stringently pointed to this kind of argumentation as superior to assertions made by Coates vis-à-vis the impossibility of beneficial colonisation. This is not to say that engendering emotions as a humanitarian strategy, as Ballantyne has discussed,<sup>918</sup> was not a strategy that was also utilised. But even these narratives for engendering emotion were based on sources that appeared to adhere to empirical ideals. Whilst evidence, sources and empiricism might nowadays appear as evident bases for claimed knowledge or argumentation, the question of authority arising, for example, from empiricism or the Bible must be taken into consideration.<sup>919</sup> Considering Sarah Irving-Stonebraker’s conclusion that a shift took place from the 17<sup>th</sup> to the early 19<sup>th</sup> century in raising the authority of natural history over religious views in terms of how humanity was conceived,<sup>920</sup> the debate on New Zealand is a clear example of the most significant authority arising from empiricism rather than, for example, from religious or classical authorities.

The pamphlet war between the NZA and the missionary societies was only one side of the communication that took place in late 1830s between these two sides. It was preceded by the NZA’s approaches to various religious societies, including missionary societies and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, attempting to promote *The British Colonization* and their plans for New Zealand. In October 1837, as *The British Colonization* was being printed Wakefield asked Dr Hinds to write letters that would be sent to these societies along with copies of *The British Colonization* so that the letter could explain the intentions behind the NZA’s plans. Wakefield feared that without such a cover letter ‘they may not understand our wish

<sup>917</sup> Wakefield 1837, 6–11.

<sup>918</sup> Ballantyne 2016.

<sup>919</sup> For an example of the contemporary presentation of Māori that also leaned on religious authority and the Bible see e.g. Marshall 1836.

<sup>920</sup> Irving-Stonebraker 2019.

to forward their views and perhaps think that we treat them disrespectfully'.<sup>921</sup> In these letters from Hinds, it was described that the NZA was seeking governmental approval for their colonisation plans. But at the same time the plans as presented in the book would have been of interest to the religious societies as the NZA intended to co-operate and help in the 'humane and pious work' that was being carried out in spreading Christianity.<sup>922</sup> However, these assurances by Dr Hinds do not appear to have convinced Coates or Beecham, since they both raised into question the NZA's ultimate interests with New Zealand in their pamphlets.

Coates was openly distrustful of the NZA's proclamation of spreading civilisation among Māori as their main goal. Despite having stated that he credited the 'purity' of the NZA's motives, he opined that 'GAIN is, in fact, the main-spring and ultimate end of the whole scheme'.<sup>923</sup> Beecham, somewhat less bluntly, wrote that he did not intend 'to call the sincerity of their professions into question'. However, as he pointed out repeatedly that it could be assumed that the NZA meant what they wrote,<sup>924</sup> he seems to have backhandedly cast doubt on the Association's motives concerning New Zealand. He also eventually concluded that 'from their own book it obviously appears, that their own commercial interests are their principal aim; and that the philanthropic part of their scheme is only secondary and subordinate'.<sup>925</sup> There is the lingering question, when examining Wakefield's writing and the NZA's plans, of how genuine their attempts were in trying to fit together the colonisation of New Zealand and their alleged humanitarian goals towards Māori, however paternalistic these were. In this regard it is notable that there were contemporary doubts about the sincerity of their humanitarian language and

<sup>921</sup> Letter from Edward Gibbon Wakefield to Samuel Hinds, 6 October 1837, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Letter book 1837, ATL.

<sup>922</sup> See Letter from Samuel Hinds to the Secretary of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, no date, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Letter book 1837, ATL; Letter from Samuel Hinds to Rev. A. M. Campbell, Secretary to the Society of Promoting the Gospel, no date, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Letter book 1837, ATL; Letter from Samuel Hinds to Rev. Dr Bunting Sr., Secretary of the Wesleyan Missionary Committee, no date, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Letter book 1837, ATL; Letter from Samuel Hinds to the Rev. Secretary of the Church Missionary Society, no date, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Letter book 1837, ATL.

<sup>923</sup> Coates 1837a, 9 & 13, capitalisation in the original.

<sup>924</sup> See Beecham's comments: '[...] nor is it intended to call the sincerity of their professions into question.' '[...] there existed no stronger reason for disputing their sincerity[...]' '[...] it shall be assumed that the Association do really mean what they say[...]' 'Let the disinterested and unprejudiced reader now judge whether the proceedings of the Association are characterized by all that openness and candour which their professions lead the public to expect.' in Beecham 1838a, 25–26 & 50–51.

<sup>925</sup> Beecham 1838a, 25–27.

goals, as illustrated by Coates and Beecham. The possibility of an image of a land company as mere speculators was something of which people related to them were aware. Attwood notes that the South Australian Association sought to recruit backers among liberal intellectuals and religious enthusiasts to ward off such an image.<sup>926</sup> This same motivation could apply to the reason the NZA sought cooperation from evangelical individuals, such as Dr Hinds and Rev. Hawtrey, and the societies to which they sent *The British Colonization*. But considering the even acrid nature of some of this pamphlet war it also appears consistent that views of the NZA as speculators and the questioning of their real interests were raised by their opposition.

In the competing argumentation on New Zealand between the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward, which led to the successive pamphleteering, there appears to have been a major difference between a very basic premiss of the feasibility of settler colonialism. In the continued debates on New Zealand, the role of the missionary secretaries was particularly emphasised and they continued to promote the main arguments and suggestions of the Aborigines Committee. Buxton himself, who had been a leading force behind the Aborigines Committee, did not take much of a part in these debates. According to his memoirs, he was satisfied with the completion of the report but the uncertainty of his future in Parliament cast doubt on how long he would be able to continue his work in government for the perceived benefit of indigenous peoples. Buxton did lose his seat in the 1837 general election. After the report was published, Buxton continued his humanitarian work particularly with anti-slavery work relating to the West Indies.<sup>927</sup> Buxton also was a founding member of the Aborigines Protection Society in 1837 and published works on the slave trade.<sup>928</sup>

However, it is very notable that despite having taken a step back from the New Zealand question, after he received a copy of *The British Colonization* Buxton did write a brief letter to Wakefield. In his brief remarks in the personal letter directly to Wakefield, in contrast to the domain of the public pamphlet war between Wakefield and the mission secretaries, Buxton acknowledged that *The British Colonization* contained ‘many good sentiments & excellent principles’. Yet, Buxton perceived some problems in the NZA’s plans. He was concerned that the price Māori were to be paid for their land might have been too low. He also noted that he had understood that Māori did not wish to sell their land permanently, although he did acknowledge that there was a possibility he was wrong about that matter since ‘this however the

<sup>926</sup> Attwood 2020, 67–68.

<sup>927</sup> *Memoirs of Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton, Baronet* 1848, 417–428.

<sup>928</sup> Blouet 2010.

evidence here [in *The British Colonization*] collected seems to disprove'.<sup>929</sup> This again greatly underlines the role of supposed empirical evidence in the argumentation on New Zealand.

The main problem Buxton had with the NZA's plan, however, was in the premiss of colonisation. He stated very directly that

I doubt whether any scheme of colonization can be made beneficial to the aborigines of barbarous lands. I fear, however fair the regulations may appear, that the practical effect will always result in the crushing of the less civilised & weaker race.<sup>930</sup>

These brief responses from Buxton highlight the underlying problem in how the different plans were viewed, on the one hand, by Buxton and his inner circle, along with the majority of the Aborigines Committee and, on the other hand, by Wakefield and Ward. Buxton, Coates and Beecham all equated colonisation with settler colonialism, which they considered fundamentally incompatible with humanitarian concerns for indigenous peoples or their rights. Therefore, in their views it was out of the question in the case of New Zealand. In contrast, Wakefield, Ward and the NZA presented settler colonialism as a civilising and orderly solution if set up systematically. It can still be questioned how sincere Wakefield and Ward's use of the humanitarian ideas of improving Māori were, or if, as Attwood suggests, they were only used to gain support from a Whig government. This difference also underlines the complexity of British colonialism in general in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. While Lester is right to point out that the suggestions proposed by the Aborigines Committee were further colonial action in the form of missionary work and some limited governmental action, to Buxton and other humanitarians they did not appear as comparable to settler colonialism and therefore appeared to them as a distinctly different line of action.

This kind of nuanced understanding of colonialism is valuable particularly considering the criticism that has been directed at earlier colonial historiography. Claire McLisky, for example, notes that while significant in the historiography of Australia's colonial past, Henry Reynolds's works have been viewed as oversimplified and having created a distinction between 'the compassionate

<sup>929</sup> Letter from Thomas Fowell Buxton, 1 November 1837, fr. 425–428, New Zealand Company Micro-MS-0460 Records 1836-1840, ATL. This letter does not have the name of the recipient, but as a part of other NZC papers directed to E. G. Wakefield, this letter was in all likelihood directed to Wakefield, see List of Contents, fr. 397–398, New Zealand Company Micro-MS-0460 Records 1836-1840.

<sup>930</sup> Letter from Thomas Fowell Buxton, 1 November 1837, fr. 425–428, New Zealand Company Micro-MS-0460 Records 1836-1840, ATL, underlining in the original.

“humanitarians” of the 1830s and their nemesis, the hard-nosed capitalist colonisers’ that relied on modern views of humanitarian intervention. McLisky shows that this kind of perspective fails to take into consideration the attempts by the Aborigines Protection Society and the Aborigines Committee at intervention, having not been based on respect for Aboriginal people but on the perceived virtue of progress.<sup>931</sup> This is also evident in my examination of the Aborigines Committee’s knowledge formation and argumentation as Māori appeared more as objects of a British moral duty than as people respected in their own rights. But equally is it necessary to at least acknowledge and examine the bases presented for settler colonialism as they were given by Wakefield and Ward for the NZA. A focus on only the colonial domination that resulted from the NZA’s eventual actions can bypass any due examination of how contemporaries considered and argued their colonisation plans. Altogether, these parallel colonial projects by the NZA and the Aborigines Committee show the nuanced heterogeneity of British colonialism in a way that is not intended as ‘recuperative history’, which would emphasise British imperial benevolence in contrast to despotism of other countries, of which Lambert and Lester note Reynolds and other historical examinations have been accused.<sup>932</sup> But this nuanced view of colonialism shows the relations between different colonial projects as, for example, contestations of and complicit with other projects.

To understand these kinds of interplays between colonial projects more completely, it is necessary to understand the differences and similarities within them. As noted above, a major differentiating premiss between the NZA and the views of evangelical humanitarians focused around the Aborigines Committee and their different in conceptions of the feasibility of colonialism as a humanitarian or moral action. Another difference in the premisses for humanitarian action can be seen in how these two sides viewed how civilisation could be best disseminated among indigenous people like Māori. Next, I will take a final close look at this difference in argumentation about how civilising was supposed to have worked in New Zealand. Altogether, these examinations of the differences and convergences in claimed knowledge about Māori as well as the need and justification for action in New Zealand and why certain lines of action were supposedly the most desirable for New Zealand and Māori uncover mechanisms of British colonialism. They show why there could contemporaneously exist differing colonial projects with competing knowledge claims and argumentation, based on similar grounds for credibility of knowledge consistent with the wider contexts of their time.

<sup>931</sup> McLisky 2015, 62.

<sup>932</sup> Lambert & Lester 2004, 321.

### 3.2.2 Christianising and Civilising as Differentiating Premises for Improvement

There were clear convergences in the Aborigines Committee's report and *The British Colonization* in regards to the knowledge claims of Māori and their improvement. Māori were stated as having been savage in their character before European contact, but allegedly beneficial contact with certain Europeans had supposedly helped them improve and adopt European ways and Christianity. This in turn served as an argument for the feasibility of further civilising action that was to be taken in New Zealand. There were also significant divergences in the two sides' views of what was recommended for New Zealand. Considering these, it is expedient here to end of my examination of the knowledge claims and arguments of the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward with a fundamental question as to why opposing plans could be argued with very similar sources and by building knowledge claims of Māori with the same narratives. As seen earlier, the contexts in which these narratives and knowledge claims were presented influenced how they could be used. This illustrates the processes of how these similar and very same narratives were used selectively and creatively. However, there can also be other aspects at play in this diverging use of similar sources. It is also necessary to look at the specific arguments made by the two sides.

To shed more light on these kinds of differences, I will take one final look at the basic premises behind the two sides' arguments for how civilisation was presented as achievable in Māori and what the bases for these arguments were. A major theme that was relevant in the contemporary discussions about the British civilising mission, which I am yet to discuss here, is the question of whether civilisation or Christianity was seen as primary in the European improvement of indigenous peoples. This theme provides a clear insight into how a difference in such a basic premiss could lead to major divergences between the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward. On the one hand, the primacy of Christianity was a basic premiss in the Committee's argumentation. This was not only in coherence with the actions proposed by the Committee, but it also provides some indication as to why the Committee did not give more attention to Samuel Marsden's views of improvement or the material aspect of Māori improvement. On the other hand, Wakefield and Ward indicated that civilisation was also possible without Christianisation, a view that was in congruence with their slight disregard of missionary work. These two perspectives were consistent with what the two sides suggested as the proper line of action for New Zealand and they illustrate from where the differences between the two sides arose.

In relation to the British civilising mission in many different parts of the world, including India, Africa and Australia, questions arose as to whether Christianity or civilisation should have been introduced first. Often among those concerned with

law or administration civilisation was viewed as primary in preparing the way for the people in question to adopt Christianity. Conversely, members of churches and mission supporters often viewed Christianity as necessary for the reception of civilisation. Yet, opinions were divided even within the religious circles.<sup>933</sup> Anne Scrimgeour notes that in older historiography it has been questioned whether the ‘civilisation first’ vs. ‘Christianity first’ debate had any practical effect on British colonialism beyond semantics. Based on her examination of the civilising mission in South Australia, she argues that positions taken in the civilisation or Christianisation argument influenced approaches in the civilising mission, for example, in how schooling was provided to indigenous children.<sup>934</sup>

Similarly, differences can be seen in how improvement and civilising were approached by the Aborigines Committee in contrast to Wakefield and Ward’s ideas in *The British Colonization*. From the perspective of the history of knowledge these views and their impact can be emphasised even further. I argue that these different grounds for supposedly proper improvement can be viewed as more than cultural contexts against which the debates on New Zealand were framed. Instead, as premisses for certain lines of action, presuppositions such as the views of the primacy of Christianity or civilisation can present a more expansive explanatory frame to show why argumentation and knowledge claims were presented in certain ways in certain texts. The difference in whether improvement in indigenous peoples was presented as possible to be achieved primarily either through civilising or Christianising could appear as such a basic premiss in the background of otherwise more convergent argumentation that it resulted in differences in the respective conclusions. Examining here how the difference of Christianity or civilisation as primary were manifest in the Aborigines Committee’s report and in *The British Colonization* can thus provide some explanation for how similar knowledge claims and similar sources could lead to credible seeming argumentation for different lines of action.

This question of the primacy of Christianity or civilisation thus illuminates the discussions about various lines of colonial action and their convergences and divergences. Considering the debates about colonial action in the 18<sup>th</sup> or 19<sup>th</sup> centuries more generally, it is easier to reconcile the coexistence of different and opposing lines of action when they were argued from equally opposing moral bases and different premisses. For example, responses to the Aborigines Committee’s report in the settler press were sharp. The humanitarians were accused of partiality and, as Lester quotes from *The Sydney Morning Herald* from 1838, humanitarians were accused of ‘pity on devastating and murdering savages, that they have none to

<sup>933</sup> Porter 2004, 93–94; Scrimgeour 2006, 1–2.

<sup>934</sup> Scrimgeour 2006, 2.

spare for the white people'. These responses to the humanitarians were simultaneously campaigns against the conception of the equality of all peoples and for irredeemable racial and class differences, which included ideas that Māori sovereignty or Māori possession of land were not guaranteed after the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi.<sup>935</sup> It is easy to understand how major differences in proposed lines of action or argumentation could arise from such drastic differences in perspective. But in the case of the Aborigines Committee's report and *The British Colonization*, the sources and the humanitarian rhetoric were in many ways very closely entangled. This leads us from the perspective of the history of knowledge to ponder on how these similar bases were used for arguing for opposing lines of action. This question naturally contains an assumption of rational and to some degree fact-based argumentation, but it is evident by now that in both the cases of the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward there was at the very least an outward appearance of rational fact-based argumentation arising from a heavy emphasis on empiricism, even if it was carried out through selected pieces of evidence.

The convergences in the two sides' humanitarian rhetoric are clear as questions of morality towards indigenous peoples and the well-being of Māori appeared as the driving arguments for both the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward. Here, there was an explicit focus on attempting to protect, Christianise and civilise Māori. Resulting from this, much of the argumentation on New Zealand boiled down to questions of how it was viewed and argued that improvement could supposedly be facilitated among Māori. This perspective brings to the fore another divergence between the two sides' argumentation. As well as the difference in the premiss of whether it was possible to have colonisation that was not harmful but beneficial to indigenous peoples, another similar difference can be found in how the two sides viewed civilisation or Christianity as having been primary in civilising Māori.

