

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

Portrayals of the Moriori People

**Historical, Ethnographical, Anthropological and Popular sources, c. 1791-
1989**

By

Read Wheeler

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts in History,
Massey University, 2016

Abstract

Michael King's 1989 book, *Moriori: A People Rediscovered*, still stands as the definitive work on the Moriori, the Native people of the Chatham Islands. King wrote, 'Nobody in New Zealand – and few elsewhere in the world- has been subjected to group slander as intense and as damaging as that heaped upon the Moriori.' Since its publication, historians have denigrated earlier works dealing with the Moriori, arguing that the way in which they portrayed Moriori was almost entirely unfavourable.

This thesis tests this conclusion. It explores the perspectives of European visitors to the Chatham Islands from 1791 to 1989, when King published *Moriori*. It does this through an examination of newspapers, Native Land Court minutes, and the writings of missionaries, settlers, and ethnographers. The thesis asks whether or not historians have been selective in their approach to the sources, or if, perhaps, they have ignored the intricacies that may have informed the views of early observers.

The thesis argues that during the nineteenth century both Maori and European perspectives influenced the way in which Moriori were portrayed in European narrative. Moriori, in accordance with the prevailing theories of race were deemed to be inferior to Maori, and therefore Europeans. However, the thesis argues that despite this there does exist a literature that holds Moriori in a more favourable light and that a shift in perspective was occurring sometime before 1989.

Acknowledgements

I thank my supervisors, Professor Michael Belgrave and Dr Peter Meihana, for their invaluable insight and guidance in both research and writing. I am grateful to the staff of the Alexander Turnbull Library and the National Archives in Wellington for their assistance finding such invaluable resources. Lastly, thank you to my family, especially my Mother, for their support through-out the year.

Avito Jure

Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| Abstract | ii |
| Acknowledgements | iii |
| Chapter One: Introduction | 1 |
| <i>Historical Theory in Practice</i> | 7 |
| <i>The Changing face of Anthropology and Ethnology</i> | 11 |
| <i>Division of Material</i> | 14 |
| Chapter Two: Settlers and Christianity | 17 |
| Chapter Three: The Native Land Court | 29 |
| Chapter Four: Ethnologists and Anthropologists | 43 |
| Chapter Five: The Recovery, 1940-1989 | 60 |
| Chapter Six: Newspapers and Public Perception | 74 |
| Chapter Seven: Conclusion | 86 |
| Bibliography | 90 |

Chapter One: Introduction

‘These which the inexperienced call *true*, I maintain to be only *better*, and not truer than others.’¹

In 1835, after fleeing their homelands and numerous conflicts, Ngati Mutunga and Ngati Tama, procured the vessel Rodney and made their way to the Chatham Islands. A land they called Wharekauri and where they hoped to find abundant food and trade to sustain their tribes. When they reached the islands they were greeted by the native Moriori and were aided in their initial settlement on the islands. Two weeks later more Maori arrived on the islands and they began an aggressive colonisation, which involved killing off and enslaving the native Moriori. By 1862 there were one hundred Moriori left alive from a pre-1835 population of approximately two thousand. The leaders of the Moriori sent a letter to the Governor of New Zealand, Sir George Grey, in 1862 begging for their rescue from slavery and death. They were ignored, their plight being considered insignificant compared to events on the mainland. The Moriori made numerous claims of ownership over the islands but were forced onto small reserves by the Maori. Their subsequent claims before the Native Land Court were ignored and their numbers dwindled quickly. Tommy Solomon, the last acknowledged full blooded Moriori died in 1933 and the people and their culture were thought to be lost to oblivion.

After such torturous events, after the annihilation of their race and the degradation of their place in history the notion of rejuvenating the Moriori name and culture would have seemed laughable to most and unwanted to others. Maui Solomon, a grandson of Tommy Solomon, organised a family reunion on the Chatham Islands in 1982 and from this reunion blossomed the proposal of erecting a statue of Tommy Solomon on the islands. To oversee this task the group formed the Tommy Solomon Trust Association.² While the statue was finally erected near Solomon’s former farmlands in 1986, the main achievement of the Association was to reconnect numerous Moriori descendants and begin a process of rehabilitation for Moriori.

¹ Plato, *Theaetetus* 167, in *The Dialogues*, trans. B. Jowett, 5 vols, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1875), vol. 4, p. 316.

² Bob Maysmor, *The Moriori of Rekohu: T’chakat Henu - People of the Land* (Wellington: Pataka Porirua Museum of the Arts and Cultures, 2010), p. 44.

Other descendants were beginning to find each other and discuss a shared heritage, the Preece family numbered around fifty with another fifty descendants of Riwai Te Ropiha making one hundred. By the time the statue was unveiled there were three hundred Moriori descendants in contact with each other.³ Just two years later, early 1988, Ngati Mutunga began to reorganise its presence on the islands and the Moriori descendants did the same, both forming committees and other decision making bodies. The release of Michael King's work *Moriori: A People Rediscovered*⁴ gave the Moriori the national attention they would need in the coming decade. Meanwhile the Preece family had been working hard to gain an influence on the islands. Bunty Preece had by 1989 spent sixteen years as chairman of the Chatham Islands County Council and Riwai Preece had become the resident Anglican Priest for the islands.⁵ Maui Solomon began petitioning the government about Moriori fishery claims and the Tchaket Henu Association begun by the Preece family also began to organise cases for the future.

The Waitangi Tribunal eventually turned its eye towards the Chatham Islands and both the Maori and Moriori claims being made. The report released by the Tribunal in 2004 titled *Rekohu: A Report on the Moriori and Ngati Mutunga Claims in Chatham Islands*⁶ showed favour towards the Moriori groups; especially considering the Moriori name for the Chatham Islands, Rekohu, is used in lieu of the Maori name Wharekauri. Both Maori and Moriori won shares in all aspects of the islands resources but most importantly it recognised the failure of the Crown to liberate Moriori after the 1835 invasion and the wrongdoing of various governments in not paying heed to the Moriori pleas of the 1860s.⁷

King, considered by many the foremost modern scholar on the Moriori died tragically in 2004 and as consequence was not able to witness the pinnacle of the Moriori renaissance, the Kopinga Marae. The Marae was opened in 2005 with both former Prime Minister Helen Clark and Te Arikinui Dame Te Atairangikaahu also present. The Marae did not follow a typical Maori design but instead was unique having a pentagonal floor plan and a central pou that was inscribed with the names of all Moriori killed by Ngati Mutunga.⁸ The name

³ Michael King, Robin Morrison, *A Land Apart: The Chatham Islands of New Zealand* (Auckland: Random House New Zealand Ltd, 1990), p. 19.

⁴ Michael King, *Moriori: A People Rediscovered* (Auckland: Penguin Books, 2000).

⁵ King, Morrison, *A Land Apart*, pp. 19, 22.

⁶ Waitangi Tribunal, *Rekohu: A Report on Moriori and Ngati Mutunga Claims in Chatham Islands* (Wellington: Legislation Direct, 2001).

⁷ Tribunal, *Rekohu: A Report on Moriori*, p. 285.

⁸ Maysmor, *The Moriori of Rekohu*, p. 58.