### Different Vectors for Improvement

Despite the convergences in the sources used by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward to present claims of Māori capacity to improve, in both works there were further pieces of evidence used to argue Māori improvement that indicate from where the difference in the two sides' approaches could have arisen. In the Aborigines Committee's argumentation, the role of Christianity and Christianisation of indigenous peoples was an explicit and much emphasised matter. As has been commonly noted in the historiography of British humanitarianism, the Aborigines Committee argued that the spread of Christianity and civilisation was the only way

<sup>935</sup> Lester 2002a, 29 & 32–33.

for Britain to atone for the evils caused by British settlers. The Committee specifically viewed that the introduction of Christianity to indigenous people would have led them to civilisation. This, in turn, would have enabled them to withstand any ill-effects that colonisation might have caused. This was also the view of many of the witnesses called before the Committee who were connected to mission societies and the Society of Friends.<sup>936</sup>

The question of the primacy of Christianity was in fact directly addressed by the Aborigines Committee with a clear statement in their own voice. The Committee directly asserted that ‘there is but one effectual means of staying the evils we have occasioned, and of imparting the blessings of civilization, and that is the propagation of Christianity’.<sup>937</sup> Not only did they highlight missionaries as central for providing civilisation, but they also specifically pointed to Christianity as the main source of civilisation and thus the primary motor for improvement. While the idea of Christianisation necessarily preceding civilisation was not universally accepted, even by all missionaries, and there were dissenting voices in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, this conception was influential among the evangelical circles around the Committee and it was also successively adopted by the Aborigines Protection Society.<sup>938</sup> In the report, this argument was reinforced with evidence on the state of New Zealand and other places. As Lester notes, the testimonies of Beecham and William Ellis played a part in the Committee presenting this conception.<sup>939</sup> The secretaries were questioned widely on their conceptions of the efficacy of missionary work in introducing civilisation. They provided examples of effects that missionary work and education had had in North America, southern Africa and the South Pacific. Beecham, for example, provided evidence, such as a letter from Rev. Edward Cook of the WMS who was stationed in South Africa, which described crops, raising cattle and other aspects of what represented a ‘civilized country’ in Great Namaqualand. All this had supposedly arisen from missionary work.<sup>940</sup> A long passage from Ellis’s evidence was included in the part entitled ‘Effects of fair dealing and Christian Instruction’, which was indicative of the Committee’s views on the subject. This passage was very reflective of the values attached to Christianisation of the indigenous peoples. In it, Ellis proposed that Christianity was required so that proper civilisation could take root:

<sup>936</sup> Elbourne 2003a; Laidlaw 2007, 138.

<sup>937</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 45.

<sup>938</sup> Woolmington 1986, 93–97.

<sup>939</sup> Lester 2002b, 283–284.

<sup>940</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 532–540.

True civilization and Christianity, say Mr. Ellis, are inseparable; the former has never been found, but as a fruit of the latter. An inferior kind of civilization may precede Christianity, and prevail without it to a limited extent; such, for instance, as the adoption, by comparatively rude tribes, of the dress and modes of living of more cultivated society [...]. All this may occur without any change of character. This kind of civilization is only superficial [...]. My experience would lead me to regard this inferior kind of civilization as a very inefficient means of promoting the improvement of the native inhabitants of different countries[...]<sup>941</sup>

The conclusions that were drawn by the secretaries from these empirical-leaning sources on the influence of Christianity among indigenous peoples were significant. On the basis of the examples he referenced, Beecham concluded that '[h]aving adduced evidence furnished by the experience of our own society, with which that of other missionary societies will, I doubt not, be found to concur, in support of the conclusion, that wherever the Gospel is introduced civilization invariably follows'.<sup>942</sup> This estimation by Beecham of the effect of Christianity in civilising indigenous peoples was further corroborated by Ellis in his response to a question from Buxton himself as the chairman: 'Does your experience lead you to believe that it would be advisable to begin with civilization, in order to lead the way to the introduction of Christianity, or with Christianity, in order to introduce civilization?' Ellis responded with a long answer concurring with Beecham. An extract from this answer was included in the Committee's report proper describing 'true civilisation' coming from Christianity, as opposed to the other kinds of 'superficial' civilisation.<sup>943</sup> The question of whether civilisation or Christianisation should be attempted first had also been put to Yate earlier in the Committee proceedings. He was of the same opinion as Beecham and Ellis.<sup>944</sup> Here, based on apparent evidence arising from the mission field and the experiences of individual missionaries on improvement that had been imparted by missionary work, it was considered sufficiently compelling to argue that Christianity was the best, and even supposedly the only proper, means of improving non-European peoples. Within the framework of the entirety of the Committee's argumentation, if civilisation and improvement

<sup>941</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 45.

<sup>942</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 538.

<sup>943</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 539–542, question 4416. The question was annotated as having come specifically from Buxton as the chairman to Ellis.

<sup>944</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 200, question 1783.

more generally were desired goals and Christianity was argued as the only true way of achieving it, support for missionary work would have been foundational for any humanitarian action in New Zealand or any other colony.

Ellis's opinions on the primacy of Christianity in ensuring more than 'superficial' civilisation were on par with the views of many other contemporary missionaries. It was even viewed by some that introducing civilisation prematurely could have been harmful. Unless Christianity was introduced to ensure the moral improvement of indigenous people, different aspects of European 'civilised' life would have led to temptation, immorality and wretchedness.<sup>945</sup> The similar possibility of harm arising from introducing aspects of civilisation too early was in fact noted by the Committee in their statement that trade with Europeans had turned indigenous peoples in Upper Canada from a somewhat sedentary people into wandering hunters looking to sell fur to Europeans.<sup>946</sup> In relation to these kinds of views regarding the effects of European contact with indigenous peoples, the statements by Ellis provided the foundational basis for the Committee's report for specifically arguing the supposed benefit of missionary work.

Further pieces of evidence were also cited that provided examples from different parts of the world to support the quoted statement of the primacy of Christianity. Beecham was cited on failed attempts to civilise without Christianisation that had taken place in Canada. He viewed that the civilising attempted by governors in Canada failed because civilised life without Christian instruction provided nothing that seemed 'attractive' to the indigenous peoples in contrast to their own way of life.<sup>947</sup> Conversely, the Committee also quoted a letter from the Bishop of Quebec from 1829 that was printed as a part of papers printed for the House of Commons on 'Aboriginal Tribes in British Possessions'. These papers had also been requested for the House of Commons by T. F. Buxton. According to this letter, the Methodist Society had succeeded in converting local indigenous peoples to Christianity and had done 'much in the work of their civilization'.<sup>948</sup> Thus, the Committee provided examples that seemingly proved that civilising attempts had failed without Christianisation. But with missionary work civilisation was achieved. This provided apparent evidence and example of the seemingly fundamental and widespread phenomenon of Christianity as necessary for civilising. Thus, the Committee could

<sup>945</sup> Woolmington 1986, 94–95.

<sup>946</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 7.

<sup>947</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 45–46; for the evidence see *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1836, Minutes of Evidence, 526–528.

<sup>948</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 47; See also Papers relating to Aboriginal Tribes. (North America, New South Wales, Van Diemen's Land and British Guyana.) 1834, 52–54.

argue that past examples showed that Christianisation was necessary. This reasoning allowed them to conclude that the same effect would also have been achieved in New Zealand.

Despite examining and referencing the effects of contact between Europeans and First Nation groups in North America, the Committee did not provide any suggestions relating to North America, as they stated that they did not wish to interfere in questions in which there was on-going communication between local governors and the British Government without the Committee having had full knowledge of the contents of the communication.<sup>949</sup> But North America and interactions with indigenous peoples in the region did serve as examples for the Committee vis-à-vis settled colonial governments.<sup>950</sup> This was similar to the use of such examples to theorise and justify colonial ventures by colonial reformers including Wakefield.<sup>951</sup> For the Committee the sources on North America provided empirical evidence of what was given as the fundamental nature of interactions between Europeans and indigenous groups. This also shows the basic argumentation of the Committee. Not only was Christianisation considered *a priori* good for indigenous peoples, and not only was uncontrolled contact with Europeans harmful, which was argued extensively and supposedly proven in the case of New Zealand. As a more general argument, it was proclaimed that Christianisation could lead to civilisation, whereas without Christianity attempts at civilising could result in serious harm to indigenous peoples. In South Australia, similar conceptions among German Lutheran missionaries resulted in a view that it was necessary to segregate Aborigines from Europeans to ensure the Christianisation and the successive ‘true’ civilisation of those peoples.<sup>952</sup> This need for segregation was very similar to the Aborigines Committee suggestion of limited contact with Māori in New Zealand.

While there was clear conformity between the Aborigines Committee and the missionary sources they provided for presenting their views of the primacy of Christianity, this cannot be taken as exemplifying a similarity in the views of all missionaries even in regard to New Zealand. Samuel Marsden, who was referenced by the Committee but was not actually interviewed in the proceedings, was a powerful figure in the early missionary exertions in New Zealand. He also viewed that commerce resulted in civilisation, in turn leading to the acceptance of Christianity. This led to Marsden’s greater optimism of missionary success in New

<sup>949</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 86.

<sup>950</sup> Porter 2004, 140.

<sup>951</sup> In Wakefield’s case this is exemplified in his theorisations in his *England and America*. See Birchall 2021.

<sup>952</sup> Scrimgeour 2006, 6–8.

Zealand in contrast to Australian Aborigines.<sup>953</sup> Andrew Porter has argued, however, that Marsden was not exactly an exponent of the ‘civilisation first’ position. Instead, Marsden saw Christianity and civilisation proceeding together alongside each other. But it appears evident that Marsden did consider some aspects of what was seen as civilised life as having been necessary for the adoption of Christianity, as Porter also quotes Marsden’s statement that ‘[t]o preach the Gospel without the aid of the Arts will never succeed among the heathen for any time’.<sup>954</sup> Herein lies a significant difference, which can account to some degree as to why Marsden’s views of civilising Māori were largely bypassed by the Committee.

Commerce and similar material improvements did generally play a part in missionary instruction and attempts at social change in Māori. Marsden, who was a major instigator of the missionary endeavour in New Zealand, had strong views for effecting social change in Māori not only through religious instruction, but also through plans such as establishing productive gardens, effective farming practices and successful trading activity. This had the goal of making the mission in New Zealand self-supporting, but it was also meant to incorporate Māori into the mission as they would have been able to work in the mission stations. In his views, Māori would have acquired a desire for new tools and technology through work and improvements in industriousness. These ideas were based on Marsden’s conception of commerce and agriculture as having been central for civilisation. Ballantyne notes that Marsden’s views can be placed within the wider theological context of Protestant conceptions of the value of work. From the 18<sup>th</sup> century, Protestant figures, such as John Wesley, considered work as valuable as a spiritual and social duty as well as caring for and developing worldly things so that they may serve God’s will. These kinds of views were influential in Marsden’s thinking.<sup>955</sup> Reflections of these views can be seen in the Aborigines Committee’s report for example in the Committee having noted industriousness as an aspect of civilisation and compared Māori and their cultivation of land to the ‘idleness’ of other Polynesian people unwilling to work. While such industriousness was desirable and even formed part of civilisation, in the Aborigines Committee’s argumentation work and other aspects of ‘civilised life’ were not the causes for improvement as Christianisation was.

Porter notes that Marsden was well-known and highly regarded by Buxton, yet was absent from the Committee. Porter connects this to Marsden’s age and infirmity.<sup>956</sup> While Marsden was cited in the report as a source of information on occasions that had taken place in New Zealand, his views on civilisation were not

<sup>953</sup> Woolmington 1986, 93–94; Scrimgeour 2006, 6–7.

<sup>954</sup> Porter 2004, 94.

<sup>955</sup> Ballantyne 2015, 98–99, 101 & 103–105.

<sup>956</sup> Porter 2004, 141.

cited. This could have been due to the fact that he did not testify before the Committee and the information from him was derived from the three mission secretaries. But Porter suggests that Marsden's absence from the Committee 'reinforces one's sense of evident extent of the missionary consensus'.<sup>957</sup> However, this does not appear to be the case in the context of the Committee's overall argumentation and their approach to trade and civilisation in contrast to Christianity. Instead, there was some separation here between the Committee and the secretaries on the one side and Marsden on the other.

In many ways, as pointed to by Porter, Marsden was of the same mind as other missionary witnesses called on by the Committee and the Committee's views as presented in the report. He considered Māori to have been civilisable and European settlers as having been guilty of oppression, robberies and murders. He also saw a need to control European settlers and sailors to prevent the destruction of indigenous peoples. But Porter suggests that the Committee's recommendation to support missionary work was not only based on the belief that a missionary presence reduced conflicts, but also on trade as a way of furthering indigenous civilisation.<sup>958</sup> As I have discussed earlier in greater detail, commerce was to some degree acknowledged by the Committee and discussed in the Committee's interview of Coates, Beecham and Ellis, which Porter notes. However, in the scope of the entire report, commerce was largely relegated to secondary status behind European settler guilt and the apparent British duty to help others. Neither was commerce brought up in the Committee's suggestions, but rather missionary work was argued as a means to protect and assist indigenous peoples, as well as advance their 'social and political improvement'.<sup>959</sup> The Committee's reliance on Coates, Beecham, Ellis and Yate<sup>960</sup> in presenting its plans to limit European contact and promote missionary work, whilst omitting of Marsden's views beyond presenting him as an eye-witness from New Zealand, could instead speak to a stronger lean away from Marsden's ideas of commerce and civilisation paving the way to Christianity. As Marsden's personal views of improvement were not considered in the report, the evidence and testimony referenced in the report proper appeared to wholeheartedly support the Christianity-first idea.

Wakefield and Ward, in turn, expressed the emergence of improvement in Māori in rather different terms. Contrasting this emphasis to the Aborigines Committee's

<sup>957</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 80–81.

<sup>958</sup> Porter 2004, 141–145.

<sup>959</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements) 1837*, 80–81.

<sup>960</sup> There were disagreements between Marsden and Yate. According to Porter, Marsden, for example, considered Yate to have had corrupt personal morals. See Porter 2004, 142.

view on the primacy of Christianity sheds further light on how the differences in arguing for these two incongruent lines of action was logically possible despite the use of some of the same sources to present Māori improvement. Wakefield and Ward did quote the Aborigines Committee's report to indicate that Māori had improved since the beginning of contact with Europeans. However, they pointed to other forms of contact having allegedly brought improvement among Māori.

Wakefield and Ward did not take as explicit and outspoken a stand on the question of civilisation or Christianity first as the Committee. Yet, some stance by them relating to this question is evident in the details and emphases of how improvement and civilisation were discussed in *The British Colonization*. Christianising missionary work and other allegedly civilising effects were covered throughout *The British Colonization*. In a summation of the NZA's basic ideas of colonisation, they stated that colonisation and Christian faith together would achieve moral good in New Zealand in countering all the harm that uncontrolled colonisation had caused 'if New Zealand were so colonized that her aboriginal people should be truly civilized, embracing the Christian faith, and acquiring, by degrees, a moral equality with the British race'.<sup>961</sup> Nonetheless, missionary work generally received much less focus from Wakefield and Ward than it did in the Aborigines Committee's report. The basic premiss in *The British Colonization* was that systematic colonisation could achieve improvement and civilising in Māori. This was part of the stated objective of the NZA at the beginning of *The British Colonization*. Furthermore, it was expressed that the NZA's plan was 'not a plan of mere colonization: it has for its object to civilize as well as to colonize'.<sup>962</sup> Thus, they intended to make a distinction between their plans and other past colonisation plans for New Zealand, or other lands. This distinction placed the NZA's plans and Wakefield and Ward's argumentation more firmly towards ideas that civilisation would have been considered possible even without Christianisation, setting a clear contrast between the NZA and the Aborigines Committee.

Salesa maintains that the central features of the NZA's systematic colonisation are well known from studies by Philip Temple, Patricia Burns and Peter Adams. These were, firstly, a uniform price for land and, secondly, the use of money made from land sales to create a fund for supporting emigration to New Zealand.<sup>963</sup> However, Wakefield and Ward pronounced plans of a specifically 'civilising colony' and the more foundational premiss of how Māori were to become civilised is still less clearly analysed than the more general Wakefieldian model of systematic colonisation to which Salesa refers. The actual mechanisms of how this change was

<sup>961</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 59.

<sup>962</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 42.

<sup>963</sup> Salesa 2013, 28–29.

thought to occur were not much discussed by Wakefield and Ward, possibly either because these mechanisms for improvement were seen to have been self-evidently arising from the superiority of the British in the early-19<sup>th</sup>-century British imagination or for some other reasons.