Kopinga means 'Kopi grove' which was the traditional open air meeting places of the Moriori people. By 2009 the Marae and the Moriori iwi had become a strong supporting pillar of the Chatham Islands and all their peoples. A centre for Peace studies was being established as of 2009 and a partnership with Otago University has shown that the dream of a major learning centre is well within reach.⁹ Finally in 2011, Anne Tolley, the then Minister of Education, travelled to the Chatham Islands to present the latest School Journals which contained a fair account of the Moriori people and their history. These Journals also stated clearly that what had been taught in schools for over eighty years was false information emanating from pure ignorance and that it had harmed the image of the Moriori people. These events have resulted in the stigma surrounding the Moriori name being slowly peeled back to reveal a unique culture and a people's lost pride.

This thesis will explore in greater detail the ideas and systems used to describe and denigrate the Moriori. It will attempt to observe where various ideas originated, how these ideas may have created the early conception of the Moriori and whether this conception influenced works through-out the following century. This literature, from 1791-1989, will be viewed in conjunction with the work of Michael King and it will be observed whether King's portrayal of Moriori considered the wider context in its review of previous works.

Following the publication of Michael King's work many scholars felt a rejuvenated interest in the Moriori and their culture. Their scholarship delved into the works of earlier historians and what was written on the Moriori people is written in conjunction with the history of the early literature. These works usually appear in the form of widely available histories such as Michael King's *The Penguin History of New Zealand* and James Belich's *Making Peoples: A History of the New Zealanders*. Both works take a scathing stance against the early literature on the Moriori. King begins with the 1916 School Journal and notes its retelling of a widely believed mythos regarding New Zealand's discovery. This myth states that Moriori were a people predating the Maori in New Zealand and were subsequently wiped out by them. King comments that this view took hold because it offered a heroic retelling that would appeal to Europeans. However, he does not note the ramifications of having this myth taught as fact to three generations of New Zealand children and how that may have influenced other literature or arguments.¹⁰

⁹ Maysmor, *The Moriori of Rekohu*, p. 60.

¹⁰ Michael King, *The Penguin History of New Zealand* (Auckland: Penguin Books, 2003), p. 38.

The origin of this mythic telling of events is a focus of King's work and it is from here he begins his review of literature on the Moriori. King singles out ethnographer Stephenson Percy Smith and remarks that his work on Maori and Moriori myth had a basis in Maori oral tradition but jumbled this origin and should be disregarded. While this seems a fair conclusion about Smith's work King offers no alternative nor does he mention any works that sought to clarify Smith's work.¹¹ This appears to be a misrepresentation of literature on the Moriori especially when *Moriori: A People Rediscovered* is considered. Here King also notes different contributions to the literature in the form of primary documents such as letters. These letters, mainly sent between the Moriori and the Governor's office show willingness from other inhabitants of the Chatham Islands to help the Moriori, yet King does not comment on this, merely regarding it as another failed attempt by Moriori to reassert themselves.¹²

There were others, besides King, who described the Moriori in their general histories and discussed the historiography. Belich takes the same approach although he has never written works that focus solely on the Moriori or the Chatham Islands. Belich does not mention specific works but notes the view of Moriori as a pre-Maori Melanesian people and that this view only became widespread in the later nineteenth century after various ethnological and archaeological works were released.¹³ However, Belich does state that there were early attempts made to refute these claims by Arthur Thompson and H. D. Skinner, although he ends his brief comment on this literature stating the contravening view of a mythic or inferior view of Moriori still persists. Belich is not writing about the subject of the Moriori themselves but of the colonisation of New Zealand as a whole, meaning he could only briefly touch on this literature.¹⁴ These two popular historians do not delve too deep into the literature around the Moriori but the review they give is that the literature denigrated Moriori and no large attempts were made to challenge the earlier views. When Belich and King do mention those who challenged these views they do not expand their argument.

Atholl Anderson in his collaborative work *Tangata Whenua: An Illustrated History*, another general history, does not directly deal with the literature on the Moriori. *Tangata Whenua* is a major work that was well received upon its release. Having been conceived after the release of King's work it stands as a combination of the reassessments of Moriori portrayals up until

¹¹ King, *The Penguin History*, p. 42.

¹² King, *Moriori: A People Rediscovered*, p. 114.

¹³ James Belich, *Making Peoples: A History of the New Zealanders* (Auckland: Penguin Books, 1996), p. 26.

¹⁴ *Ibid*, p. 26.

that point. Anderson notes the lack of knowledge surrounding Moriori custom. This he states as being due to the invasion showing his thinking to be in line with King and Belich, although whether the same can be said for his thoughts on the literature is unclear.¹⁵ This work also takes care to always mention Maori and Moriori in conjunction with each other, ‘All Maori and Moriori knowledge... History mattered for Maori and Moriori.’¹⁶ This inclusiveness demonstrates the contemporary acknowledgement of the Moriori and their place in New Zealand’s culture and heritage. It provides Maori and Moriori with their separate place, not mentioning one when the focus is on issues that solely affect the other.

Michael Belgrave in his post-tribunal work *Historical Frictions* dedicates an entire chapter to the immediate history of the Moriori in the report of the Waitangi tribunal. He notes the earlier work of men such as Alexander Shand and Hirewanu Tapu, and the favourable outlook they had in their collection of Moriori oral tradition and customs in the 1870s. Belgrave notes ‘the explanations of their culture as provided by Shand were clearly rooted in the experience of being Moriori. This was substantially filtered by their more immediate history, in particular their subjugation by the Maori.’¹⁷ While these sources may have been Moriori focused in their collection and correlation of data the filters imposed on them by the intervening Maori culture have caused a unfavourable slant to appear. It must be considered that Belgrave is trying to look at these works and their ability to establish a modern case about Maori-Moriori relations, instead of their link to Moriori at the time of writing or the author’s intentions.

Many histories of the Chatham Islands were not widely published but still give insight into literature on Moriori. *The People of the Chatham Islands*¹⁸ by Te Miria Kate and Wills Johnson only published one thousand copies and focused on the lives of more recent Chatham Islanders rather than their history. The work recounts an occasion where Bully Solomon’s grandsons were asked ‘who was the last Moriori?’ The boys answered hesitantly with Te Kooti unaware it was their own grandfather. This work looks at Moriori not as a

¹⁵ Atholl Anderson, “Emerging Societies: AD 1500-1800”, in *Tangata Whenua: An Illustrated History*, ed. Atholl Anderson, Judith Binney and Aroha Davis, 102-132 (Auckland: Bridget Williams Books, 2015), p. 122-123.

¹⁶ Atholl Anderson, “Speaking of Migration: AD 1150-1450”, in *Tangata Whenua: An Illustrated History*, ed. Atholl Anderson, Judith Binney and Aroha Davis, 42-70 (Auckland: Bridget Williams Books, 2015), p. 42.

¹⁷ Michael Belgrave, *Historical Frictions: Maori Claims and Reinvented Histories* (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2005), p. 286-287.

¹⁸ Te Miria Kate, Wills Johnson, *The People of the Chathams: True Tales of the Islander’s Early Days* (Martinborough: GWJ Publications, 1994).

defeated people but as survivors who came back from the brink of oblivion and regained a self-awareness that was almost completely lost.