Apart from the very general arguments for civilisation through systematic colonisation, the practical ways in which it would have been spread to Māori was quite implied and not clearly explicated by Wakefield and Ward. As Wakefield and Ward used the empirical sounding evidence, sources and quotations to provide the claim that contact with Europeans had already improved Māori, it was implied that further systematic colonisation in place of the allegedly on-going and harmful uncontrolled colonisation would have continued this desired trend. The idea of colonisation and contact themselves as conveyors of civilisation were all in all inherent as a basis for the NZA's plans. In a meeting of the NZA on May 31, 1837, a former member of parliament and the chair of the meeting, William Wolryche Whitmore, stated into the minutes of the meeting that 'there was no way so effectual of civilizing a barbarous people as that of settling among them a well-selected, superior class of working-people; that the authority wielded, and the instruction afforded by the wealthier colonist would be inadequate to the social and moral improvement of the natives'.<sup>964</sup> This does not appear as a point of any contention in the minutes of the NZA's meetings, and thus, while not explicitly spelled out in *The British Colonization*, it appears a main tenet in the NZA's colonisation plans.

Missionary work was not denounced in *The British Colonization* and Wakefield and Ward presented missionary influence as having had a major impact on Māori improvement. However, the role, or lack thereof, envisaged for missionaries in the NZA's proposed colonisation scheme was left quite unclear. Wakefield and Ward's ambiguity in terms of any practical Christianisation of Māori was in fact one further criticism Beecham focused on in his response to the NZA's plans as presented in *The British Colonization*. He attacked 'the want of a comprehensive and adequate provision for the religious instruction of the Aborigines' as a radical defect in the NZA's plans. Wakefield had previously rebutted Coates's criticism of the NZA by pointing to him having disregarded the chapter 'Religious Establishment' and the appendix on 'Exceptional laws', which were to present this side of the NZA's plans. As an answer to this criticism Beecham paid particular attention to those parts of *The British Colonization* and found them insufficient and impractical from a missionary's point of view. Beecham particularly disapproved of the suggestion in the appendix that Christian instruction and example was to be provided to Māori by their close interaction with 'the better classes of Colonists' rather than missionaries

<sup>964</sup> 'At a meeting held at the rooms of the New Zealand Association', 31.5.1837, fr. 306–308, New Zealand Association Micro-MS-0459 Minutes etc 1837, ATL.

specifically.<sup>965</sup> Hawtrey, in his appendix for the book, did not specify missionary work as the specific conduit for improvement. Instead, he noted that proper British colonists could have a good influence over Māori:

It were idle to suppose that every one who engages in this enterprize[sic] will be a missionary [...]. How much knowledge, how much experience, how many seeds of great and useful principles, have been stored up, dry and unproductive, among the higher classes, which only required to be carefully implanted into the common soil of the country to germinate into a thousand happy forms of order and of beauty!

This contact with civilised people, especially in contrast to the allegedly unlawful and morally corrupt settlers and sailors, and the example of civilised life set by them was considered in this line of thinking as a proper agency for civilisation. As an alternative to the missionary focus on improving, very similar ideas of not segregating indigenous peoples from the colonial society but, instead, placing them in the midst of society in close contact with Europeans was considered by Grey to have been the best line of action in South Australia as well.<sup>966</sup> As a part of the debate on the best intervention in New Zealand, Wakefield and Ward's focus on colonists acting as mediators of Christianity to Māori was a clear manifestation of the difference in their view of the 'Christianity or civilisation first' question in contrast to the Committee's emphasis on Christianisation.

More generally, ideas of civilisation as having been possible to be achieved through means that did not centrally include Christian instruction had their proponents in British discussions on Empire and expansion in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Peter Cain argues that some British views of the British Empire and expansion in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century were generally built around the moral superiority of British rule. In these views, moral improvement of indigenous peoples was not the primary purpose of Empire. While the ideas of the civilising mission having been able to improve others remained in place, for some Empire was rather considered as serving British interests. Nevertheless, it was still considered that as a secondary purpose for imperial expansion, contact with more civilised Europeans could provide indigenous and non-European peoples moral and material benefits and change them 'for the better'. This was despite the fact that in those later-19<sup>th</sup>-century contexts British views of indigenous peoples and their station as possible parts of British-style societies and their capacity of improving had soured somewhat.<sup>967</sup> Similarly, these

<sup>965</sup> Beecham 1838a, 11, 29 & 41–42.

<sup>966</sup> Scrimgeour 2006, 6–7.

<sup>967</sup> Cain 2012, 563–564.

principles of contact and interaction with ‘civilised’ Europeans as beneficial for those seen as less civilised was a central implication already in *The British Colonization* in the 1830s when improving indigenous peoples was a more common object for British action than later in the century.

On the mechanisms of this kind of improvement, there were some explications in British colonial thought more widely for how this kind of improvement could have happened through British influence and contact. In the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century, the Foreign Secretary and later Prime Minister, Lord Palmerston, viewed that progress was applicable to all societies and that the ‘backward’ state of some societies was based on environmental circumstances. Thus, British influence could help modify people’s environments removing barriers for progress. On the other hand, according to David Livingstone the solution was Anglicisation which included trade, Christianisation and education. For Livingstone, trade, in particular, was the primer leading to civilisation, peace and happiness.<sup>968</sup> Alongside the evangelical views of the civilising force of Christianity in early-19<sup>th</sup>-century Britain, there were also notions that free trade could help civilise the world through spreading enterprise and British notions of work ethic.<sup>969</sup> This concept of civilising related to free trade could have been a logical influence for the NZA and the argumentation presented in *The British Colonization* considering that economists such as Adam Smith had had a significant influence on Wakefield.<sup>970</sup> Although, the connection of free trade and promoting the founding of colonies was not perfectly straight-forward, since, as Martin Lynn points out, some free trade thinkers viewed that Britain did not need colonies or governmental involvement overseas.<sup>971</sup>

In Wakefield and Ward’s presentation of the civilising plans of the NZA such details of how civilisation was to take place were left quite implicit. For the most part it appeared almost as a self-explanatory concept in their argumentation that systematic colonisation, influence and contact from civilised people would instil civilisation in others. One of the clearest examples Wakefield and Ward gave of civilisation having supposedly arisen from non-religious contact with Europeans appears in the material change in clothing and tools adopted by Māori that was presented from Hokianga. They described the change that had allegedly taken place in the items Māori wanted to receive in barter; a change from weaponry to clothes, tools and other ‘civilised’ items. These descriptions not only appeared as supposed proof that Māori had become more civilised and thus were capable of civilising.

<sup>968</sup> Lynn 1999, 106–107.

<sup>969</sup> Lynn 1999, 103.

<sup>970</sup> On Wakefield’s background and studies of free trade economists see Olssen 1997, 200–215; See also Moloney 2001, 153.

<sup>971</sup> Lynn 1999, 103–104.

Wakefield and Ward's presentation included allusions that as Māori had adopted the material goods, these goods had also acted as a source for them becoming more civilised. Based on their quoting of Yate's book, Wakefield and Ward claimed that Māori were 'gradually becoming good judges of the articles they purchased; and detect and reject, with little ceremony, an inferior article'.<sup>972</sup> This quoting from Yate included a passage appearing to support Wakefield and Ward's apparent view that contact alone could improve indigenous peoples, as Yate had noted that '[t]he importation of other European articles of dress has much increased the wants of these people; and now almost the only articles of trade which they require from us [...] are shirts, trousers[sic], gowns and cotton'.<sup>973</sup> Following this quote from Yate, they also noted that Māori were 'becoming very careful of their clothes, and consequently improved in their habits of cleanliness and health'.<sup>974</sup>

While these quoted texts came from a missionary and the quote also included a mention of missionaries' wives having provided some goods to Māori and instructing them on their use, in the context of *The British Colonization* it appeared that the civilising force was not missionary influence as such, but rather the material goods. The context of the section on 'Trade and shipping', in which these passages were discussed, was the already existing trade with New Zealand. With apparent Māori improvement having been discussed in this section it was the importation and adoption of European goods that were the main focus of what had supposedly helped civilise Māori, rather than missionary instruction. Similar views of contact itself as imparting civilisation to indigenous peoples also appeared elsewhere in British argumentation. For example, Cole Harris in his examination of the colonisation of Vancouver Island notes that in the 1850s, when Vancouver Island was being settled by Europeans, a manager of a sawmill being built tried to argue to a local chief, whose people had been displaced, that the local people would be civilised and improved through contact with Europeans.<sup>975</sup> Evocative of this idea of contact resulting in improvement, it was stated in Wakefield and Ward's section on 'Trade and shipping' that the importation of goods resulted in a greater desire for such goods and that care for the new clothes resulted in better cleanliness. This idea is not very different from the evident view of the Aborigines Committee that improvement led to desire for further improvement. But the apparent force for civilisation is important here, since Wakefield and Ward appear to have used clothing and other material goods as examples and arguments as to how contact and civilisation gleaned from it

<sup>972</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 352–353.

<sup>973</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 353; See also Yate 1835, 158–159.

<sup>974</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 354.

<sup>975</sup> Harris 2004, 174.

fed further civilisation thus bypassing or disregarding ideas that Christianisation would have been necessary.

Of other more concrete explanations or allusions by Wakefield and Ward for how civilisation was specifically realised, only a very brief mention was made of allocating money for schoolhouses.<sup>976</sup> Thus, the civilising effect of contact appeared more as a rationalistic idea based on conceptions of the principles of civilisation and interactions between peoples and its mechanisms were not ‘proven’ through empirical evidence. But the empirical evidence of supposed Māori improvement across *The British Colonization* did appear to prove the existence of this civilisation in Wakefield and Ward’s argumentation. Wakefield and Ward’s presentation of Māori inferred generally the idea that European contact and trade alone were capable of having the desired effects of improvement on Māori without any apparent need for missionary work or other religious instruction. This supposedly gave credence to the NZA’s plan that systematic colonisation could bring beneficial contact to Māori.

### Differences in Premisses for Improvement

The difference in the premiss of ‘Christianity or civilisation first’ between the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward can to some degree account for the differences in what was presented of Māori in their two works. The Committee quoted Ellis’s statement that Christianity was needed for proper civilisation to happen and that there can be ‘adoption, by comparatively rude tribes, of the dress and modes of living of more cultivated society’ but that ‘[a]ll this may occur without any change of character’. From this basis, it would appear consistent that the Committee did not focus as much on material improvement in Māori or other indigenous peoples as Wakefield and Ward did. Presenting material change could have given some indication of change enacted by missionaries, similarly to what T. J. Tallie observes in his examination of the mission field in the British colony of Natal in southern Africa. Tallie observes that as colonists, clergy and converts created competing representations of the colonial space, missionaries pointed to change and newly formed civilisation in indigenous Africans. This was done by claiming that the transformative power of the Gospel had led them to adopt European clothing, domestic habitation and family networks. Yet, even in Tallie’s examination for many Christianity appeared as the primary means for improvement.<sup>977</sup>

This same discourse is evident in some of the missionary testimonies quoted in the Committee’s report. In the report, the quoted statements from Beecham and Ellis on Christianisation included the view that Christianisation led to new wants, such as

<sup>976</sup> *The British Colonization of New Zealand* 1837, 60 & 352–356.

<sup>977</sup> Tallie 2016, 389–392 & 397.

articles of clothing and commerce.<sup>978</sup> This was in this context, however, specifically an indication of the effects of Christianisation, not caused by adopted civilisation. Since in the Committee's view material improvement could happen without deeper change in character, then a stronger focus on clothing and other material wants would not necessarily have held significant weight in expressing deeper spiritual improvements in Māori beyond the claim that missionary work supposedly did have some tangible impact on indigenous peoples. The view of the primacy of Christianisation could therefore have led to the meagre focus that was given to material improvement in Māori and others. This was also quite consistent with experiences derived from the mission field in New Zealand. Missionaries faced challenges in getting the mission on a strong footing in its early decades and the first full Māori convert to Christianity was claimed as late as 1825. This led missionaries, such as William Hall, John King and Thomas Kendall, to doubt the efficacy of Marsden's civilised arts as an instrument for change in Māori.<sup>979</sup> These doubts were then communicated back to the secretaries of the parent societies and could have been reflected in the matters they discussed in their testimonies.

Conversely, for Wakefield and Ward the adoption of 'civilised' ways of living were indicators of what was seen as true improvement. It also showed that such improvement was possible through contact, trade and allegedly beneficial British influence. While Wakefield and Ward did not explicitly take part in the conversation on the primacy of Christianity or civilisation, their implied subscription to the idea that spreading civilisation could lead to improvement even without a clear Christian influence or instruction as a premiss was significant in the shaping of the argumentation on intervention in New Zealand. It may seem paradoxical that the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward presented what was clearly intended as credible argumentation based on empirical sources and empirically proven knowledge, but arrived at very different conclusions and recommendations from very similar sources and even similar knowledge claims about Māori having improved through European contact. But while the empirical argumentation was heavily focused on Māori, their character and alleged proof that they could have been improved according to the early-19<sup>th</sup>-century Eurocentric conceptions of civilisation, one of the major separating factors between the two sides was the difference in the premisses of the primacy of Christianity and civilisation.

As these views on the primary source of improvement, Christianity for the Aborigines Committee and civilisation for Wakefield and Ward, could be presented with the use of these similar sources, this was done, for example, through selective

<sup>978</sup> See e.g. *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)* 1837, 50.

<sup>979</sup> Ballantyne 2015, 107–108; See also O'Malley 2012, 162–163.

citing of sources. Yet, the two sides had crucially different premisses for presenting their argumentation. This difference in premisses allowed for the two lines of argumentation to appear empirical, in keeping with contemporary criteria for credible knowledge and based on similar sources but could still arrive at different conclusions. The appearance of the paradoxical nature of these two sides argumentation was further extenuated by the manner in which they presented their cases. Whereas the Aborigines Committee in their report further argued their explicit views on the primacy of Christianity, the focus on civilisation as the primary means for improvement taken by Wakefield and Ward was very much implied and left unarticulated. This somewhat hid the difference between the two sides, whether it was intentional to make their argumentation seem more in line with the contemporary humanitarian climate or out of sincere concern. This difference between the two sides and their argumentation also gives further answers to the question of whether there was any real significance between the ‘Christianity first’ and ‘civilisation first’ stances that Scrimgeour raises from historiography. In the case of the debates on New Zealand, these different approaches appear to have had significant effects on political argumentation and how different conclusions could be drawn from source material due to differing premisses. The difference in the primacy of Christianity or civilisation was by far not the only differentiating factor between the two, as, for example, there was a major difference in how the two sides viewed the possibility of colonisation having been beneficial for the colonised. Yet, all these different aspects and premisses for the argumentation on New Zealand were intertwined in the works of the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward and these aspects all illustrate different angles to the same larger arguments giving a comprehensive understanding of them.

### Chapter Conclusions – Coherent Arguments from Particular Perspectives

Building on how individual sources and pieces of supposed evidence were used to form claimed knowledge of Māori, in this chapter I have focused on how that formation of knowledge was related to and translated into more practical argumentation on why and what action was to be taken in New Zealand. Here the closer examination of the Aborigines Committee’s and Wakefield and Ward’s argumentation on New Zealand reveals in greater detail the differences between the arguments from both parties. It also highlights the processes and bases that allowed for such opposing argumentation to arise from their presentations of Māori that on the surface appear to have had close similarities. The two sides used similar sources and were clearly connected to similar contemporary traditions and criteria for credible seeming knowledge formation. For example, they clearly relied on empiricism to support their knowledge claims and arguments. Yet, differences in

how they viewed the manner of conveying civilisation and improvement to Māori had significant impacts in allowing presentation of the two sets of seemingly credible but opposing arguments. Furthermore, their establishment of guilt for the harm caused in New Zealand, on the one hand, and their presentation or bypassing of Māori wants, on the other hand, provided them with very different justifications for their proposed actions. These different justifications also paved the way for the different solutions to these problems.

All in all, the works by the two sides presented argumentation through knowledge claims of Māori, the alleged need to act and the supposed ways of achieving improvement in Māori that had clear internal coherence. This apparent coherence is fascinating especially considering Ann Laura Stoler's observations that imperial rule was often 'fashioned from piecemeal and uncertain knowledge' and that a historian should not attempt to place such a jumble into a single coherent narrative.<sup>980</sup> The reality in imperial rule and even in the Aborigines Committee's and Wakefield and Ward's formation of knowledge and argumentation on New Zealand was in many ways selective and piecemeal, and the availability of various sources was very much contingent and 'lumpy' in nature, which was in accordance with Stoler's observations. Yet, their centrifugal presentation of the argumentation appears surprisingly coherent. Despite similarities in the sources used, their humanitarian language and at the very least a rhetorical, and at times even sincere, concern for the well-being of Māori, two sides were capable of forming coherent-seeming arguments that were markedly different between the two.

Wakefield and Ward presented their systematic colonisation and proper settlers as the solution for the problems caused by the uncontrolled colonisation that was supposedly already taking place in New Zealand. This perspective was particularly emphasised in how they cast blame for the violence and evils in New Zealand generally on the uncontrolled nature of how New Zealand was supposedly already being colonised with equal blame on those 'bad', uncontrolled sailors and traders who were taking part in this colonisation. The systematic colonisation as a solution was given as having been feasible since according to Wakefield and Ward's use of sources, Māori had already improved in European contact and were thus proven to have been capable of improving. The conceptions of trade and contact with civilised British people as civilising forces and the apparent primacy of civilisation as a vector for improvement solidified this argument of the supposed good of the NZA's plans, even despite the criticism from the likes of Coates and Beecham on the limited role Wakefield and Ward presented for missionary work. This was all claimed to have

<sup>980</sup> Stoler 2012, 35–38.

been approved by Māori based on sources representing Māori opinion, and making official treaties would have formalised this Māori consent.

The Aborigines Committee, on the other hand, focused their argumentation on the juxtaposition of nearly all settlers and sailors to the supposedly beneficial side of missionaries. This was in line with how the report's objects were described in Buxton's memoirs as, first, the 'destructive cruelty' and, second, the humane treatment of indigenous peoples by Europeans. As missionary work was introduced as having done much good in New Zealand, settlers, sailors and convicts were presented as the polar opposites causing violence and impeding missionary work. As Christianity was seen as primary in providing improvement, and aspects of civilisation alone without Christianity were even given as possibly harmful, missionary endeavours and limiting all other contact appeared as logical conclusions. Yet, this argument was hampered by the appearance of insufficiency in their plans of Consular Agents preventing European evils. Also, the very limited attention received by Māori as actors was in keeping with the Committee's more general presentation. Their views of improvement appeared in the Committee's discussion even as unnecessary to take into consideration, since civilisation would have supposedly brought them the required understanding of what was good for them.

Eventually, the back-and-forth debates on New Zealand and Māori did not result in either sides' recommendations or plans having been adopted as a direct result of their argumentation. In late 1838, the CMS and other evangelicals were content that the NZA's Bill had been defeated and waited for the colonisers to take their next steps. Yet in early 1839, Wakefield and the NZC decided to act before the British Government took any concrete action on New Zealand, and they sent the *Tory* to set up a colony in New Zealand. The announcement made to the Colonial Office of the sailing of the *Tory* resulted in the colonial administration to take prompt action. Thus, in August Captain Hobson embarked for New Zealand with instructions to negotiate the relationship of the British Crown and Māori, eventually resulting in the Treaty of Waitangi. This sudden action meant that the circumstances surrounding the earlier debates had changed, and as Adams points out, what was earlier seen as 'unjust interference' in New Zealand became necessary in the views of the British administration. Claudia Orange has described a change in attitudes towards Māori and New Zealand that took place during 1838 as 'a fatalistic and defeatist acceptance of the inevitable' that British intervention was necessary and Māori sovereignty was no longer worth supporting.<sup>981</sup> These changing circumstances also meant that the arguments by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward no longer applied in any practical way, since the question of whether and what kind of colonial action

<sup>981</sup> Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 92–93 & 106–121; Orange (1987) 1997, 27.

was to be taken was becoming redundant. This does not however mean that the debates were insignificant vis-à-vis how New Zealand and Māori were considered to be known in Britain in the 1830s and, moreover, the processes of knowing in these debates were significant.

From the perspectives of the rather coherent, although selectively formed and biased, arguments by the two sides that have been examined in this study, it is possible to draw together relationships between, firstly, the sources used and knowledge claims made based on those sources and, secondly, the more direct argumentation and its premisses in the two works that have been the main focus in this study. On the one hand, the sources used and the knowledge claims of Māori drawn from these sources appear very similar in the two works, for example, in terms of the presentation of Māori capacity to improve. Despite these similarities and convergences, there were differing premisses of how colonisation could impact indigenous peoples and how civilisation could supposedly have been achieved in these peoples. From such foundational differences, it is possible to see how the two sides reached different conclusions and argumentation for their different lines of action. Furthermore, considering Livingstone's concept of geographies of reading and other similar aspects of how actors' preconceptions influenced the reception of knowledge and information, understanding as much of the processes of knowledge formation and the backgrounds of the different actors involved as possible provides the best means for understanding argumentation itself. These actors' preconceptions, goals and interests played a part in how they received, selected, processed, presented and reiterated knowledge claims of Māori, and in expansive networks of communication these filtering and creative processes became multiplied. In this way, the goals of the argumentation on the two sides impacted how knowledge claims of Māori were formed. Thus, it in part explains the differences in focus and tone in what was argued as proper lines of action for New Zealand. The relationships between the formation of knowledge from different sources and the further use of those claims for argumentation are complex and entangled with goals, interests and other such factors relating to actors that took part in these processes. As my analysis demonstrates, a close examination of these complexities reveals how coexistent and competing knowledge systems functioned and supported different types of colonial projects and decision making connected to practical colonial actions.

## 4 Conclusions and Implications

The Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward were parts of and connected to wider networks of communication spanning New Zealand, Britain and other parts of the world. As is evident from the cross-section this study provides of these networks of communication, the range of actors, contexts, interests, geographical places, modes of communication and further factors was expansive and vastly complex. However, defined windows, such as the debates on colonising New Zealand in this study, provide ways of peering into these complexities to uncover how certain delimited sections of these networks functioned and what effect different processes and mechanisms had on knowledge, its formation and use.

Viewing communication and different connections between places and individuals as networks with overlapping criss-crossing strands between different nodes, along the lines of Tony Ballantyne's view of webs, illustrates and provides ways of analysing this kind of communication on a global scale. Focusing on the formation of knowledge by the Aborigines Committees and Wakefield and Ward highlights certain structures and strands within those vast networks. In the cases of the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward, for example, missionary connections, Māori travellers and British travel writers and these actors' connections are highlighted. This is significant for the formation of knowledge and the resulting political argumentation that are at the centre of this study's aims. The information and knowledge that moved within these highlighted structures of the networks provided raw material which was gathered, selected, processed, edited, filtered and omitted in order to form knowledge claims. These knowledge claims could in turn have been formed in different ways. They could have been produced genuinely out of and based on this raw material. They could have been generated so as to be useful for fulfilling the respective goals of different actors. Or they could have been formed to fit the preconceptions, which the different sides had about New Zealand and Māori from their own perspectives. Based on my examination, the two latter options appear more prominent in the debates on New Zealand. This underlines the perspective that while the verity of European claims to knowledge concerning topics such as Māori can often be questioned, they could have practical implications that made those claims in effect very real.

The concept of networks allows us to focus on individual processes in vastly complex and intertwined communication and formation of knowledge. Individual strands of communication and processes within this communication can be viewed as having facilitated, influenced and even resulted in the formation of knowledge for political argumentation in the Aborigines Committee's report and *The British Colonization*. This facilitation and resulting does not mean that these publications would not have been written without these exact lines of communication or that these lines of communication teleologically resulted in these specific publications. Had these exact sources that were used not been available, the Committee and Wakefield and Ward would most likely have looked for other available sources. What I mean by networks facilitating and resulting in these publications, instead, is that as the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward had their intentions for producing the works, they used these networks. These networks that were used, for example, allowed the two sides to claim credibility for their knowledge claims. Thus, what was eventually written and published was facilitated by those networks and was made as a result of the trans-antipodean communication in a contingent way. Neither were these publications final endpoints in the formation of knowledge. Beyond the scope of this study, the Aborigines Committee's report and *The British Colonization* continued to be cited in the following decades in further intertextual transfer of knowledge.

The result of a certain strand or part of communication in the wider networks spanning the British Empire, in turn, depended in the perspective of what the information that was communicated was used for. In the complex networks that criss-crossed between different nodes, these same strands of communication resulted in different forms of action and formation of knowledge. Missionary communications, for example, helped provide material for missionary periodicals, which in turn were disseminated intertextually further. Thus, the analysis of the networks should not be seen in an overly teleological manner, since the same forms of communication could have had reach in many different directions. But in specific cases the significance of those strands of communication for the formation of specific knowledge claims or for other effects can be made visible.

Based on my empirical examination of the formation of knowledge and the use of this knowledge in the colonial argumentation regarding New Zealand, I identify three wide-reaching conclusions that illustrate the processes that were in play in claiming knowledge about Māori as the subject of the debate, the communication these claims were based on and the impact they had on colonial argumentation. First, claimed knowledge based on apparent empirical proof played a significant role in the debates and argumentation. This is significant as there were also, for example, many contemporary general notions or preconceptions about indigenous peoples. These preconceptions alone did not provide sufficient basis for argumentation;

instead there was an apparent need for claimed knowledge when presenting argumentation. This is evident in the extent to which the two sides strove to present evidence and what they called proof for claiming knowledge. Second, the processes that were part of the formation and use of knowledge, such as the centripetal gathering of material, processing it based on one's own interests and preconceptions and the centrifugal dissemination of it, were not only influential in what and how was argued, but they also had a marked impact on the content of the knowledge claims themselves. Third, focusing on what was claimed and why this was claimed by different individuals underlines the complexity and multiple perspectives that not only existed in knowledge, but also in colonialism itself. This, in turn, highlights the significance of local contexts as explanatory factors in understanding such large themes.

These conclusions arise from the examination of the different sides of the debates on New Zealand in the 1830s and their discussion of Māori in their respective argumentation. These conclusions, however, also reflect more generally aspects of knowledge and epistemic processes that can be identified at the very least in the context of early-19<sup>th</sup>-century Britain. They can also be applied to and contrasted with epistemic processes found in other spatial and temporal contexts to understand the nature and formation of knowledge more generally. This works towards how Östling, Larsson Heidenblad, Nilsson Hammar and Mulsow view knowledge as an umbrella term able to bridge different topics and periods in historical research. I discuss these three conclusions and their implications for the historical examination of knowledge more broadly next, and also connect these conclusions to my more specific findings of why and how Māori featured centrally in the debates on New Zealand.

Beginning with the first topic of the significance of knowledge, the presence and formation of claimed knowledge itself is significant. Both the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward were focused on civilising Māori, and the evident dichotomy they presented of the supposed past Māori savagery and possible civilisation appears to have served as proof that the plans for action they suggested for New Zealand could achieve the desired effect. I have demonstrated that the two sides' presentations of Māori were connected to contemporary, less empirical and more preconceived general notions of indigenous peoples. There were clear convergences between the knowledge claims and contemporary, general conceptions, even though there was also some selectivity in which aspects of European characterisations were emphasised by the two sides. For example, the playing down of the supposed warlike character of Māori is evident in *The British Colonization*. Yet, despite these convergences and the wide spread of preconceptions about indigenous peoples in Europe, it is notable that empirical evidence was presented to such an extent in the two publications.

The presentation of knowledge claims that was based on sources was often not accurate when reflected to what we can deduce of the real-world situations of the time. Instead, they were coloured by the actors' biases, and the evidence provided appeared similar in nature to Jeffrey Cox's articulation of defamatory synecdoche: a small number of characteristics were given to represent the entirety of Māori character. Furthermore, a small number of individuals and individual incidents came to represent all Māori. Yet, for many British readers who did not have any further understanding or connections to New Zealand these knowledge claims would have appeared as real knowledge. Moreover, the use of empirical sources appears indicative of contemporary British ideals concerning knowledge and argumentation. The empirical proving of knowledge was required for credible colonial argumentation in the context of this debate. This requirement existed, despite the appearance that those source-driven knowledge claims matched the surrounding preconceptions of indigenous peoples to a significant degree. The ways in which the two sides attempted to show credibility in their formation of knowledge was not, however, uniform. They had distinctly different strategies for displaying credibility. The Committee emphasised a few named seemingly authoritative sources to describe matters, whereas Wakefield and Ward cited a larger mass of selected sources to indicate that their claims were supposedly true. This shows diverse ways in the specific spatial and temporal setting as to why certain claims of Māori could appear as credible knowledge in their contexts. Empirical proving in some form indicates shared ideals for presenting credibility, but these ideals could be adapted to fit different contexts and aims.

This significance of knowledge is not, however, only limited to the in itself interesting topic of how a group of people in a given time and place considered it possible to know something of a geographically distant place. Many themes that I have discussed concerning knowledge and the aspirations of different actors in forming knowledge had effects further than simply to the formation of knowledge. For example, the endeavours to form credible knowledge in the debates on New Zealand through strategies such as citing seemingly empirical evidence and authorities presented as reliable, were not only in the interest of forming new knowledge concerning a topic that was not well-known in early-19<sup>th</sup>-century Britain. Instead, the credibility of the knowledge claims on Māori that was demonstrated through empiricism, among other strategies, also carried over to the argumentation on New Zealand. The claimed knowledge about Māori capacity to improve, for example, was used to argue that actions for improving Māori were feasible. Thus, the credibility of that knowledge also lent itself to provide credibility for the more practical colonial argumentation. This also applies to other aspects of knowledge, which indicates that it can be found to be very significant for actions taken by historical actors.

This can seem quite a rationalistic and logical conclusion. Yet, it is also notable for the overall significance of the history of knowledge as a field, as it can provide new explanatory frameworks for historical research. What an actor or a group could have known was likely to have had an impact on their actions. For example, it is curious why Māori were more of a focus relating to New Zealand than Australian Aborigines were concerning New South Wales or South Australia. The manner in which these different peoples were ‘known’ by Europeans could have impacted this difference. If Māori were considered in Britain to have been more proactive or powerful than Aborigines, it could have influenced the actions taken, political decisions made and the attention given to Māori in contrast to Australian Aborigines. Philipp Sarasin has suggested that while we are unable to look into the minds of others, the history of knowledge can offer a ‘proxy’ for learning ‘why people behaved, spoke, and acted one way or another in the past’.<sup>982</sup> Similarly, the connections between knowledge and the argumentation and promotion of colonial practices shows how understanding knowledge can impact the understanding of historical actions by individuals. This also provides a window into the paradox raised by Lester and Dussart about the connection of humanitarian concern for indigenous peoples at the same time as the lands of these peoples were being colonised. Without any intentions of apologism or recuperative history, it could be viewed that humanitarians could have sincerely considered their actions as promoting beneficial effects on indigenous peoples based on how they viewed and ‘knew’ matters such as savagery, civilisation and indigenous character. This provides ways for understanding various mechanisms of colonialism without dismissing or diminishing the dispossession it caused.

Regarding my second conclusion, the processes of formation and use of knowledge were crucial in shaping the form the knowledge claims took. The significance of examining knowledge is further deepened beyond simply viewing what was presented as knowledge to how and on what bases it was presented as knowledge. As can be seen from my examination of the knowledge claims in and the parallels between the Aborigines Committee’s report and *The British Colonization*, processes of centripetal gathering, centrifugal disseminating and the connected selection, exclusion, combining and other forms of processing inherent in formation of knowledge were all creative processes. They are active and dynamic processes of communication that can create new significances for similar sources in different contexts and in different combinations. For the examination of these processes, concepts like ‘centripetal’ and ‘centrifugal’ can help illustrate the different directions of transfer of knowledge and perspectives inherent in various networks. Thus, these

<sup>982</sup> Sarasin 2020, 4.

concepts provide useful tools for the examination of these processes. Similarly, and particularly in terms of intertextual communication, textual fixity, mutable mobiles and the flattening of sources, for example, can also further emphasise and indicate the impact these different processes of communication and formation of knowledge had on the knowledge itself.

The creative and formative aspect of these processes also indicates further what is required for understanding knowledge and argumentation; whether it is in historical cases, such as the debates on New Zealand, or in our current lives. As the different strategies used by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward illustrate, contemporary criteria for credibility or contemporary ways of using and citing empirical sources could be flexible. This illustrates why it was possible for diverging lines of argumentation to emerge from similar sources, considering the two sides' seemingly shared views of the bases for credible knowledge. Even if empiricism was one central aspect of how credible knowledge claims were formed in early-19<sup>th</sup>-century Britain, processes inherent in the formation of knowledge allowed these empirical sources to be cited and used selectively and in flexible ways based on different contexts and different premisses. This allowed different arguments to arise from similar sources. In their arguments, the two sides had differing premisses of how colonisation could impact indigenous peoples and how civilisation could supposedly have been achieved in these peoples. The difference between the two sides' conceptions of Christianity or civilisation as the primary ways of improving Māori was a clear such difference in premisses, with the Committee advocating the former and Wakefield and Ward favouring the latter. These premisses and other preconceptions influenced how they received information, formed knowledge claims and disseminated their views. Therefore, understanding as much of the processes of knowledge formation and the backgrounds of the different actors involved as possible provides the best means for understanding the argumentation itself.

The more general criteria and practices for knowledge are naturally bound to their contexts, but it is reasonable to imagine that many different systems of knowing in different times and places could be utilised in similarly flexible and creative ways. The possibility of cherry picking, or other such creativeness, has significant implications for viewing and evaluating knowledge and argumentation. If the same criteria, such as empiricism and source-based argumentation, allow for different arguments to arise from similar or identical sources, then the knowledge claims and the citing of sources presented in that argumentation do not provide sufficient bases for evaluating the accuracy, feasibility or preferability of two differing lines of argumentation that fulfil the same criteria. This is exemplified by the presentation of argumentation on New Zealand. Furthermore, this indicates that for both historical examination as well as life in the 21<sup>st</sup> century that instead of looking at the claimed

knowledge and argumentation that are presented, the understanding of what they are based on and how they were formed is also crucial. For example, instead of relying on citations and references to empirical sources for evaluating given argumentation, it is beneficial to be familiar with what is in the original sources as well as parts of the process of formation of knowledge rather than relying on what is cited or referenced.