Ashley Gould's research, which he contributed to the Waitangi Tribunal, covers many smaller pieces of literature that may have been omitted by other historians. These pieces of literature include primary materials and archival sources that could provide a different perspective as they gave a first-hand account of Moriori. Rather than the ethnological views provided by those who focused on secondary sources, it was on these sources that many historians would centre their reassessments.¹⁹ His research into the Native Land Court proceedings, and their aftermath, also went further than King's research which centred mostly on the initial proceedings. Gould continued on and viewed the wider workings of the Court, their decisions elsewhere and their role within the Colonial Government. His chapter on slavery in mainland New Zealand and then a comparison with that on the Chatham Islands shows he does not share the same perspective of the sources that others, including King, had.²⁰

The Rekohu report is unusual in the sense that it could be argued it takes a pro-Moriore view as a political, legal, and historical document. The Tribunal report was a substantial investigation and presented the largest correlation of sources at the time.²¹ Unlike the histories of the Chatham Islands, it does not seek to deal with the past but with the present. In doing this it has an extensive bibliography of almost all research material affiliated with the Moriori and the invasion. Along with this the Tribunal received submissions from various individuals and parties with interests in the claims being made; these were all documented in the reports section on the hearing proceedings and included Maori and Moriori claimants.²² Most importantly, this report demonstrates how the submission process allowed Moriori and Maori to present their own versions of events and actively partake in the writing of their histories. Before the end of the second hearing the Tribunal added to its document bank the work of Michael King.²³ The Tribunal's conclusions regarding the events on the Chatham Islands and the treatment of Moriori follow King's conclusions, that is, that Moriori were not treated fairly and were belittled by colonisers and their institutions.²⁴ This demonstrates the extent to which King's work had changed the predominant views about Moriori and that his

¹⁹ Ashley Gould, *Te Iwi Moriori Claim Rekohu/Wharekaui (Chatham Islands)*, Wai 64 Doc # F3, p. 2-3.

²⁰ *Ibid*, p. 22.

²¹ Tribunal, *Rekohu: A Report on Moriori*.

²² *Ibid*, p. 293.

²³ *Ibid*, p. 315.

²⁴ *Ibid*, p. 285.

portrayal was becoming the majority view. The outcome of the Tribunal investigation was a ruling in favour of the Moriori.

Literature regarding the Moriori is detailed and has left little to study on the people themselves. There is an extensive collection of works that detail their language, larger customs and traditions. There are some aspects of Moriori culture that have not been recorded in great detail and attempting to describe these would lead to guesswork. The literature analysing this collection of works is sparse and all seem to take the same approach. They view the earlier literature as damaging in its portrayal of Moriori or accuse the authors of misrepresenting Moriori while attempting themselves to provide a differing view. King specifically, does not attempt to show that the literature could also be seen as more favourable in its representation. He omits sources that could have given a more hospitable portrayal of Moriori and this is why the focus of this research will be the historians and other scholars rather than the Moriori themselves.

Historical Theory in Practice

To understand the purpose of this research it is important to locate its place in a theoretical context. This will determine how the sources will be approached, help direct the research and determine the outcomes of the reassessment. To approach any sources with the intention of re-examining their contents is a post-modernist intention. Although the subject matter of the sources in this thesis centres on the Moriori, an indigenous Polynesian people, and understanding how portrayals of them were devised and then revisited, revised, and repeated prior to King's work. It will attempt to understand why these portrayals emerged the way they did and the context as to why this happened, the post-colonial approach may be helpful for this. Post-Colonial theory addresses the politics of knowledge. When applied to history it is the theory that after colonisation an indigenous people will reorganise and begin to re-establish control over the narrative of their own history, which under colonialism would have been dramatically influenced by the perspective of the colonisers. The histories written in the colonisers' words would not have accurately represented an indigenous people as they viewed themselves in comparison to other cultures.

The coloniser view of history and its Euro-centrism has been challenged by historians such as Edward Said in his work *Orientalism*²⁵ and historical theorists such as Beverley Southgate. Southgate stated the purpose of her works is to challenge the notion that history can be told ‘as it was’ and that the myriad of perspectives and ideas have proven that a completely unbiased, impartial and accurate history cannot be written. However, some narratives do have merits others do not. Southgate’s works have seen wide success in the field of historical theory and have been influential in the countering of ‘pomophobia’, or the aversion many feel to postmodernist history.²⁶ In his work *Postmodernism in History: Fear or Freedom?*²⁷ Southgate described a process of racial dominance in history. For centuries Europeans viewed their civilisation as the pinnacle of mankind’s achievements and as lesser peoples were subjugated by more advanced civilisations so too would those advanced peoples be subjugated by Europe. He stated that up until even the twenty-first century men such as ‘John Vincent could still complacently assert “We do not understand Asia and we do not need to.”’²⁸ Such assertions and Euro-centrism were to be effectively challenged by post-colonialism.

A core value of post-colonialism is the constant re-evaluation of all material. Said asserted that the fragmentation of perspectives, from colonisers and indigenous peoples, could also help raise ‘historiographical awareness’ and dispose of the belief history can be told ‘as it was.’²⁹ The various examples of European imperialism and the differing attitudes the colonisers had to natives, for example the difference between the British attitudes to Indian independence and the French attitude to Algerian independence show that examining the motivations of colonisers separately is just as important as viewing them as a single large historical force.³⁰ This means that post-colonialism includes not only creating a new history from the point of view of the Native peoples but also rewriting of the colonial view of history, as from the post-colonial standing it contains omissions and a lack of understanding that cannot be tolerated.³¹ This rewriting will allow the ‘villainy’ of colonial historians and

²⁵ Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (London: The Penguin Group, 2003).

²⁶ Beverley Southgate, *Postmodernism in History: Fear or Freedom?* (London: Routledge, 2003), p. i.

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 38.

²⁹ Beverley Southgate, *History: What and Why? Ancient, Modern and Post-modern Perspectives* (London: Routledge, 1996), p.107.

³⁰ Said, *Orientalism*, p. 41.

³¹ Southgate, *History: What and Why?*, p. 102.

events to become more qualified, instead of casting away the colonisers' interpretation of events without thought.³²

As a Pakeha researcher I am conscious of my place within the theoretical context. Even though post-colonial theory will be used and applied to the sources the researcher is a part of the process of re-evaluation that Said and Southgate described. As a Pakeha the researcher would not contribute to the post-colonial view of history but the colonisers' outlook of history. 'The settler makes history and is conscious of making it... Thus the history which he writes is not the history of the country which he plunders, but the history of his own nation in regard to all that he skims off, all that she violates and starves.'³³ However, the historiographical nature of this research circumvents the issue of a coloniser writing about an indigenous people, as the research is a reassessment not of the direct history of the Moriori, the indigenous people involved, but of the colonising historians themselves. This reassessment, to both Said and Southgate, does constitute a post-colonial outlook as both colonised and colonisers must be included in any history.³⁴

Those studying the 'nationalisation' of history also weighed in on the debate over post-colonialism in history. Stefan Berger, a German historian whose main interests lay in British history, admitted that drawing a clear line between colonial and post-colonial ideas and viewpoints is a difficult task. This was because European ideas had spread into different parts of the world, and vice versa, before large scale European colonisation began and so there are no inherently European ideals. However, further discussing this hybridity he said that this does not indicate that ideals were not used by Europeans for the purpose of colonisation.³⁵ Qualitative analysis of language is important because of this, a word's meaning may change depending on the language, context or who is using it.³⁶ Berger's final analysis is that only by looking at the motivations of the subjects and historians themselves can we see whether material is being utilised for colonial purposes and then respond appropriately by reinterpreting colonial histories.³⁷

³² Beverley Southgate, *Why Bother with History? Ancient, modern and postmodern motivations* (Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2000), p. 29.