In this study, I have focused on the Aborigines Committee and the NZA as the hubs at the centre of the centripetal and centrifugal processes of communication. This has raised to the fore their activity in the formation and dissemination of knowledge and the influence of their respective perspectives on what form the knowledge claims about New Zealand took. In addition to identifying the processes discussed above, this study lays foundations for further expanding the understanding of these processes that spanned the antipodes from the perspective of different actors. Equal approaches could be taken to missionaries as similarly central nodes in networks of communication with centripetal and centrifugal strands connected to them. Whereas scholars have studied mediators in intercultural contacts, for example in exploration, missionaries who were active in providing information to the Aborigines Committee and the NZA could also be examined in terms of their participation in networks of communication as mediators of knowledge between geographically distant places. Further examination of missionaries, Māori travellers and other such actors as mediators between the local sites of New Zealand and Britain and as having influenced the nature of the content of knowledge about New Zealand would thus be valuable. This would serve to provide a more detailed understanding of the functioning of the expansive networks of communication and the movement and formation of knowledge, which in this study resulted in the Aborigines Committee's report and *The British Colonization of New Zealand*.

From viewing how and on what bases something was presented as knowledge, a further expansion into examining knowledge comes in the form of the third conclusion of the multiplicity of knowledge. As there were different ways and forms in which knowledge was claimed, this underlines the existence of different claims to knowledge or *knowledges* more generally. This study illustrates how different knowledge claims were formed and disseminated in different spatial and temporal contexts not only by the Aborigines Committee and the NZA, but also by missionaries, governmental officials, Māori and other actors that were connected to the trans-antipodean communication. The different knowledges and claims were entangled with complex bundles of different aspects that influenced formation of knowledge, such as contemporary models and criteria for knowledge and credibility, different actors' preconceptions, goals and interests in the given subjects, as well as other spatial and temporal contexts. In the case of the debates on New Zealand, examples of such aspects were the contemporary stadial view of human progress and

humanitarian perspectives inherent in missionary and other evangelical views as well as in the contemporary political climate. Other such matters were missionaries' interests in promoting their work, the NZA's interests in showing the feasibility and supposedly good results of their colonial plans and the availability of information on Māori, which was markedly different, for example, for Europeans visiting New Zealand in contrast to political argumentation based in London. The various processes of communication also indicate that these different knowledges did not move in simple or unproblematic ways between different contexts.

In historical research this multiplicity emphasises the presence of different perspectives and underlines that matters such as early-19<sup>th</sup>-century British colonialism cannot be viewed as overtly monolithic. This kind of colonialism cannot be viewed as an organised and systematic project considering the complexities and contingencies that are evident, for example, in the case of New Zealand in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. There are clear examples of this multiplicity and contingency in how New Zealand came to be known in British colonial political spheres. As Attwood has recently indicated, historians have specified different factors that played into the drafting and signing of the Treaty of Waitangi. These included the British view of Māori as sovereign based on stadial and legal perceptions, British policy to negotiate with indigenous peoples, evangelical influence on colonial policy and Māori as militaristically strong to such extent that a treaty was necessary. Attwood further suggests that most of these factors had some truth to them, but the most significant cause for the Treaty was the improvised actions and reactions that were contingent historical forces rather than normative factors. Hence, other results in British colonial policy towards New Zealand could have been equally possible.<sup>983</sup> This multiplicity of knowledges and the multiplicity of colonialism is also evident in how the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward discussed Māori as actors. Wakefield and Ward recognised Māori as active participants in their interactions with Europeans, which appears to have influenced their view of requiring Māori consent, even though indigenous consent was also called for in the contemporary political climate. The Aborigines Committee in turn discussed Māori as far more reactive, rather than proactive, which was also reflected in their disregarding of Māori consent.

I strongly concur with Attwood, but I further suggest that my examination of the different actors in play in the 1830s debates on New Zealand demonstrates how these diverse perspectives and contingent historical factors can be understood alongside and in contrast to each other. Being mindful of the different perspectives and different actors shows that all evangelical humanitarians cannot be viewed as having

<sup>983</sup> Attwood 2020, 96–97 & 137–138. On the contingency of British colonial policy in Attwood's views see also Attwood 2019, 101.

been of the same mind. What is more, even groups that argued for opposing lines of action could have close connections in some of their views. Taking such convergences, divergences and the results of interaction and negotiation between different perspectives into consideration and under examination provides a deeper understanding of why there was such contingency and scramble in British colonial politics. It also illustrates what factors, such as aspects of knowledge and communication, further complicated the situation in London when it came to viewing what was to be done regarding New Zealand. For moving beyond simply identifying different localised knowledges as a conclusion, which Secord has criticised, it is necessary to consider the practical interactions and connections between such different actors. This can show, for example, why seeming concern for Māori welfare in practice allowed argumentation both for and against the colonisation New Zealand.

This does not, however, imply that any examination of the larger picture of colonialism or attempts to draw expansive conclusions should be discouraged, as they might not reflect the complexity of the issue to its full extent. Rather this multiplicity of knowledge, and by extension the multiplicity of colonialism, calls for historians to be mindful that contemporary philosophy or actions taken by decision-makers might not reflect the full extent of early-19<sup>th</sup>-century colonialism, for example. This can in turn raise further, more specific, questions about colonial practices and support a more nuanced understanding of colonial practices and networks inherent in it.

In understanding the nuance of the different perspectives in the case related to claimed knowledge and argumentation on New Zealand, I have also identified diverse, yet rather coherent, combinations of claimed knowledge and argumentation that the Aborigines Committee, on the one hand, and Wakefield and Ward, on the other, presented in their works. It cannot be expected that such coherence in knowledge and argumentation can or should always be found considering the ‘frenzied scramble’ in colonial knowledge that Ann Laura Stoler points out.<sup>984</sup> In terms of formation of knowledge, this coherence would however indicate that despite communication across long distances that could be slow, fragmentary and otherwise complicated, the different processes of formation of knowledge I have discussed in this study allowed for the formation of multiple forms of what appeared as coherent knowledge claims and argumentation in different perspectives and contexts.

These multiple forms of knowledge and their boundedness to different contexts can, however, also pose challenges to historians. While it is possible to view how humanitarian thinking in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, for example, influenced the

<sup>984</sup> Stoler 2012, 35–38.

formation of knowledge about Māori, there is a risk in getting stuck in viewing knowledge only from that specific localised context and viewing those contexts as static. This can lead to a failure to see whether different actors changed their minds, for example, after receiving new information, or if knowledge arising from one perspective was also accepted more generally, rather than having only been a biased view from a limited perspective. While a localised context can provide insight into how knowledge was formed by or appeared to certain actors, it is problematic to assume that the context automatically and always resulted in purely biased knowledge. In the specific case of this study, considering the biases that have been identified in the Aborigines Committee's work and the NZA's *The British Colonization*, the locality of the knowledge claims made by those two sides is evident and in parallel to the goals and interests of the two sides. Nonetheless, it can be questioned whether this biased nature completely colours the way in which these two sides and their knowledge claims can be viewed.

As Sarasin notes, knowledge can provide a proxy for viewing people's actions as we cannot see into their minds. Without this ability it can be impossible to completely understand the backgrounds and the nature of given knowledge. For example, whether certain knowledge claims were the result of sincere attempts at objectivity, deliberate propagandistic rhetoric or something in between. I suggest, however, that both the multiplicity of knowledges and the processes of formation and use of knowledge provide some clues to the nature of given knowledge claims. We can subsequently attempt to understand some aspects from this. By examining presented knowledge claims in relation to what these claims were based on, as well as what sources were used for forming these claims and how they appear in contrast to other contemporary claims, it is possible to identify differences in different knowledge claims within the same networks or between different localised knowledges. This can help identify whether something appeared as divergent from other similar claims, for example, and thus was possibly biased or otherwise arose from a specific context, or whether some claims were convergent with each other thereby implying a possibly more general acceptance of that knowledge. An example that arises from my examination in this study is how the Aborigines Committee's views and presentation of Māori were closely connected with missionary groups. This indicates that missionary perspectives influenced the Committee's views and recommendations. Yet, there were also significant divergences from some missionary perspectives. Marsden's views of commerce, for example, and the way in which Māori proactivity was acknowledged. Thus, the entirety of the Committee's knowledge claims and argumentation cannot be directly attributed to missionary contexts, but other contexts, such as goals in political argumentation and the distance from the subject at hand, appear as further contexts that influenced their work and in turn influenced how New Zealand was 'known' in Britain. Equivalently, for all their

political differences, both the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward rested their discussion of Māori on the perceived superiority of British culture and the British way of life in contrast to that of Māori. This indicates their common wider spatial and temporal context and shared views.

The question of sincerity in the two sides' presentations of Māori as well as their plans is a further similar question. It is difficult to know whether the presentation of humanitarian concern relating to Māori by the two sides was sincere and not mere political rhetoric. However, there was a certain consistency, for example, in Wakefield's presentation of concern for Māori in different contexts. This provides some clue that while the NZA's interests and colonial plans most certainly influenced how and why Māori were discussed by Wakefield and Ward, there could have been other considerations at play as well. There could have been some genuine concern for the welfare of Māori in Wakefield's mind. However, this was not necessarily contradictory, in his view, with plans to colonise New Zealand. These appear as different aspects of the broader context in which Wakefield and Ward formed their knowledge claims and argumentation on New Zealand, and thus they were parts of the process. Thus, this kind of concern was not necessarily only outward rhetoric. Such contexts were not, however, static. By the 1840s, Adams observes that the NZA's assertions of the necessity to respect Māori sovereignty had been forgotten. By that time these contexts could have changed.<sup>985</sup> This change does not necessarily mean that the earlier concern for Māori was absolutely disingenuous. Rather, it calls for further examination of what change took place between the late 1830s and the mid-1840s for a fuller understanding of these different contexts.

The change in British attitudes and practices towards New Zealand and Māori provides a further object for study from the perspective of the history of knowledge that stretches beyond the timeframe of this study. From the perspective of the history of knowledge, my examination shows the significance of processes and networks in formation and use of knowledge. These influenced different ways in which New Zealand came to be 'known' in Britain in certain contexts and how this had an impact on actions that were taken, such as the political argumentation on New Zealand. Generally, the contexts of the discussions changed in the 19<sup>th</sup> century following the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in New Zealand and the rise of more 'scientific' and Darwinist thinking in terms of racial difference in European thought. Contrasting the localised formation of knowledge claims in this study to an examination of those different contexts can provide further understanding as to how the changing contexts influenced claimed knowledge and how this was connected to colonial actions or argumentation. This kind of longitudinal comparison of different circumstances and

<sup>985</sup> See Adams, P. (1977) 2013, 150.

knowledges could indicate the dynamics of what was preserved and what changed, not only in the knowledge claims but also in the processes of formation of these knowledge claims.

In my focus on the knowledge claims that were formed in London, I have identified the significance of different actors, such as the Aborigines Committee, Wakefield and Ward and missionaries, as nodes between New Zealand and Britain. I have indicated how information that was received from missionaries and other actors was processed by the Aborigines Committee and Wakefield and Ward, thus forming new knowledge claims with their own significances. In sum, this study is an examination of movement of knowledge that provides detailed understanding of the circumstances in which knowledge is formed and used. This does not imply a justification or approval of such colonial actions, but provides perspective as to why certain actions could have been taken in history and the basis on which these actions or decisions were taken. While this study is tied closely to the precolonial history of New Zealand, this kind of examination of knowledge as an expansive concept also provides a wider perspective on the functioning of Western epistemic systems in history and even in our current time.

# Abbreviations

ATL	Alexander Turnbull Library
BLOU	Bodleian Library, Oxford University
CO	Colonial Office
CMS	Church Missionary Society
LMS	London Missionary Society
NZA	New Zealand Association
NZC	New Zealand Company
TNA	The National Archives
WMS	Wesleyan Missionary Society

# References

## Primary Sources

### Archives

#### **Alexander Turnbull Library (Wellington, New Zealand)**

Baker, Charles: *Journal of Charles Baker*, Vol. 1–2 1827–1833; 1833–[1834], qMS-0109.

Clarke, George, 1798-1875: *Letter and Journals. Letters to Church Missionary Society Vol 1*, qMS-0463.

Colenso, William: *Journal 1833-1838*, 88-103-1/16.

New Zealand Association: *Letter book 1837*, Micro-MS-0459.

New Zealand Association: *Minutes etc 1837*, Micro-MS-0459.

New Zealand Association: *Letterbook 1837–38*, MSI-Papers-7551.

New Zealand Company: *Records 1836-1840*, Micro-MS-0460.

Wakefield, Edward Gibbon: *Wakefield family Papers 1815-1853*, Micro-MS-Coll-20-1887.

Wakefield, Edward Gibbon, 1796–1862: *Letter to E B Hopper concerning progress and plans for colonisation*, MS-Papers-3124.

White, William: *Diary of Rev William White 1823-1835*, Micro-MS-0612-17.

Williams, Henry: *Journal of Henry Williams Dec 1826-Jan 1833*, 85-049-2/10.

Yate, William: *William Yate letters 1827–1834, Journals, Reports, Papers 1828–34*, Micro-MS-Coll-04-64.

#### **Bodleian Library, The University of Oxford (Oxford, United Kingdom)**

*Papers of Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton 1st Baronet (1) Vol. 2. Family Letters 1812–1851*, MSS. Brit. Emp. s. 444.

*Papers of Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton 1st Baronet (1) Vol. 14 Extracts Relating to Abolition of Slavery, Vol. IV 1835–36*, MSS. Brit. Emp. s. 444.

*Papers of Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton 1st Baronet (1) Vol. 15. Extracts Relating to Abolition of Slavery, Vol. V Feb 1836–Aug 16<sup>th</sup> 1837*, MSS. Brit. Emp. s. 444.

#### **The National Archives (Kew, United Kingdom)**

Colonial Office and Predecessors: *New Zealand Original Correspondence, Despatches and Individuals 1830–1835*, CO 209/1.

Colonial Office and Predecessors: *New Zealand Original Correspondence, Despatches and Individuals 1836–1837*, CO 209/2.

Colonial Office and Predecessors: *New Zealand Original Correspondence, Despatches and Individuals 1838*, CO 209/3.

### Newspapers and periodicals

*The Missionary Register for MDCCCXX. Containing the Principal Transactions of the Various Institutions for Propagating the Gospel: with the Proceedings, at large, of the Church Missionary Society.* London: Printed by Richard Watts, Crown Court, Temple Bar. Published by L. B. Seeley, 169, Fleet Street, 1820.

*The Missionary Register for MDCCCXXII. Containing the Principal Transactions of the Various Institutions for Propagating the Gospel: with the Proceedings, at large, of the Church Missionary Society.* London: Printed by Richard Watts, Crown Court, Temple Bar. Published by L. B. Seeley, 169, Fleet-Street, 1822.

*The Missionary Register for MDCCCXXXVI. Containing the Principal Transactions of the Various Institutions for Propagating the Gospel: with the Proceedings, at large, of the Church Missionary Society.* London: Printed by Richard Watts, Crown Court, Temple Bar. Published by L. & G. Seeley, 169, Fleet-Street, 1836.

*The Sydney Herald.* "New Zealand." 21<sup>st</sup> August 1834: 2.

### Parliamentary publications

"Papers relating to Aboriginal Tribes. (North America, New South Wales, Van Diemen's Land and British Guyana)." 19<sup>th</sup> Century House of Commons Sessional Papers, House of Commons Papers No. 617. 1834.

*Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords, appointed to inquire into the Present State of the Islands of New Zealand, and The Expediency of regulating the Settlement of British Subjects therein; with the Minutes of Evidence taken before the Committee, and an Index thereto.* Ordered to be printed 3d April 1838.

*Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements); together with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index.* Ordered, by the House of Commons, to be Printed, 5 August 1836.

*Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements); with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index.* Ordered, by the House of Commons, to be Printed, 26 June 1837.

*Report from the Select Committee on the Disposal of Lands in the British Colonies; together with the Minutes of Evidence and Appendix [Communicated by the Commons to the Lords].* Ordered to be printed 20<sup>th</sup> August 1836.

### Printed primary sources

*A Letter from Sydney, the principal town of Australasia.* [By Edward Gibbon Wakefield.] Edited by Robert Gouger. London: Joseph Cross, Simpkin and Marshall, and Effingham Wilson, 1829.

*A Statement of the Objects of the New Zealand Association. With some particulars concerning the position, extent, soil and climate, natural productions, and natives of New Zealand.* London: Published for the Association. Black and Armstrong, Colonial Booksellers, &c., 1837.

Beecham, John. *Colonization: being Remarks on Colonization in General, with an Examination of the Proposals of the Association which has been formed for Colonising New Zealand.* London: Hatchards, Piccadilly; Seeleys, Fleet Street; and Hamilton, Adams, & CO., and John Mason, Paternoster Row, 1838a.