³³ Southgate, *History: What and Why?*, p. 103.

³⁴ *Ibid*, p. 100.

³⁵ Stefan Berger, "Comparative History," in *Writing History: Theory and Practice*, ed. Stefan Berger, Haiko Feldner, Kevin Passmore, 161-179 (London: Hodder Arnold, 2003), p. 168.

³⁶ *Ibid*, p. 169.

³⁷ *Ibid*, p. 168.

Joan W. Scott affirms that theory in general can cause the assumption that the history is not objective and that historians try to create the appearance of objectivity when they have none. ‘An appearance achieved by insisting that human subjects act in full command of their intentions, that words literally mean what they say, and that ‘nature’ or ‘experience’ are transparent categories outside the reach of politics, philosophy or theory.’³⁸ However, the ‘history of apologetics’ shows that literature about Native peoples, their memory, and their history will mix, and objectivity, while not lost, will be swayed to different sides of their debates. This saw historians such as Eric Hobsbawm and Lawrence Stone try to defend objectivity from what they saw as the ‘presentism built into the rhetoric of ‘experience.’³⁹ As this thesis is a largely historiographical piece of research objectivity is not completely lost. Ewa Domanska theorised that historiography is a performative act since ‘one of its goals is to participate in the change of historical consciousness, to prepare the ground for the emergence of some ‘post-historical’ approach to the past.’⁴⁰ The historiographical approach therefore fulfils both the post-colonial demand for reinterpretation and the historical need for accuracy.

An issue arises in the study of Moriori history. The Moriori themselves did not record their history, except through oral traditions of which many are lost. While it still may be their history it has been heavily influenced by colonisers. This has led to many scholars not questioning the colonial point of view or, what Saliha Belmessous quoted Brian Slattery as calling, the ‘blessedly uncomplicated view.’⁴¹ As previously stated any history written by the colonisers would not be a history of the Moriori but more a history of their relationship to the colonisers. This creates the conundrum that to follow the post-colonial theory and eliminate the colonisers from any re-evaluation would most likely also eliminate almost all information about the history of the Moriori from their perspective. However, if the Moriori written about in the histories were treated as the product of a colonial worldview or as an ‘imagined Moriori’ rather than a direct portrayal then this issue of removing a Native people from their own history can be avoided. It would no longer be their history but an imagined story. This would be in line with a post-colonial view, or could even be treated as going a step beyond

³⁸ Joan W. Scott, “History-writing as critique,” in *Manifestos for History*, ed. Keith Jenkins, Sue Morgan and Alun Munslow, 19-38 (Oxon: Routledge, 2007), p. 22.

³⁹ Dipesh Chakrabarty, “History and the Politics of Recognition,” in *Manifestos for History*, ed. Keith Jenkins, Sue Morgan and Alun Munslow, 76-86 (Oxon: Routledge, 2007), p. 83.

⁴⁰ Ewa Domanska, “Historiographical Criticism: a manifesto,” in *Manifestos for History*, ed. Keith Jenkins, Sue Morgan and Alun Munslow, 197-204 (Oxon: Routledge, 2007), p. 202-203.

⁴¹ Saliha Belmessous, “Introduction: The Problem of Indigenous Claim Making in Colonial History,” in *Native Claims: Indigenous Laws against Empire 1500-1920*, ed. Saliha Belmessous, 3-18 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 6.

post-colonialism, by not just viewing the colonisers and colonised histories as separate but removing them from each other's literature completely. Having created an 'imagined Moriori' we can understand how colonial biases work, which may help untangle a more Moriori centred history or at least find out how their story has been distorted by colonisation.

The Changing face of Anthropology and Ethnology

To understand the literature on the Moriori it is essential that the changing faces of anthropology and ethnology be observed. While there were minor changes between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the starkest development was between the racial views of the nineteenth century and the redeveloped cultural views of the twentieth. The racial concepts of the nineteenth century had their origins much earlier in the eighteenth century. One such origin was the work of Carl Linaeus, a Swedish writer notable for his ethnographical works on the Sami people, who divided mankind into four races based on their colour; these were European, Asian, American and African.⁴² In the nineteenth century itself the works of Herbert Spencer encapsulated the mainstream racial thought. Spencer believed the 'immediate, impulsive, and concrete responses of dark-skinned "savages" were posed against the mediated, considered, and abstract thinking of the white-skinned "civilised" Europeans'.⁴³ Many other authors continued this work looking upon dark-skinned peoples as racially inferior, unable to compete culturally with Europeans and trapped in a lower state of civilisation due to their biology.

After the publication of Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species* in 1859 the evolutionary model was quickly adapted for other fields. The physical characteristics of different racial groups were attributed to a different ancestry or a faster and more superior development. The same went for culture, an inferior culture was lower on an evolutionary scale and only the stronger races, and cultures, would survive.⁴⁴ Religious views were also adapted to fit the developing models of race. A popular religious racial theory was that Africans were the descendants of those cursed by Noah. This theory made its way to New Zealand in the work of Reverend Richard Taylor who declared that all races were descendants of the different sons of Noah. Europeans were the descendants of the eldest and strongest child while Africans and

⁴² Harry Liebersohn, "Anthropology Before Anthropology," in *A New History of Anthropology*, ed. Henrika Kuklick, 17-31 (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2008), p. 28.

⁴³ George W. Stocking, Jr., "Essays on Culture and Personality," in *Malinowski, Rivers, Benedict and Others: Essays on Culture and Personality; History of Anthropology Volume 4*, ed. George W. Stocking, Jr., 3-12 (Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1986), p. 3.

⁴⁴ Vernon J. Williams Jr., *Rethinking Race: Franz Boas and His Contemporaries* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1996), p. 1.

Melanesians were the descendants of the youngest weakest child. This was used to explain why Europeans were supposedly inherently superior to others.⁴⁵ Taylor additionally stated that Maori were possibly the lost tribe of Israel, this would explain their supposed superiority to other Pacific races, essentially excluding all other Polynesian peoples.⁴⁶

Franz Boas was an American-German anthropologist who worked from the late nineteenth to the early twentieth century. He rejected the racial views found through-out earlier anthropology and set about moving the focus of the field from race to culture. He, along with others, advocated cultural determinism and argued that cultures should be viewed comparatively. They were not to be viewed on evolutionary terms, a view that only the strongest race or culture would survive, which would mark them as inferior as they were decimated by colonisation. On the apparent extinction of native races before European colonisation he blamed the speed by which they were attacked by Europeans rather than an inherent racial inferiority.⁴⁷ He admitted that while some cultures were less advanced technologically than European civilisation this did not mean they were inferior. In the case of Mesoamerican cultures he instead asserted they were just as advanced culturally but a thousand years behind Europe in technology.⁴⁸

However, Boas' work is full of contradictions. He was described by Vernon J. Williams Jr. as being a prisoner of his times, caught in a conflict between ideology and scientific belief.⁴⁹ While he portrayed himself as an egalitarian his works contain many concessions to the racial views of the day. He talks of the importance of culture as a basis for anthropological study and yet remarks on the possible relationship between intelligence and physical attributes.⁵⁰ Boas worked within a framework developed by Paul Broca, a popular craniologist, who asserted that Africans have a lesser cranial capacity than Europeans and therefore cannot be as intelligent. Boas maintained many of these biases until around 1915 when it is argued he felt the prejudice for being a German immigrant in America was the same as the issues facing African Americans, whom he was studying at the time. He then began to argue that the

⁴⁵ J. M. R. Owens, *The Mediator: A Life of Richard Taylor 1805-1873* (Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2004), p. 218.