—. *Remarks upon the Latest Official Documents relating to New Zealand: (ordered, by the House of Commons, to be printed February 7, 1838).* London: Hatchards, Piccadilly; Seeleys, Fleet Street; and Hamilton, Adams, & CO., and John Mason, Paternoster Row, 1838b.

- Busby, James. *Authentic Information relative to New South Wales and New Zealand*. London: Joseph Cross, 1832a.
- . *A Brief Memoir relative to the Islands of New Zealand*. [Submitted to the Right Hon Secretary of State for the Colonies, July, 1832]. In Busby: James: *Authentic Information relative to New South Wales and New Zealand*. London: Joseph Cross, 1832b.
- Coates, Dandeson. *The Principles, Objects, and Plan of the New Zealand Association Examined, in a letter to the Right Hon. Lord Glenelg, Secretary of State for the Colonies*. London: Hatchards, Piccadilly; Seeleys, Fleet Street; and Hamilton, Adams & CO. Paternoster Row, 1837a.
- . "Notes for the Information of those Members of the Deputation to Lord Glenelg, respecting the New-Zealand Association, who have not attended the meetings of the Committee on the subject. Confidential." Copy in TNA, CO209/3, fl. 134–144. London: Printed by Richard Watts, Crown Court, Temple Bar, 28. December 1837b.
- . *The Present State of the New-Zealand Question Considered, in a letter to J. P. Plumptre, Esq., M.P.* London: Printed by Richard Watts, Crown Court, Temple Bar, 1838.
- Craik, George Lillie. *Library of Entertaining Knowledge Vol. V. Part I. The New Zealanders*. Boston: Wells and Lilly, Court Street. Published under the Superintendence of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, 1830.
- Earle, Augustus. *A Narrative of a Nine Months' Residence in New Zealand in 1827; together with a Journal of a Residence in Tristan D'Acunha, and island situated between South America and the Cape of Good Hope*. London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, Green, & Longman, 1832.
- England and America. A Comparison of the Social and Political State of Both Nations*. [By Edward Gibbon Wakefield.] London: Richard Bentley, New Burlington Street, 1833.
- Gibbon, Edward. *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. First published 1782. Revised in 1845.
- Hawkesworth, John. *An Account of the Voyages Undertaken by the Order of His Present Majesty for Making Discoveries in the Southern Hemisphere, And successively performed by Commodore Byron, Captain Carteret, Captain Wallis, and Captain Cook. Vol. 3*. London: Printed for W. Strathan; and T. Cadell, 1773.
- Instructions to Colonel Wakefield, Principal Agent of the Company*. May, 1839. New Zealand Electronic Collection. <http://nzetc.victoria.ac.nz/tm/scholarly/tei-Mac01Comp-t1-g1-t5-g1-t3-g1-t2.html>. Accessed 22.5.2021.
- Marshall, William Barrett. *A Personal Narrative of Two Visits to New Zealand, in His Majesty's Ship Alligator, A.D. 1834*. London: James Nisbett and Co. Berners Street, 1836.
- Memoirs of Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton, Baronet. With selections from his correspondence*. Edited by his son, Charles Buxton, Esq. London: John Murray, Albemarle Street, 1848.
- Nicholas, John Liddiard. *Narrative of a Voyage to New Zealand, Performed in the years 1814 and 1815, in Company with the Rev. Samuel Marsden in two Volumes, Vol. I*. London: Printed for James Black and Son, 1817a.
- . *Narrative of a Voyage to New Zealand, Performed in the years 1814 and 1815, in Company with the Rev. Samuel Marsden in two Volumes, Vol. II*. London: Printed for James Black and Son, 1817b.
- Plan of a Company to be Established for the Purpose of Founding a Colony in Southern Australia, purchasing land therein, and preparing the land so purchased for the reception of immigrants*. London: Rudgway and Sons Piccadilly, 1832.
- The British Colonization of New Zealand; Being an account of the principles, objects, and plans of the New Zealand Association; together with particulars concerning the position, extent, soil, and climate, natural productions, and native inhabitants of New Zealand. With charts and*

- illustrations*. [By Edward Gibbon Wakefield & John Ward] Published for the New Zealand Association. London: John W. Parker, West Strand, 1837.
- The New British Province of South Australia; or a description of the country, illustrated by charts and views; with an account of the principles, objects, plan, and prospects of the colony*. London: Printed for C. Knight, 22, Ludgate-Street, 1834.
- Wakefield, Edward Gibbon. *Mr. Dandeson Coates, and the New Zealand Association; in a letter to Right Hon. Lord Glenelg*. London: Henry Hooper, 13, Pall Mall East, 1837.
- Ward, John. *Information relative to New Zealand, compiled for the use of colonists*. London: John W. Parker, West Strand, 1840.
- Yate, William. *An Account of New Zealand; and of the Formation and Progress of the Church Missionary Society's Mission in the Northern Island*. London: Seeley and Burnside, 1835.

## Secondary sources

- Abulafia, David. *The Discovery of Mankind: Atlantic Encounters in the Age of Columbus*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Adams, Percy G. *Travelers and Travel Liars 1660–1800*. New York: Dover Publications, 1962.
- Adams, Peter. *Fatal Necessity: British Intervention in New Zealand 1830–1847*. First published in 1977. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2013.
- Andersson Burnett, Linda and Bruce Buchan. "The Edinburgh Connection: Linnaean Natural History, Scottish Moral Philosophy and the Colonial Implications of Enlightenment Thought." In *Linnaeus, Natural History and the Circulation of Knowledge*, Edited by Hanna Hodacs, Kenneth Nyberg and Stéphane Van Damme. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2018: 161–186.
- Asad, Talal. "Reflections on Violence, Law, and Humanitarianism." *Critical Inquiry*, 41(2), December, 2015: 390–427.
- Attwood, Bain. *Empire and the Making of the Native Title: Sovereignty, Property and Indigenous People*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- Attwood, Bain. "Protection Claims: The British, Maori and the Islands of New Zealand, 1800–40." In *Protection and Empire: A Global History*, edited by Lauren Benton, Adam Clulow & Bain Attwood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017: 153–174.
- Attwood, Bain. "Returning to the Past: The South Australian Colonisation Commission, the Colonial Office and Aboriginal Title." *The Journal of Legal History*, 34:1, 2013: 50–82.
- Attwood, Bain. "Towards a post-foundational history of the Treaty." In *Indigenous Peoples and the State: International Perspectives on the Treaty of Waitangi*, edited by Mark Hickford and Carwyn Jones. Abingdon: Routledge, 2019: 94–110.
- Ballantyne, Tony. "Archive, Discipline, State: Power and Knowledge in South Asian Historiography." *New Zealand Journal of Asian Studies*, 1, June, 2001: 87–106.
- . "Rereading the Archive and Opening up the Nation-State: Colonial Knowledge in South Asia (and Beyond)." In *After the Imperial Turn: Thinking with and through the Nation*, edited by Antoinette Burton. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2003: 102–122.
- . *Orientalism and Race: Aryanism in the British Empire*. Houndmills: Palgrave MacMillan, 2002.
- . "Colonial Knowledge." In *British Empire: Themes and Perspectives*, edited by Sarah Stockwell. Oxford & Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2008: 177–197.
- . "Humanitarian Narratives: Knowledge and the Politics of Mission and Empire." *Social Sciences and Missions* 24, 2011: 233–264.
- . *Webs of Empire: Locating New Zealand's Colonial Past*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2012.

- . "Remaking the Empire from Newgate: Wakefield's A Letter from Sydney." In *Ten Books that Shaped the British Empire: Creating an Imperial Commons*, edited by Antoinette Burton and Isabel Hofmeyr. USA: Duke University Press, 2014: 29–49.
- . *Entanglements of Empire: Missionaries, Māori, and the Question of the Body*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2015.
- . "Moving Texts and 'Humane Sentiment': Materiality, mobility and the emotions of imperial humanitarianism." *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History*, Vol. 17, No. 1, Spring, 2016.
- . "Entangled Mobilities: Missions, Māori and the Reshaping of Te Ao Hurihuri." In *Indigenous Mobilities: Across and Beyond the Antipodes*, edited by Rachel Standfield. Acton: ANU Press and Aboriginal History Inc., 2018: 115–144.
- Ballara, Angela. *Taua: 'Musket Wars', 'land wars' of tikanga? Warfare in Māori society in the early nineteenth century*. Auckland: Penguin Books, 2003.
- Banner, Stuart. *How the Indians Lost Their Land: Law and Power on the Frontier*. Cambridge, MA & London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007.
- Banner, Stuart. "Why Terra Nullius? Anthropology and Property Law in Early Australia." *Law and History Review*, Vol. 23, No. 1., Spring, 2005: 95–131.
- Barnett, Louise K. *The Ignoble Savage: American Literary Racism, 1790–1890*. Westport: Greenwood, 1975.
- Barnett, Michael. *Empire of Humanity: A History of Humanitarianism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2011.
- Bartsch, Shadi, Clifford Ando, Robert J. Richards and Haun Saussy. "Editors' Introduction." *KNOW: A Journal on the Formation of Knowledge*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Spring, 2017: 201–209.
- Beavan, Iain and Warren McDougall. "The Scottish Book Trade." In *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Volume V: 1695-1830*, edited by Michael F. Suarez, S.J. and Michael L. Turner. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009: 352–365.
- Belgrave, Michael. *Historical Frictions: Māori Claims and Reinvented Histories*. First published in 2005. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2013.
- Belich, James. *Making Peoples: A History of the New Zealanders from Polynesian Settlement to the End of the Nineteenth Century*. First published in 1996. Auckland: Penguin Group (NZ), 2007.
- . *The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict*. First published 1986. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2015.
- Belmessous, Saliha. *Assimilation and Empire: Uniformity in French and British Colonies, 1541–1954*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- . "The Paradox of an Empire by Treaty." In *Empire by Treaty: Negotiating European Expansion, 1600–1900*, edited by Saliha Belmessous. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015: 1–18.
- Benton, Lauren. "This Melancholy Lebyrith: The Trial of Arthur Hodge and the Boundaries of Imperial Law." *Alabama Law Review*, Vol. 64:1:91, 2012: 91–122.
- Benton, Lauren and Adam Clulow. "Legal encounters and the origins of global law." In *The Cambridge World History, Volume VI: The Construction of a Global World, 1400–1800 CE, Part 2: Patterns of Change*, edited by Jerry H. Bentley, Sanjay Subrahmanyam and Merry E. Wiesner-Hanks. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015: 80–100.
- . "Empires and protection: making interpolity law in the early modern world." *Journal of Global History*, Vol. 12, 2017: 74–92.
- Binney, Judith. "Christianity and the Maoris to 1840: A Comment." *New Zealand Journal of History*, Vol. 3, No 2, 1969: 143–165.

- . Kendall, Thomas. *Te Ara – The Encyclopedia of New Zealand*, 1990. <https://teara.govt.nz/en/biographies/1k9/kendall-thomas>. Accessed on 4.11.2020.
- . Yate, William. *Te Ara – Dictionary of New Zealand Biography*, 1990. <https://teara.govt.nz/en/biographies/1y1/yate-william>. Accessed on 11.2.2019.
- . "Whatever happened to poor Mr. Yate? An exercise in voyeurism." *New Zealand Journal of History*, 2004: 154–168.
- Birchall, Matthew. "History, Sovereignty, Capital: Company Colonization in South Australia and New Zealand." *Journal of Global History*, 16:1, 2021: 141–157.
- Blacker, B. H. "Hinds, Samuel." Revised by H. C. G. Matthew. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biographies*, 2016.
- Bleichmar, Daniela. "The Geography of Observation: Visibility in Eighteenth-Century Botanical Travels." In *Histories of Scientific Observation*, edited by Lorraine Daston and Elizabeth Lunbeck. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2011: 373–395.
- Blouet, Olwyn Mary. "Buxton, Sir Thomas Fowell, first baronet." First published in 2004. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2010.
- Bodensten, Erik. "A societal knowledge breakthrough: Knowledge of potatoes in Sweden, 1749–50." In *Forms of Knowledge: Developing the History of Knowledge*, edited by Johan Östling, David Larsson Heidenblad and Anna Nilsson Hammar. Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 2020: 193–208.
- Boisen, Camilla. "The Changing Moral Justification of Empire: From the Right to Colonise to the Obligation to Civilise." *History of European Ideas*, 39:3, 2013: 335–353.
- Brilkman, Kajsa. "Confessional knowledge: How might the history of knowledge and the history of confessional Europe influence each other?" In *Forms of Knowledge: Developing the History of Knowledge*, edited by Johan Östling, David Larsson Heidenblad and Anna Nilsson Hammar. Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 2020: 29–46.
- Brown, Michael. "'Like a Devoted Army': Medicine, Heroic Masculinity, and the Military Paradigm in Victorian Britain." *Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 49, No. 3, July, 2010: 592–622.
- Buchan, Bruce. "The Empire of Political Thought: Civilization, savagery and perceptions of Indigenous government." *History of the Human Sciences*, Vol. 18, No. 2, 2005: 1–22.
- Buchan, Bruce and Linda Andersson Burnett. "Knowing savagery: Humanity in the circuits of colonial knowledge." *History of Human Sciences*, Vol. 32, No. 4, 2019: 115–134.
- Burke, Peter. *What is the History of Knowledge?* Cambridge: Polity Press, 2016.
- . "Response." *Journal for the History of Knowledge*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 2020: 1–7.
- Burns, Patricia. *Fatal success: A History of the New Zealand Company*. Auckland: Heinemann Reed, 1989.
- Byrne, Angela. *Geographies of the Romantic North: Science, Antiquarianism, and Travel, 1790–1830*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013.
- Cain, Peter J. "Empire and the Language of Character and Virtue in Later Victorian and Edwardian Britain." *Modern Intellectual History*, Vol. 4, No. 2, 2007: 249–273.
- . "Character, 'Ordered Liberty', and the Mission to Civilise: British Moral Justification of Empire, 1870-1914." *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 40:4, 2012: 557–578.
- Calder, Alex, Jonathan Lamb and Bridget Orr (eds.). *Voyages and Beaches: Pacific Encounters, 1769–1840*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1999.
- Carey, Daniel. "Truth, Lies and Travel Writing." In *The Routledge Companion to Travel Writing*, edited by Carl Thompson. London and New York: Routledge, 2016: 3–14.

- Carey, Jane and Jane Lydon. "Introduction: Indigenous Networks: Historical Trajectories and Contemporary Connections." In *Indigenous Networks: Mobility, Connections and Exchange*, edited by Jane Carey and Jane Lydon. New York and London: Routledge, 2014:1–26.
- Caulker, Tcho Mbaimba. *The African-British Long Eighteenth Century: An Analysis of African-British Treaties, Colonial Economics, and Anthropological Discourse*. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2009.
- Chartier, Roger. "Texts, Printing, Reading." In *The New Cultural History*, edited by Lynn Hunt. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1989: 154–175.
- Clark, Steve. "Introduction." In *Travel Writing and Empire: Postcolonial Theory in Transit*, edited by Steve Clark. London & New York: Zed Books, 1999: 1–28.
- Clayton, Daniel W. *Islands of Truth: The Imperial Fashioning of Vancouver Island*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2000.
- Cohn, Bernard S. *Colonialism and its forms of knowledge: The British in India*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Comaroff, Jean and John Comaroff. *Of Revelation and Revolution: Volume 1: Christianity, Colonialism, and Consciousness in South Africa*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Comaroff, John L. and Jean Comaroff. *Of Revelation and Revolution: Volume 2: The Dialectics of Modernity on a South African Frontier*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1997.
- Cooper, Frederick. *Colonialism in Question: Theory, Knowledge, History*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 2005.
- Cox, Jeffrey. *The British Missionary Enterprise since 1700*. New York and London: Routledge, 2008.
- Dalziel, Raewyn. "Southern Islands: New Zealand and Polynesia." In *The Oxford History of the British Empire, Volume III: The Nineteenth Century*, edited by Andrew Porter. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 1999: 573–596.
- Darnton, Robert. "What is the History of Books?" In *The Book History Reader*, edited by David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery. London: Routledge, 2003: 9–26.
- Daston, Lorraine. "The History of Science and the History of Knowledge." *KNOW: A Journal on the Formation of Knowledge*, Vol 1, No. 1, 2017.
- . "Comment." In *Debating New Approaches to History*, edited by Marek Tamm and Peter Burke. London, New York, Oxford, New Delhi, Sydney: Bloomsbury Academic, 2019.
- Daston, Lorraine and Peter Galison. *Objectivity*. New York: Zed Books, 2007: 131–154.
- Douglas, Bronwen. "Science and the art of representing 'savages': Reading 'Race' in Text and Image in South Seas Voyage Literature." *History and Anthropology*, Vol. 11, No. 2–3, 1999: 157–201.
- . "Philosophers, Naturalists, and Antipodean Encounters, 1748-1803." *Intellectual History Review*, 23:3, 2013: 387–409.
- . "Agency, affect, and local knowledge in the exploration of Oceania." In *Indigenous Intermediaries: New Perspectives on Exploration Archives*, edited by Shino Konishi, Maria Nugent and Tiffany Shellam. Acton: ANU Press and Aboriginal History Inc., 2015: 103–130.
- Driver, Felix. "Intermediaries and the archive of exploration." In *Indigenous Intermediaries: New Perspectives on Exploration Archives*, edited by Shino Konishi, Maria Nugent and Tiffany Shellam. Acton: ANU Press and Aboriginal History Inc., 2015: 11–30.
- Dupré, Sven and Geert Somsen. "The History of Knowledge and the Future of Knowledge." *Berichte zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte*, Vol. 42, Issue 2–3, September, 2019: 186–199.