⁴⁶ Rev. Richard Taylor, *Te Ika A Maui: New Zealand and its Inhabitants* (Wellington: A.H and A.W Reed Ltd, 1974 (1855)), p. 9.

⁴⁷ K. R. Howe, *Quest for Origins: Who First Discovered and Settled New Zealand and the Pacific Islands?* (Auckland: Penguin Books, 2003), p. 51.

⁴⁸ Franz Boas, "Human Faculty as Determined by Race," in *The Shaping of American Anthropology 1883-1911: A Franz Boas Reader*, ed. George W. Stocking, Jr., 221-242 (New York, NY: Basic Books, Inc., 1974), pp. 223-225.

⁴⁹ Williams, *Rethinking Race*, pp. 4-6.

⁵⁰ *Ibid*, p. 10.

supposed inferiority of African Americans was due to their subjugation in America and stated that the cultures of West Africans and other ancestors of African Americans were not inferior to any others.⁵¹ This was a pivotal moment for anthropology worldwide with the old racial attitudes being seriously challenged for the first time.

The ideas of Boas would be far reaching and would even find their way to the Pacific with the work of his student Margaret Mead. Mead's work, *Coming of Age in Samoa*, became an international best seller upon its release in 1928 and assured the ascendancy of comparative study of culture in the anthropological field.⁵² However, far more influential in the Pacific sphere was the work of Bronislaw Malinowski. While Boas was contributing to American anthropology, the British school was applying its new social anthropology to the Pacific, more specifically Melanesia. Malinowski was a proponent of 'functionalism', the idea that a society was run in an equilibrium of different aspects such as economic and psychological. The balance of these aspects in relation to their environment ensured the survival of the culture and the race. For the Melanesian culture that had been portrayed as inferior or stunted this reassessment was a much needed salvation.⁵³

Malinowski's views made it into New Zealand anthropology in the form of his student Raymond Firth. Firth was a clear believer in the effect of the immediate environment on a people's culture and applied this thinking to Maori. In his work *Economics of the New Zealand Maori* Firth attempts to explain the economic system of the Maori in the context of their environment. He states that the harsh nature of New Zealand environment meant that Maori had to adapt to a system where there had to be a duality of both cultivating and hunting. They could not rely solely on one or the other. They also developed a cultural system of war, dances and religious practices based around this system, 'his material culture was based upon the biological resources and geological character of the country.'⁵⁴ As a result of this, Maori became extremely fit and strong, able to withstand the environment and its challenges. However, he takes care to note that Maori became fit because the environment demanded it of them, not because they created a system that allowed it. 'The Maori was fit because of his mode of life; he did not think out his mode of life in order to be fit.'⁵⁵

⁵¹ Williams, *Rethinking Race*, pp. 33-35.

⁵² Margaret Mead, *Coming of Age in Samoa* (Mitcham: Penguin Books Pty Ltd, 1943).

⁵³ Howe, *Quest for Origins*, p. 52.

⁵⁴ Raymond Firth, *Economics of the New Zealand Maori* (Wellington: A. R. Shearer, Government Printer, 1972), p. 56.

⁵⁵ *Ibid*, p. 53.

Firth was also aware of the resounding notions that ‘lower races’ are unintelligent and only name things that pertain to the systems that satisfy their immediate needs. He states that this cannot be the case with Maori as they had a detailed inventory of names for most species and natural features, although he continues by remarking ‘it is unquestionable that the greater part of the fund of information pertaining to birds, plants, and minerals was accumulated directly on the basis of economic interest.’⁵⁶ However, he recants this, partly, in his next section by commenting that some knowledge that Maori had on birds, plants and insects was not gathered through pure material interest.⁵⁷ By the 1940s functionalism had become central to many New Zealand anthropologists, including Peter Buck, and its emphasis on culture rather than evolutionary theories of race would influence the next generation of anthropologists.⁵⁸ The works of Boas and Malinowski caused a stir in the field of anthropology. With the effect of this work reaching out to New Zealand, the magnitude of the development of the field through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries can be taken into consideration in this thesis.

The development of anthropology and how it affected Moriori was important. Many of the older racial views that had caused the world to look down on Moriori as mediocre, stagnant and inferior both racially and culturally were beginning to wear off as scholars re-examined them from a cultural viewpoint. Though, the changing of views about Moriori may also be attributed to personal relationships. In the 1920s and 1930s many scholars were meeting personally with Tommy Solomon, the last full-blooded Moriori, and he was almost exclusively described as warm-hearted, genial and welcoming to those wanting to learn about Moriori. The starkness of having a member of the race in front of them may have caused many to be more sympathetic in their portrayals of Moriori.⁵⁹ The same could be said for the Moriori renaissance and Michael King’s portrayal of Moriori. He too, was meeting with descendants of Moriori who were proud of their heritage; this may have influenced a more favourable review of their ancestor’s culture.

Division of Material

Organising this thesis has been an obstacle of some contention, however, the most appropriate option was to organise it in a way that accommodated the relationship between

⁵⁶ Raymond Firth, *Economics*, p. 59.

⁵⁷ *Ibid*, p. 59.

⁵⁸ Howe, *Quest for Origins*, p. 56.

⁵⁹ King, *Mori: A People Rediscovered*, p. 185-186.

the sources and subject material. Ludmilla Jordanova stated in her work, *History in Practice*⁶⁰, that ‘the most satisfying accounts of the past involve a wide range of materials and of methods and that... the two should be brought into harmony with one another. One possibility is to take a theme as the organising principle.’⁶¹ This organisational harmony Jordanova mentions would be easier than organising information chronologically, as the vaguely defined theory of post-colonialism and its cross over with post-modernism would make chronological organisation difficult. Therefore, the material in this thesis has been divided thematically.

This has allowed the separate developments of different schools, fields of research, and method of publication, to be the focal point of each chapter rather than the development of the literature as a whole. The added attention to each school is required because while some changed drastically in their approach and representation of the Moriori, others did not, and this may be overlooked if they are all discussed as one. The exceptions to this are the chapters examining scholarly works in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. These chapters have been split into two separate periods, up to 1940 and 1940-1989. This has been done to avoid losing the changing dynamic of discussion found in the two periods.

The exchangeability of the terms European or New Zealand European and Pakeha is acknowledged in this thesis. However, the differing connotations associated with these terms are also noted. ‘European’ and ‘New Zealand European’ will be used when referring to persons from Europe, those living in New Zealand from Europe, or those of European descent. ‘Pakeha’ will also be used, but only sparingly. A continuum is acknowledged here as well. As Said noted, ‘all cultures are involved in one another; none is single and pure, all are hybrid, heterogeneous, extraordinarily differentiated and monolithic.’⁶² So some individuals are recognised as having both Maori and European elements in their identity and this will be acknowledged where possible and appropriate. The term ‘slavery’ also needs to be addressed. Within the context of colonial New Zealand and the Chatham Islands there were two different definitions of the term. A European definition which viewed slaves as property and their children were automatically enslaved upon birth. The Maori definition, while not the same in all parts of New Zealand, was that war captives would be taken as slaves back to the conquerors homeland. However, when a tribe relocated they could create vassal communities

⁶⁰ Ludmilla Jordanova, *History in Practice* (London: Arnold, 2000).

⁶¹ *Ibid*, p. 53.

⁶² Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1993), p. xxv.

who were subservient and were expected to do as directed. Children born to a slave mother and master father would not be automatically enslaved but would be classed as free.⁶³ It is therefore acknowledged that in some sources an indirect comparison is being made.

Chapter Two will examine the early histories of the Moriori written by settlers and visitors to the Chatham Islands. It will attempt to discern whether religious, namely Christian, belief held any influence over how Moriori were represented and whether this followed a trend in mainland scholarship on Maori. Chapter Three will examine the Native Land Court proceedings on the Chatham Islands in 1870 and whether the relationship between Maori and the Court took the form of racial collusion. It will be determined whether this collusion took form through claimant's debates centred on a racial hierarchy. Chapter Four will discuss the works of amateur and professional ethnographers, ethnologists and archaeologists from the nineteenth century until 1940, such as Elsdon Best, Stephenson Percy Smith and H. D. Skinner. It will endeavour to determine whether these works share a similar unfavourable origin and if other works were overshadowed by this.

Chapter Five will continue on from the previous chapter and cover the period 1940-1989. It will examine the works of various scholars and how the changing representation of Moriori caused a schism creating a two school system of thought and debate. It will examine whether favourable representations of Moriori appeared in this era and how these may contradict Michael King's view of this literature. Chapter Six will examine the role of newspapers in presenting the Moriori to the New Zealand public and how these may have followed a common trend set by articles about Maori. The origin of the views and information presented within the newspapers will also be traced to determine whether they were influenced by scholars from their period.

⁶³ Tribunal, *Rekohu: A Report on Moriori*, p. 43.

Chapter Two: Settlers and Christianity

After the 1835 invasion of the Chatham Islands, and for the rest of the nineteenth century, a number of European settlers made their way to the islands in the hopes of establishing homes, businesses and livelihoods. From these Europeans comes much of our understanding of Moriori. This chapter will explore the settler views of Moriori and how those views may have been influenced or formed by their Christian beliefs. While the settlers may have had different motivations for making the long, arduous and often dangerous journey to the islands, their Christian faith was an underlying influence on their observations. At the same time what they recorded and what they omitted to record would influence later historians and anthropologists. The settlers, through their writing and understanding of Moriori, created an imagined Moriori, influenced both by their beliefs and by their reliance on the information provided them by the Maori conquerors of the islands. Unlike in Maori history, very few Moriori voices are heard in this period. From the earliest days of European contact, Maori were keen to foster relationships with settlers and missionaries because of the trade they could bring, this eventually included converting to Christianity. The same can be said for Maori on the Chatham Islands, although not all converted in this period and many Moriori had converted earlier. The history created would not include much in the way of direct Moriori perspectives and would follow a different path to Maori history on the mainland.

When regarding the settler view of Moriori King said ‘They remained virtually invisible, other than as objects of collective contempt on the part of the Maori and pity on the part of European settlers.’⁶⁴ With pity comes connotations of charity and benevolence but also an inclination of viewing something or someone as lesser in demeanour or place. Through this pity Christianity on the Chatham Islands, as practiced by Europeans, may have contributed to the decline of Moriori culture and of the Moriori as a cohesive group, through a forced changing of their practices and customs, but alternatively may have also saved them from a worse situation by aiding them against other struggles they faced such as slavery. Edward Said noted that spreading the Christian message was one of the key principles of European colonisation and imperialism in the nineteenth century.⁶⁵ Numerous Christian societies

⁶⁴ King, *Moriori: A People Rediscovered*, p. 90.

⁶⁵ Said, *Orientalism*, p. 100.

appeared after large scale colonisation began. Some of these societies, including the ‘Church Missionary Society’, played active roles European contact with native peoples.⁶⁶

Frederick Hunt is one of the most recognisable names during this period of Chatham Islands history. Hunt arrived in the islands in 1843 and settled on Pitt Island with his family. He found Pitt Island almost completely deserted as it had neither whaling stations nor a Maori presence, although he discovered a dozen Moriori who were still hiding from Ngati Mutunga and Ngati Tama almost eight years after the invasion.⁶⁷ Hunt began to build a sustainable existence on the island, constructing a farm house and importing a small number of sheep. When in 1855 Archibald Shand arrived to take up the position of Resident Magistrate for the islands, he began imposing import duties on the various ships that anchored at Chatham Island. Hunt, however, advertised Pitt Island as an excellent way of averting these tolls and as a result he enjoyed relative prosperity as more ships unloaded their wares on Pitt Island rather than Chatham Island. By the 1860s Hunt had become a successful farmer and a well-respected settler.⁶⁸ He continued to live on the islands until his death in 1891, leaving a legacy of children and grandchildren who continue to farm Pitt Island today.

Hunt published his autobiography in 1866 with the assistance of fellow settler John Amery, who served as editor. This work gives a clear indication of Hunt’s personal beliefs and prejudices. In the first page of the work he describes his first sighting of New Zealand and how ‘I [Hunt] determined, with God’s help, to struggle manfully for an honest livelihood.’⁶⁹ From the outset we glimpse Hunt’s Christian beliefs. His first statement regarding the Moriori was that they were a ‘slothful’ race. He calls them this when he begins to use them as labourers on his farm.⁷⁰ His use of the word slothful conjures up images of Christian diligence and studiousness. Most strikingly, he deliberately mentions his unease at Moriori not worshipping a benevolent God. This is in lieu of the fact Moriori worshipped a large pantheon of Gods like other Pacific cultures. Hunt was not aware of this, as knowledge about the Moriori was limited even to those who lived among them but this would still not change his perception of them.⁷¹ The final tell-tale indicators of Hunt’s personal beliefs are the praises he sings of German missionary, Franz Schiermeister, whom he thanks for being both

⁶⁶ Said, *Orientalism*, p. 100.

⁶⁷ King, *Moriori: A People Rediscovered*, p. 90.

⁶⁸ *Ibid*, p. 97.

⁶⁹ Frederick Hunt, *Twenty-Five Years’ Experience in New Zealand and the Chatham Islands* (Wellington: William Lyon, 1866), p. 7.

⁷⁰ *Ibid*, p. 31.

⁷¹ *Ibid*, p. 32.

a teacher for his children and the family's priest. Hunt includes the passage from Matthew 7:16, 'By their fruits ye shall know them'⁷² to express his admiration for the pious Schiermeister.