- Durrer, Rebecca. "Propagating the New Zealand ideal." *The Social Sciences Journal* 43, 2006: 173–183.
- Dwyer, Philip. "Violence and its Histories: Meanings, Methods, Problems." *History and Theory*, 55, December, 2017: 7–22.
- Early New Zealand Books Online, The University of Auckland Libraries and Learning Services. 1814–1853 - The Missionary Register [Sections Relating to New Zealand]. <http://www.enzb.auckland.ac.nz/document/?wid=2962&action=null>. Accessed on 14.6.2021.
- Eastwood, David. "'Amplifying the Provenience of the Legislature': the Flow of Information and the English State in the Early Nineteenth Century." *Historical Research: The Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, Vol. LXII, 1989: 276–294.
- Edmond, Rod. *Representing the South Pacific: Colonial discourse from Cook to Gauguin*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Edmonds, Penelope. "Elite and 'Shadow Networks': Quaker investigative counter travel, protective governance, and Indigenous worlds in the Southern oceans." *Journal of Colonialism & Colonial History*, Vol. 19, Iss. 2, Summer, 2018.
- Edmonds, Penelope and Anna Johnston. "Empire, Humanitarianism and Violence in the Colonies." *Journal of Colonialism & Colonial History*, Vol. 17, Iss. 1 Spring, 2016.
- Elbourne, Elizabeth. *Blood Ground: Colonialism, Missions, and the Contest for Christianity in the Cape Colony and Britain 1799–1853*. Montreal & Kingston, London, Ithaca, NY: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2002.
- . "The Sin of the Settler: The 1835-36 Select Committee on Aborigines and Debates over Virtue and Conquest in the Early Nineteenth-Century British White Settler Empire." *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History*, Vol. 4, No. 3, Winter, 2003a.
- . "Word Made Flesh: Christianity, Modernity, and Cultural Colonialism in the Work of Jean and John Comaroff." *American Historical Review*, Vol. 108, Iss. 2, April, 2003b: 435–459.
- . "Violence, Moral Imperialism and Colonial Borderlands, 1770s-1820s: Some contradictions of humanitarianism." *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History*, Volume 17, Number 1, Spring, 2016.
- Ellingson, Ter. *The Myth of the Noble Savage*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2001.
- Etherington, Norman. "Ellis, William." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biographies*, 2004.
- . "Introduction." In *Oxford History of the British Empire Companion Series: Missions and Empire*, edited by Norman Etherington. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005: 1–18.
- Evans, Julie, Patricia Grimshaw, David Philips and Shurlee Swain. *Equal subjects, unequal rights: Indigenous people in British settler colonies, 1830s–1910*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2003.
- Fan, Fa-ti. *British Naturalists in Qing China: Science, Empire, and Cultural Encounter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Finkelstein, David and Alistair McCleery. "Introduction." In *The Book History Reader*, edited by David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery. London: Routledge, 2003: 1–4.
- Fischer, Steven Roger. *A History of the Pacific Islands*. Houndmills: Palgrave, 2002.
- Fitzmaurice, Andrew. "The Genealogy of Terra Nullius." *Australian Historical Studies*, Vol. 129, 2007: 1–15.
- Freitag, Jason. *Serving Empire, Serving Nation: James Tod and the Rajputs of Rajasthan*. Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2009.

- Friedrich, Markus. "Genealogy and the history of knowledge." In *Genealogical Knowledge in the Making*, edited by Jost Eickmeyer, Markus Friedrich & Volker Bauer. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2019: 1–22.
- Frost, Michael H. *Introduction to Classical Legal Rhetoric: A Lost Heritage*. London and New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Ganter, Regina. *The Contest for Aboriginal Souls: European Missionary Agendas in Australia*. Acton: ANU Press and Aboriginal History Inc., 2018.
- Gascoigne, John. *The Enlightenment and the Origins of European Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- . *Encountering the Pacific in the Age of Enlightenment*. Port Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- . "Cross-cultural knowledge exchange in the age of the Enlightenment." In *Indigenous Intermediaries: New Perspectives on Exploration Archives*, edited by Shino Konishi, Maria Nugent and Tiffany Shellam. Acton: ANU Press and Aboriginal History Inc., 2015: 131–147.
- Gibbons, Peter. "Cultural Colonization and National Identity." *New Zealand Journal of History*, Vol. 36, No. 1, 2002: 5–17.
- Gittos, M. B. "White, William." *Dictionary of New Zealand Biography. Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand*, 1990. <https://teara.govt.nz/en/biographies/1w19/white-william>. Accessed on 30.3.2019.
- Grady, Don. "Guard, Elizabeth." *Dictionary of New Zealand Biography. Te Ara - Encyclopedia of New Zealand*, 1990. <https://teara.govt.nz/en/biographies/1g23/guard-elizabeth>. Accessed on 16.11.2020.
- Grant, Robert. "New Zealand 'Naturally': Ernst Dieffenbach, Environmental Determinism and the mid nineteenth-century British colonization of New Zealand." *New Zealand Journal of History*, Vol. 37, No. 1, 2003: 22–37.
- Grimshaw, Patricia. "Federation as a Turning Point in Australian History." *Australian Historical Studies*, Vol. 33 (118), 2002: 25–41.
- Hall, Catherine. *Civilising Subjects: Metropole and Colony in the English Imagination 1830–1867*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2002.
- Hall, Stuart. "Encoding and Decoding in the Television Discourse." *Paper for the Council of Europe Colloquy on "Training In The Critical Reading of Televisual Language"*. Council & The Centre for Mass Communication Research, University of Leicester, 1973: 1–20.
- Harrington, Jack. "Edward Gibbon Wakefield, the liberal political subject and the settler state." *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 20:3, 2015: 333–351.
- Harris, Cole. "How Did Colonialism Dispossess? Comments from an Edge of Empire." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 94(1), 2004: 165–182.
- Hawes, Donald. "Craik, George Lillie." First published in print 2004. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2019.
- Hickford, Mark. "'Decidedly the Most Interesting Savages on the Globe': An Approach to the Intellectual History of Māori Property Rights, 1837–53." *History of Political Thought*, Vol. XXVII, No. 1, Spring, 2006: 122–167.
- . "'Vague Native Rights to Land': British Imperial Policy and Native Title and Custom in New Zealand, 1837–53." *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, Vol. 38, No. 2, June, 2010: 175–206.
- . *Lords of the Land: Indigenous Property Rights and the Jurisprudence of Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

- Hofmeyr, Isabel. "Inventing the World: Transnationalism, Transmission, and Christian Textualities." In *Mixed Messages: Materiality, Textuality, Missions*, edited by Jamie S. Scott and Gareth Griffiths. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005: 19–35.
- Honoré, Christopher. "The Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand, and Polynesia." In *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to the Anglican Communion*, edited by Ian S. Markham, J. Barney Hawkins, Justyn Terry and Leslie Nuñez Steffensen. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013: 374–386.
- Howe, K. R. "The Fate of the 'Savage' in Pacific Historiography." *New Zealand Journal of History*, Vol. 11, No. 2, 1977: 137–154.
- . *Nature, Culture, and History: The "Knowing" of Oceania*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2000.
- Hulme, Peter. "Making No Bones: A Response to Myra Jehlen." *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 20, No. 1, Autumn, 1993: 179–186.
- Ilfie, Rob. "Science and Voyages of Discovery." In *The Cambridge History of Science, Vol. 4: Eighteenth-century science*, edited by Roy Porter. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003: 618–645.
- Irving-Stonebraker, Sarah. "Nature, Knowledge, and Civilisation. Connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Worlds in the Enlightenment." *Itinerario*, Vol. 41, April, 2017: 93–107.
- . "From Eden to savagery and civilization: British colonialism and humanity in the development of natural history, ca. 1600-1840." *History of Human Sciences*, Vol. 32 (4), 2019: 63–74.
- Jacob, Christian. "Lieux de Savoir: Places and Spaces in the History of Knowledge." *KNOW: A Journal on the Formation of Knowledge*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 2017: 85–102.
- Jahoda, Gustav. *Images of Savages: Ancient Roots of Modern Prejudice in Western Culture*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Jauss, Hans Robert. *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception* (Translated from German by Timothy Bahti). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982.
- Jehlen, Myra. "Response to Peter Hulme." *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 20, No. 1, Autumn, 1993: 187–191.
- Jennings, William. "The Debate over Kai Tangata (Māori Cannibalism): New Perspectives from the Correspondence of the Marists." *The Journal of the Polynesian Society*, Vol. 129, No. 2, June, 2011: 129–147.
- . "The Marist Missionaries' First Encounters with Inhabitants of the Pacific." *Australian Journal of French Studies* (50) 1, 2013: 115–149.
- Jensz, Felicity. "Missionaries and Indigenous Education in the 19th-Century British Empire. Part I: Church-State Relations and Indigenous Actions and Reactions." *History Compass* 10/4, 2012a: 294–305.
- . "Missionaries and Indigenous Education in the 19th-Century British Empire. Part II: Race, Class and Gender." *History Compass* 10/4, 2012b: 306–317.
- . "The Function of Inaugural Editorials in Missionary Periodicals." *Church History* 82:2, June, 2013: 374–380.
- Jensz, Felicity and Hanna Acke. "FORUM: The Form and Function of Nineteenth-Century Missionary Periodicals: Introduction." *Church History* 82:2 June, 2013: 368–373.
- Joas, Christian, Fabian Krämer and Kärin Nickelsen. "Introduction: History of Science or History of Knowledge?" *Berichte zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte*, Vol. 42, Issue 2–3, September, 2019: 117–125.
- Johns, Adrian. *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1998.

- Johnston, Anna. *Missionary Writing and Empire, 1800–1860*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- . *The Paper War: Morality, Print Culture, and Power in Colonial New South Wales*. Crawley, Western Australia: UWA Publishing, 2011.
- . "'The Awful Depravity of Human Nature': Violence and humanitarian narratives in New South Wales and Tahiti, 1796–99." *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History*, Vol. 17, No. 1, Spring, 2016.
- Jolly, Margaret, Serge Tchekézo and Darrell Tryon (eds). *Oceanic Encounters: Exchange, desire, violence*. Canberra: ANU E Press, 2009.
- Jones, Carwyn. "Māori and State visions of law and peace." In *Indigenous Peoples and the State: International Perspectives on the Treaty of Waitangi*, edited by Mark Hickford and Carwyn Jones. London: Routledge, 2018.
- Jones, Carwyn and Mark Hickford. "Introduction." In *Indigenous Peoples and the State: International Perspectives on the Treaty of Waitangi*, edited by Mark Hickford and Carwyn Jones. London: Routledge, 2018.
- Keane, Basil. "Traditional Māori religion – ngā karakia a te Māori - Tohunga". *Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand*, 2011a. <http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/traditional-maori-religion-nga-karakia-a-te-maori/page-2>. Accessed on 10.12.2021.
- . "Tūranga i te hapori – status in Māori society - Class, status and rank". *Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand*, 2011b. <http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/turanga-i-te-hapori-status-in-maori-society/page-1>. Accessed on 17.9.2021.
- Keefer, Katrina H.B. "The First Missionaries of The Church Missionary Society in Sierra Leone, 1804–1816: A Biographical Approach." *History in Africa*, Vol. 44, 2017: 199–235.
- Keighren, Innes M., Charles W. J. Withers and Bill Bell. *Travels into Print: Exploration, Writing, and Publishing with John Murray, 1773–1859*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2015.
- Keim, Wiebke. "Conceptualizing circulation of knowledge in the social." In *Global Knowledge Production in the Social Sciences: Made in circulation*, edited by Wiebke Keim, Ercüment Çelik and Veronika Wöhrer. Ashgate, 2014: 87–113.
- Kennedy, Dane. "Imperial History and Post-Colonial Theory." *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, Vol. 24, No. 3, September, 1996: 345–363.
- . *The Last Blank Spaces: Exploring Africa and Australia*. Cambridge, MA, & London: Harvard University Press, 2013.
- Keown, Michelle. *Pacific Islands Writing: The Postcolonial Literatures of Aotearoa/New Zealand and Oceania*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Kercher, Bruce. "Native Title in the Shadows: The Origins of the Myth of Terra Nullius in Early New South Wales Courts." In *Colonialism and the Modern World: Selected Studies*, edited by Gregory Blue, Martin Bunton and Ralph C. Croizier. First published in 2002. London and New York: Routledge, 2015: 100–119.
- Khair, Tabish. "India / South Asia." In *The Routledge Companion to Travel Writing*, edited by Carl Thompson. London and New York: Routledge, 2016: 384–393.
- King, Michael. *The Penguin History of New Zealand*. Auckland: Penguin Books (NZ), 2003.
- Konishi, Shino, Maria Nugent and Tiffany Shellam (eds.). *Indigenous Intermediaries: New Perspectives on Exploration Archives*. Acton: Australian National University and Aboriginal History Inc., 2015.
- Konishi, Shino, Maria Nugent and Tiffany Shellam. "Exploration archives and indigenous histories: An introduction." In *Indigenous Intermediaries: New Perspectives of Exploration Archives*,

- edited by Shino Konishi Maria Nugent and Tiffany Shellam. Acton: ANU Press and Aboriginal History Inc., 2015: 1–10.
- Kuper, Adam. "Civilization, Culture, and Race: Anthropology in the Nineteenth Century." In *The Cambridge History of Modern European Thought, Volume 1: The Nineteenth Century*, edited by Warren Breckman and Peter E. Gordon. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019: 398–421.
- Laidlaw, Zoë. "'Aunt Anna's Report': The Buxton Women and the Aborigines Select Committee, 1835–37." *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, Vol. 32, No 2, May, 2004: 1–28.
- . *Colonial Connections, 1815–45: Patronage, the information revolution and colonial government*. Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press, 2005.
- . "Heathens, Slaves, and Aborigines: Thomas Hodgkin's Critique of Missions and Anti-Slavery." *History Workshop Journal*, Issue 64, Autumn, 2007: 133–161.
- Lambert, David and Alan Lester. "Geographies of colonial philanthropy." *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol. 28, No. 3, 2004: 320–341.
- Laqueur, Thomas W. "Bodies, Details, and the Humanitarian Narrative." In *The New Cultural History*, edited by Lynn Hunt. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1989: 176–204.
- Larsson Heidenblad, David. "Financial knowledge: A rich new venture for historians of knowledge." In *Forms of Knowledge: Developing the History of Knowledge*, edited by Johan Östling, David Larsson Heidenblad & Anna Nilsson Hammar. Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 2020: 47–58.
- Latour, Bruno. *Science in Action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987.
- Lester, Alan. *Imperial Networks: Creating identities in nineteenth-century South Africa and Britain*. London and New York: Routledge, 2001.
- . "British Settler Discourse and the Circuits of Empire." *History Workshop Journal*, Iss. 54, 2002a: 24–48.
- . "Obtaining the 'due observance of justice': the geographies of colonial humanitarianism." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, Volume 20, 2002b: 277–293.
- . "Humanitarians and White Settlers in the Nineteenth Century." In *Oxford History of the British Empire Companion Series: Missions and Empire*, edited by Norman Etherington. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008: 64–85.
- . "Humanism, race and the colonial frontier." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 2011: 132–148.
- . "Settler colonialism, George Grey and the politics of ethnography." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, Vol. 34 (3), 2016: 492–507.
- Lester, Alan and Fae Dussart. "Trajectories of protection: Protectorates of Aborigines in early 19th century Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand." *New Zealand Geographer*, Vol. 64, 2008: 205–220.
- . *Colonization and the Origins of Humanitarian Governance: Protecting Aborigines across the Nineteenth-Century British Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Lester, Alan, Kate Boehme and Peter Mitchell. *Ruling the World: Freedom, Civilisation and Liberalism in the Nineteenth Century British Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021.
- Livingstone, David N. "Geographical Inquiry, Rational Religion, and Moral Philosophy: Enlightenment Discourse on the Human Condition." In *Geography and Enlightenment*, edited by David N. Livingstone and Charles C. J. Withers. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1999: 93–119.