Just prior to Hunt's arrival an incident occurred in which a young Moriori woman and her infant were shot and killed by an American whaler who had intended to kill her husband and then rape her. The Moriori themselves had been unable to bring the killer to justice. However, Frederick Hunt on being made aware the man still resided on the island asked a Maori hunting group to help apprehend him. The man evaded arrest, but Hunt's dedication to justice and moral righteousness suited the civilised way of life he was trying to portray with his Christian piety and showed that he believed the Moriori were entitled to justice.⁷³

After these events Hunt began some peaceful persuasion with the Moriori hiding on Pitt Island, this led to many of them building huts near his home and working on his farm. Hunt recalls when Bishop Selwyn visited in 1848 he encouraged Hunt's Moriori neighbours to go to Hunt's residence every night for prayer. Many did and some even converted having been attracted to the peaceful work they were seeing from Christianity as portrayed by Hunt's example. But this idyllic scene was not to last. A hapu of Ngati Mutunga, Ngati Kura, arrived on the island and began to capture the Moriori. The Moriori went to Hunt for help stating that they did not want to be captured but especially so by this group 'because they were not Christian Maoris,- that they had never listened to the good Bishop's teaching.'⁷⁴ Hunt went to the Maori Christian teacher and together they sent for a boat to take the Moriori to the mainland where he instructed them to seek protection from 'the Bishop's Maoris.'⁷⁵ This act of outstanding benevolence by Hunt potentially saved the lives of a number of Moriori.

Hunt's Christian beliefs influenced his attitude towards Moriori and how he portrayed them in his writing. His attitudes changed when he was met with one of the starker aspects of Moriori culture, their funerary customs. According to Hunt there was a figure within Moriori belief called the *kiko-kiko*, which is the embodiment of a dead person's spirit come back from the afterlife to wreak havoc and cause misfortune. The Moriori believed that by performing a ceremony the night of a person's death they could evade the vengeful spirit and prevent it

⁷² Hunt, *Twenty-Five Years' Experience*, p. 54.

⁷³ *Ibid*, p. 30.

⁷⁴ *Ibid*, p. 37.

⁷⁵ *Ibid*, p. 37.

from ever returning.⁷⁶ This ritual was still practiced when Hunt arrived on Pitt Island and he ‘attempted to wean them from this foolery, but without success.’⁷⁷ His determination unshaken, he waited until the next time they performed the ritual and dressing up in a white sheet with a painted white face he ran into the Moriori group as they were beginning the ritual and they fled. He states that after that he does not know of the *kiko-kiko* custom ever being performed again.⁷⁸ Hunt’s determination to stop this ritual is inexplicably linked to his own beliefs; he stopped the practicing of what he saw as a heathen ritual. However, Hunt notes that while the ritual was never performed again there was still talk of the *kiko-kiko*. This would follow a trend amongst Maori in which some ceremonies were abandoned after contact with Europeans and Christianity but the belief behind them would still remain.⁷⁹

The Moriori custom for burial would depend on the person’s occupation or station. They would be interred in different ways to mark how they had lived their lives. A renowned fisherman would be tied into a small boat with a fishing rod with live bait on the hook and then be cast adrift in the ocean. Others would be tied to a karaka tree and left until the tree enveloped their body while some would be stored away in a cave where the body could be visited by relatives. If a Moriori was to be buried they would be tied into a sitting position, wrapped in a mat and then buried only up to their chest/stomach area with the rest being exposed.⁸⁰ Hunt was horrified at these modes of burial which he referred to as ‘indecent and unholy customs.’⁸¹ Hunt’s wife felt the same way as her husband and when she saw a typical Moriori burial being constituted she ordered them to stop and dig a grave, which they did. She also ensured a prayer was said as the body was buried. Hunt once again cannot recall the old custom ever again being followed after this point.⁸² Hunt’s religious belief caused another Moriori tradition to be modified and therefore he contributed to the decay of Moriori culture. According to Hunt’s narrative, Moriori seemed to be giving up important rituals without a fight. More likely the rituals may have just been driven underground. Christians on the mainland were having mixed success in making Maori abandon their traditions and religious

⁷⁶ Hunt, *Twenty-Five Years’ Experience*, p. 32.

⁷⁷ *Ibid*, p. 32.

⁷⁸ *Ibid*, p. 33.

⁷⁹ Angela Wanhalla, “The Natives Uncivilise Me: Missionaries and Interracial Intimacy in Early New Zealand,” in *Missionaries, Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Exchange*, ed. Patricia Grimshaw and Andrew May, 24-36 (Eastbourne: Sussex Academic Press, 2010), p. 25.

⁸⁰ Rhys Richards, *Manu Moriori: Human and Bird Carvings on Live Kopi Tress on the Chatham Islands* (Wellington: Paremata Press, 2007), p. 21.

⁸¹ Hunt, *Twenty-Five Years’ Experience*, p. 34.

⁸² *Ibid*, p. 34.

customs.⁸³ There is no way of knowing whether other circumstances affected Moriori abandonment of these rituals as these occasions are only recorded by Hunt himself and he makes no mention of the rituals outside of these set examples.

Hunt's Christian belief also found another Moriori rite objectionable. However while this interference may not have had an effect on Moriori the way Hunt portrayed this practice contributed to the unfavourable stereotype of them. Moriori, according to Hunt, had a fear of the *tamaiti tangi*, children who cry just after birth. These children were considered a bad omen and so were killed as soon as possible, usually by crushing them beneath a boulder or flinging them into the ocean. Hunt stated that upon his arrival a child was born during the night and when he inquired after it he was taken to a spot in the forest where the baby had been crushed beneath a large boulder. He chastised the Moriori for what they had done and said that a terrible curse would be put upon them if they ever did it again.⁸⁴ The Moriori rebuke was that it was their custom and they had done it since time immemorial and would not stop because a European had told them.

When the wider context of events are considered, the enslavement and mass killings occurring, to ensure that Moriori children being born would not be killed by their own people would have been extremely beneficial as the population could grow.⁸⁵ Hunt yet again claims that after this occasion the custom was never renewed. Hunt's relationship with Moriori clearly reflected his Christianity and European background. The attitude he had towards Moriori non-Christian customs and the actions he took to stop them aided the destabilisation and downfall of Moriori culture. Alternatively his wish to stop their killing of infants may have contributed to preserving their quickly declining population for a time, although as no other Moriori children were being born due to the Maori ban on marriage this good may have been short term. The evangelical nature of Hunt's beliefs and the vehement way in which he went about instructing Moriori follows the general trend of Christianity in this era. His portrayal of Moriori gives an image of them as a primitive and unintelligent race; this would affect the views of those who came after him as his first-hand interactions with Moriori would be seen as an invaluable source.

⁸³ Tony Ballantyne, *Entanglements of Empire: Missionaries, Māori, and the Question of the Body* (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2015), p. 190.

⁸⁴ Hunt, *Twenty-Five Years' Experience*, p. 35.

⁸⁵ King, Morrison, *A Land Apart*, p. 34.

The Moravian Missionaries played a minor role in the settlement of the islands. However, their leader Johannes Gottfried Engst was instrumental in the teaching of Maori and Moriori, although as a missionary he never succeeded in converting a single person. Engst's devotion to the gospel is evident in his journals as entire pages were dedicated to various Bible verses from Psalms to Revelations.⁸⁶ He was a man devoted to his duty to preach the gospel and uphold Christian morals. He saw the Moravian community as the perfect opportunity to present Maori and Moriori with an example of civilised life, endeavouring to further this by having the missionaries marry the German women the Missionary Society had sent to live with them.⁸⁷ However, his contact with Maori and Moriori was largely limited. He details issues in determining who trustees of the land were when the owner or main proprietor was absent and also arguing over boundaries with Maori land owners.⁸⁸

Engst's portrayals of Moriori are limited in number but do not have the same reservations as Hunt's. Engst had hoped to write a book about the Chatham Islands and his experiences there. In his notebook he had decided the order and focus for the chapters he wanted to include. The second chapter was to be titled, 'About the Morioris', and would include notes about their culture, language and physical appearance. The next chapter would focus on the invasion and the treatment of Moriori by the Maori.⁸⁹ Engst's intentions appear to have been to write an objective account of Moriori history. His notes, while at times fragmented, do not judge the actions or culture of the Moriori against his beliefs. While he was never able to finish this work, it does offer an impression of Engst's intentions as a writer on Moriori and his ability to remove his personal views in an ethnological context.