- . *Putting Science in its Place: Geographies of Scientific Knowledge*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- . "Science, text and space: thoughts on the geography of reading." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, New Series*, Vol. 30, No. 4, December, 2005: 391–401.
- Livingstone, David N. and Charles W. J. Withers (eds.). *Geographies of Nineteenth-Century Science*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2011.
- Lynn, Martin. "British Policy, Trade, and Informal Empire in the Mid-Nineteenth Century." In *The Oxford History of the British Empire Volume III: The Nineteenth Century*, edited by Alain Low and Andrew Porter. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999: 101–121.
- Lässig, Simone. "The History of Knowledge and the Expansion of the Historical Research Agenda." *Bulletin of the GHI*, Vol. 59, Fall, 2016: 29–58.
- Mackay, David. *In the Wake of Cook: Exploration, Science & Empire, 1780–1801*. Beckenham: Croom Helm Ltd, 1985.
- Mackay, Joseph Angus. *Historic Poverty Bay and the East Coast, N.I., N.Z.* Gisborne: J. A. Mackay, 1949.
- MacKenzie, John M. *Propaganda and Empire: The Manipulation of British Public Opinion 1880–1960*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984.
- MacLean, Gerald. "Early Modern Travel Writing (1): Print and Early Modern European Travel Writing." In *The Cambridge History of Travel Writing*, edited by Nandini Das and Tim Youngs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019: 62–76.
- Mann, Michael. "'Torchbearers Upon the Path of Progress': Britain's Ideology of a 'Moral and Material Progress' in India. An Introductory Essay." In *Colonialism as Civilizing Mission: Cultural Ideology in British India*, edited by Harald Fischer-Tiné and Michael Mann. London: Anthem Press, 2004: 1–28.
- Maxwell, Alexander and Evan Roberts. "The Whangaroa Incident, 16 July 1824 A European–Maori Encounter and Its Many Incarnations." *The Journal of Pacific History*, Vol. 49, No. 1, 2014: 50–75.
- MacLaren, I. S. "From exploration to publication: the evolution of a 19th-century Arctic narrative." *Arctic*, Vol. 47, Iss. 1 (March), 1994: 43–53.
- McGann, Jerome. "The Socialization of Texts." In *The Book History Reader*, edited by David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleer. London: Routledge, 2003: 39–46.
- McKenzie, D. F. "The Books as an Expressive Form." In *The Book History Reader*, edited by David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery. London: Routledge, 2003: 27–38.
- McKitterick, David. "Introduction." In *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Volume VI: 1830–1914*, edited by David McKitterick. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009: 1–74.
- McLisky, Claire. "'Due Observance of Justice, and the Protection of their Rights': Philanthropy, Humanitarianism and Moral Purpose in the Aborigines Protection Society circa 1837 and its portrayal in Australian Historiography, 1883–2003." *Limina: A Journal of Historical and Cultural Studies*, Vol. 11, 2015: 57–66.
- Mein Smith, Philippa. *A Concise History of New Zealand*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Mitchell, Jessie. *In Good Faith?: Governing Indigenous Australia through God, Charity and Empire, 1825–1855*. Canberra: ANU E Press and Aboriginal History Incorporated, 2011.
- Mitchell, Rosemary. "Knight, Charles." First published in print 2004. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 2008.

- Moloney, Pat. "Savagery and Civilization: Early Victorian Notions." *New Zealand Journal of History*, Vol. 35, No. 2, 2001: 153–176.
- Moon, Paul. *This Horrid Practice: The Myth and Reality of Traditional Maori Cannibalism*. Auckland: Penguin NZ, 2008.
- . "Thomas Shepherd and the First New Zealand Company." *New Zealand Journal of History*, Vol. 47, No. 1, 2013: 22–38.
- . *The Voyagers: Remarkable European Explorations of New Zealand*. Auckland: Penguin Books, 2014.
- . "Shades of the Savage in Colonial New Zealand." *Journal of Colonialism & Colonial History*, Vol. 18, Iss. 2 Summer, 2017: 1–14.
- . *The Rise and Fall of James Busby: His Majesty's British Resident in New Zealand*. London, New York, Oxford, New Delhi, Sydney: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2020.
- Motohashi, Ted. "The Discourse of Cannibalism in Early Modern Travel Writing." In *Travel Writing and Empire: Postcolonial theory in transit*, edited by Steve Clark. London & New York: Zed Books, 1999: 83–99.
- Mulsow, Martin. "History of Knowledge." In *Debating New Approaches to History*, edited by Marek Tamm and Peter Burke. London, New York, Oxford, New Delhi, Sydney: Bloomsbury Academic, 2019a: 159–173.
- Mulsow, Martin. "Response." In *Debating New Approaches to History*, edited by Marek Tamm and Peter Burke. London, New York, Oxford, New Delhi, Sydney: Bloomsbury Academic, 2019b: 179–187.
- Nayar, Pramod K. *The Postcolonial Studies Dictionary*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 2015.
- Nickel, Sandra. "Intertextuality as a Means of Negotiating Authority, Status, and Place – Forms, Contexts, and Effects of Quotations of Christian Texts in Nineteenth-Century Missionary Correspondence from Yorùbáland." *Journal of Religion in Africa*, Vol. 45, Fasc. 2, 2015: 119–149.
- Nilsson Hammar, Anna. "Theoria, praxis, and poieses: Theoretical considerations on the circulation of knowledge in everyday life." In *Circulation of Knowledge: Explorations in the History of Knowledge*, edited by Johan Östling, Erling Sandmo, David Larsson Heidenblad and Anna Nilsson Hammar. Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 2018: 107–124.
- Obeyesekere, Gananath. "'British Cannibals': Contemplation of an Event in the Death and Resurrection of James Cook, Explorer." *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 18, no. 4, Summer, 1992: 630–654.
- Olssen, Erik. "Mr Wakefield and New Zealand as an Experiment in Post-Enlightenment Experimental Practice." *New Zealand Journal of History*, Vol. 31, No. 2, 1997: 197–218.
- O'Malley, Vincent. *The Meeting Place: Māori and Pākehā Encounters, 1642–1840*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2012.
- . *Haerenga: Early Māori Journeys Across the Globe*. Wellington: Bridget William Books, 2015.
- Orange, Claudia. *The Treaty of Waitangi*. First published in 1987. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books Limited, 1997.
- Pagden, Anthony. *European Encounters with the New World: From Renaissance to Romanticism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.
- Pennell, C. R. . "Treaty law: the extent of consular jurisdiction in North Africa from the middle of the seventeenth to the middle of the nineteenth century." *The Journal of North African Studies*, Vol. 14, No. 2, June, 2009: 235–256.
- Pocock, J. G. A. *Barbarism and Religion. Volume 2: Narratives of Civil Government*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

- . *Barbarism and Religion. Volume 4: Barbarians, Savages and Empires*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Porter, Andrew. "Commerce and Christianity': The Rise and Fall of a Nineteenth-Century Missionary Slogan." *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 28, No. 3, 1985: 597–621.
- . "Trusteeship, Anti-Slavery, and Humanitarianism." In *The Oxford History of the British Empire, Volume III: The Nineteenth Century*, edited by Andrew Porter. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1999: 198–221.
- . *Religion versus empire?: British Protestant missionaries and overseas expansion, 1700–1914*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2004.
- . "An Overview, 1700-1914." In *Oxford History of the British Empire Companion Series: Missions and Empire*, edited by Norman Etherington. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005: 40–63.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. New York: Routledge, 2008 (2. edition), first published 1992.
- Prest, Wilfrid (ed.). *The Wakefield Companion to South Australian History*. Kent Town: Wakefield Press, 2001.
- Procter, James. *Stuart Hall*. London and New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Quirk, Joel. *The Anti-Slavery Project: From the Slave Trade to Human Trafficking*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.
- Raj, Kapil. *Relocating Modern Science: Circulation and the Construction of Knowledge in South Asia and Europe, 1650-1900*. Houndmills and New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007.
- . "Beyond Postcolonialism ... and Postpositivism: Circulation of the Global History of Science." *Isis*, Vol. 104, No. 2 (June), 2013: 337–347.
- Raven, James. "Print for Free: Unsolicited Literature in Comparative Perspective." In *Free Print and Non-Commercial Publishing Since 1700*, edited by James Raven. New York: Routledge, 2000: 1–28.
- Renn, Jürgen. "From the history of science to the history of knowledge – and back." *Centaurus*, Vol. 57, No. 1, 2015: 37–53.
- Reynolds, Henry. *The Law of the Land*. First published in 1987. Ringwood: Penguin Books Australia, 1992.
- Roque, Ricardo and Kim A. Wagner. "Introduction: Engaging Colonial Knowledge." In *Engaging Colonial Knowledge: Reading European Archives in World History*, edited by Ricardo Roque and Kim A. Wagner. UK: Palgrave MacMillan, 2012: 1–32.
- Ross, R. M. "Te Tiriti o Waitangi: Texts and Translations." *New Zealand Journal of History*, Vol. 6, No. 2, 1972: 129–157.
- Royal, Te Ahukaramū Charles. "Te Ao Mārama – the natural world - Mana, tapu and mauri." *Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand*. 2007. <http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/te-ao-marama-the-natural-world/page-5>. Accessed 29.9.2021.
- Rubiés, Joan Pau. "Travel writing and ethnography." In *The Cambridge Companion to Travel Writing*, edited by Peter Hulme and Tim Youngs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002: 242–260.
- Rutz, Michael A. "'Meddling with Politics': The Political Role of Foreign Missions in the Early Nineteenth Century." *The Parliamentary History Yearbook Trust*, 2008: 109–118.
- Salesa, Damon Ieremia. *Racial Crossings: Race, Inter-marriage, and the Victorian British Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Salmond, Anne. *Tears of Rangī: Experiments across the Worlds*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2017.

- . *Between Worlds: Early exchanges between Maori and Europeans 1773-1815*. First published in 1997. New Zealand: Penguin Random House New Zealand, 2018.
- Samson, Jane. *Imperial Benevolence: Making British Authority in the Pacific Islands*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1998.
- Sanborn, Geoffrey. "Whence Come You, Queequeg?" *American Literature*, Volume 77, Number 2, June, 2005: 227–257.
- Sarasin, Philipp. "Was ist Wissensgeschichte?" *Internationales Archiv für Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Literatur*, Vol. 36, Iss. 1, 2011: 159–172.
- . "More Than Just Another Specialty: On the Prospects for the History of Knowledge." *Journal for the History of Knowledge*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 2020: 1–5.
- Scanlan, Padraic X. *Freedom's Debtors: British Antislavery in Sierra Leone in the Age of Revolution*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2017.
- Schaffer, Simon, Lissa Roberts, Kapil Raj and James Delbourgo (eds.). *The Brokered World: Go-Betweens and Global Intelligence, 1770–1820*. Sagamore Beach: Science History Publications/USA, 2009.
- Scrimgeour, Anne. "Notions Civilisation and the Project to 'Civilise' Aborigines in South Australia in the 1840s." *History of Education Review*, Vol. 35, No. 1, 2006: 1–12.
- Sebastiani, Silvia. *The Scottish Enlightenment: Race, Gender, and the Limits of Progress*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013.
- Secord, James. *Victorian Sensation: The Extraordinary Publication, Reception, and Secret Authorship of Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- . "Knowledge in Transit." *Isis*, Vol. 95, 2004: 654–672.
- Shapin, Steven. *A Social History of Truth: Civility and Science in Seventeenth-Century England*. The University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1994.
- Shellam, Tiffany, Maria Nugent, Shino Konishi & Allison Cadzow (eds.). *Brokers and Boundaries: Colonial Exploration in Indigenous Territory*. Acton: ANU Press and Aboriginal History Inc., 2016.
- Simms, Brendan and D. J. B. Trim (eds.). *Humanitarian Intervention: A History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Simonsen, Maria and Laura Skouvig. "Videnshistorie: Nye veje i historievitenskaberne." *Temp - Tidsskrift for Historie*, 10(19), 2019: 5–26.
- Skinner, Rob and Alan Lester. "Humanitarianism and Empire: New Research Agendas." *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, Vol. 40, No. 5, December, 2012: 729–747.
- Skurnik, Johanna. *Making Geographies: The Circulation of British Geographical Knowledge of Australia, 1829–1863*. Turku: The University of Turku, 2017.
- Smith, Bernard. *European Vision and the South Pacific*. First published in 1960. Melbourne, Oxford, Auckland, New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Standfield, Rachel. "Archives of Protection: Language, Dispossession, and Resistance in 1840s Port Phillip District and New Zealand." *Pacific Historical Review*, Vol. 87, No. 1, 2018: 54–78.
- State Library South Australia. "South Australian Company." 2014. <https://www.samemory.sa.gov.au/site/page.cfm?u=1483>. Accessed on 19.10.2021.
- Stenhouse, John. "'A disappearing race before we came here': Doctor Alfred Kingcome Newman, the dying Maori, and Victorian scientific racism." *New Zealand Journal of History*, Vol. 30, No. 2, 1996: 124–140.

- Stoler, Ann Laura. "In Cold Blood': Hierarchies of Credibility and the Politics of Colonial Archives." In *Engaging Colonial Knowledge: Reading European Archives in World History*, edited by Ricardo Roque and Kim A. Wagner. Houndmills: Palgrave MacMillan, 2012: 35–66.
- Tallie, T. J. "Sartorial Settlement: The Mission Field and Transformation in Colonial Natal, 1850–1897." *Journal of World History*, Vol. 27, No. 3 September, 2016: 389–410.
- Taussig, Michael. *Shamanism, Colonialism, and the Wild Man: A Study in Terror and Healing*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1986.
- Temple, Philip. *A Sort of Conscience: The Wakefields*. First published in 2002. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2012.
- Thorne, Susan. *Congregational Missions and the Making of an Imperial Culture in Nineteenth-Century England*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999.
- Tindale, Christopher W. *Rhetorical Argumentation: Principles of Theory and Practice*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications, Inc., 2004.
- Topham, Jonathan R. "Scientific and medical books, 1780–1830." In *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Volume V: 1695–1830*, edited by Michael F. Suarez, S.J. and Michael L. Turner. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009: 827–833.
- Traue, J.E. "Once upon a time in New Zealand: Library aspirations and colonial reality in the early years of European settlement, or, 'The tone and character of civilization'." *The Journal of New Zealand Studies*, Vol. 3. No. 2, 1993: 3–8.
- Twells, Alison. *The Civilising Mission and the English Middle Class, 1792-1850: The 'Heathen' at Home and Overseas*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2009.
- Ulrich Cloher, Dorothy. *Hongi Hika: Warrior Chief*. Auckland: VIKING An imprint of Penguin Books, 2003.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. *Discourse and Knowledge: A Sociocognitive Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Walton, Douglas. *Dialog Theory for Critical Argumentation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2007.
- Ward, A. W. "Ward, John." Revised by H. C. G. Matthew. First published in 2004. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2009.
- Ward, Alan. *A Show of Justice: Racial 'amalgamation' in nineteenth century New Zealand*. New Zealand: Auckland University Press/Oxford University Press, 1974.
- . *An Unsettled History: Treaty Claims in New Zealand Today*. First published in 1999. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2015.
- Wevers, Lydia. *Country of Writing: Travel Writing and New Zealand 1809–1900*. First published in 2002. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2013.
- Whyte, Iain. *Zachary Macaulay 1768-1838: The Steadfast Scot in the British Anti-Slavery Movement*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2011.
- Wintroub, Michael. *The Voyage of Thought: Navigating Knowledge across the Sixteenth-Century World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- Withers, Charles W. J. and David N. Livingstone. "Introduction: On Geography and Enlightenment." In *Geography and Enlightenment*, edited by David N. Livingstone and Charles W. J. Withers. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1999: 1–32.
- Wood, Marcus. "'The Abolition Blunderbuss': Free Publishing and British Abolition Propaganda, 1780–1838." In *Free Print and Non-Commercial Publishing Since 1700*, edited by James Raven. New York: Routledge, 2000: 67–92.
- Woolmington, Jean. "The Civilisation/Christianisation Debate and the Australian Aborigines." *Aboriginal History*, Vol. 10, No. 2, 1986: 90–98.

- Östling, Johan. "Vad är Kunskapshistoria?" *Historisk Tidskrift*, 135:1, 2015: 109–119.
- Östling, Johan, David Larsson Heidenblad and Anna Nilsson Hammar (eds.). *Forms of Knowledge: Developing the History of Knowledge*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 2020.
- Östling, Johan, David Larsson Heidenblad and Anna Nilsson Hammar. "Introduction. Developing the history of knowledge." In *Forms of Knowledge: Developing the History of Knowledge*, edited by Johan Östling, David Larsson Heidenblad and Anna Nilsson Hammar. Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 2020: 9–28.
- Östling, Johan, David Larsson Heidenblad, Erling Sandmo, Anna Nilsson Hammar and Kari H. Nordberg. "The history of knowledge and the circulation of knowledge: An introduction." In *Circulation of Knowledge: Explorations in the History of Knowledge*, edited by Johan Östling, Erling Sandmo, David Larsson Heidenblad, Anna Nilsson Hammar & Kari H. Nordberg. Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 2018: 9–36.
- Östling, Johan, Erling Sandmo, David Larsson Heidenblad, Anna Nilsson Hammar and Kari Nordberg (eds.). *Circulation of Knowledge: Explorations in the History of Knowledge*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 2018.



**TURUN  
YLIOPISTO**  
UNIVERSITY  
OF TURKU

ISBN 978-951-29-8975-1 (PRINT)  
ISBN 978-951-29-8976-8 (PDF)  
ISSN 0082-6987 (Print)  
ISSN 2343-3191 (Online)