Engst's other journals detail his experience of witnessing Maori cannibalism of Moriori.⁹⁰ Translated into English for Michael King's *Moriori: A People Rediscovered* Engst stated,

'All the bones and ribs were separated out, the hands and feet cut off at the joints, and the flesh was taken to the water in flax baskets... Their favourite meal places were usually by fresh-water ditches from which they drank... In my locality is a water ditch earlier called 'Maku' but later they called it 'Kai Tangata' [Human food]. A Chief

⁸⁶ Johannes Gottfried Engst, *Engst, Johannes Gottfried, 1819-1910: Notebook* (Wellington: National Library, record ID MSX-6305), p. 22.

⁸⁷ *Ibid*, p. 35-36.

⁸⁸ *Ibid*, p. 26-28.

⁸⁹ *Ibid*, p. 61-62.

⁹⁰ J. G. Engst, manuscript in Florance Collection, Canterbury Museum Library, Christchurch.

whom I knew, by the name of Werikuri, slaughtered a number of his Morioris at this ditch.’⁹¹

This is a simple account of Maori cannibalism and cooking customs and does not reveal to any great extent Engst’s views towards Moriori or how through his religious beliefs he may have been upset by the events on the islands. Hunt on the other hand made many allusions to Christianity in his writing. However, Engst’s duty was the conversion of all natives on the Chatham Islands and the zest with which he wrote about this demonstrates that given the opportunity he would not stop in his attempts for the sake of native customs. The actions of the Maori during this period may have acted as a major deterrent for the Missionaries and may have significantly hampered their efforts to interact and write about Moriori. However, Engst’s portrayal did not have substantial enough distribution to influence future works in their views of Moriori.

Visitors to the Chatham Islands in this early period generally consisted of whalers or traders, but members of the clergy did find their way out to the islands, the most prominent of which was the first Bishop of New Zealand George Selwyn. Selwyn visited the islands in 1848, thirteen years after the invasion, and he remarked on the Moriori in his journal. His portrayal reflected an ignorance and thinning of information through Maori sources that would affect later scholarship. Upon meeting the Moriori, Selwyn was not pleased with their position. He took a census of the population and stated, ‘the very small number of children, and the unmarried state in which they seemed for the most part to be living, would lead me to fear they are rapidly decreasing.’⁹² He then asserted that when compared to the Maori, who had the right to cultivate, marry whom they pleased and barter with traders, the Moriori living situation and place as serfs was not satisfactory for a Christianised society.

Selwyn’s attitude to Moriori in regards to slavery changed after his first meeting with them. He compared the work of Moriori slaves to the fagging system of British boarding schools and decided that such a system was doing more harm to the Maori because they had become lazy. He remarked that no harshness or severity was being inflicted on Moriori although he has already mentioned the restrictions on marriage.⁹³ He conceded a desire to remove this institution but decided a long residence would be needed to do so. He saw the Moriori plight

⁹¹ King, *Moriori: A People Rediscovered*, p. 64.

⁹² George Selwyn, *A Journal of the Bishop’s Visitation Tour Through His Diocese, Including A Visit to the Chatham Islands, In the Year 1848* (Christchurch: Kiwi Publishers, 2002), p. 98.

⁹³ Selwyn, *A Journal*, p. 99.

as no more abhorrent than that of Maori slaves on the mainland. Grant Phillipson, a Waitangi Tribunal historian, cited the work of Ashley Gould in proposing that Selwyn faced a serious ethical dilemma. On the mainland Selwyn wanted a gradual process of assimilation in converting Maori that did not upset their cultural practices, however, Moriori were suffering consequences unheard of on the mainland. Most of the Ngati Mutunga leaders on the islands had already converted and his short visit would not be enough to continue changing their practices. Phillipson notes that on the mainland missionaries had been more forceful in their attempts to stop Maori practicing customs that did not agree with their teachings, after they had supposedly converted.⁹⁴

Selwyn's approach to Moriori seemed gentler than that of missionaries on the mainland, this gentle approach may have been due to his lack of familiarity with Moriori. Selwyn preached to the Moriori on his short visit and explained to them they were descended from Noah and gave them the title 'Tuakana o te Pihopa' (Elder brothers of the Bishop), which they apparently delighted in but such a title did not help their position. Although it does suggest a sense of eagerness on the part of Selwyn, through his Anglican perspective, to recognise the Moriori and acknowledge they required help. The biases Selwyn had towards Moriori stemmed from a lack of familiarity with their culture and predicament, but he genuinely wished to help them. He was more familiar with Maori culture and had a favourable relationship with Maori on the islands that he did not want to disrupt. Pomare, the prominent Ngati Mutunga Chief at the time of the Bishops visit, had recently become a Christian and was known to Selwyn under his baptismal name, William Pitt. They had met a year previously and had become good friends. Such a friendship with a chief instigator of Moriori oppression would surely have given the Bishop, if not bias towards the Moriori, at the very least a Maori lens through which to view them.

Selwyn's familiarity with Maori was also displayed when he was sailing to the islands and called them by their Maori name - Wharekauri not by their English name. It would not be expected for him to call the islands Rekohu, the Moriori name, as he had never before been to the islands and it is unlikely he would have ever heard the name used on the mainland. Selwyn stated upon arrival he was very anxious to see the Moriori, whom he referred to as the 'Aborigines'. However, he noticed the Maori referred to them as 'Paraiwhara', 'the

⁹⁴ Grant Phillipson, "High and even Holy Purposes': Selwyn in Treaty History" in *A Controversial Churchman: Essays on George Selwyn, Bishop of New Zealand and Lichfield, and Sarah Selwyn*, ed. Allan K. Davidson (Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2011), pp. 106-107.

meaning of which I [Selwyn] could not ascertain.⁹⁵ He began to use this term as well. Selwyn was also aware of the name ‘Moriōri’, although he spelt it ‘Maoriōri’, yet he did not use this.⁹⁶ Not knowing the meaning of this term, and its racial connotations, may have influenced Selwyn’s understanding of slavery on the islands. Selwyn’s lack of understanding of Moriōri appears to have stemmed from his closer relationship with Maori than his Christian beliefs. He barely mentions his faith in relation to Moriōri and wrote sections focusing solely on them, and not them in relation to Maori. Regardless, he still condemned the Moriōri and the way they lived in his written work.

Another member of the clergy, Reverend Richard Taylor, never met a Moriōri and there is no record of him having visited the Chatham Islands. However, his work *Te Ika A Maui* and the time of its publication, 1855, coupled with the influence he held on the mainland deems him fit to be included alongside Selwyn. Taylor mixed his Christian belief with ethnological developments in his portrayal of Moriōri. This began a long line of ethnological works with interest in Moriōri, although the Christian slant would not endure. Taylor was not kind to Moriōri in his writing. He called them a defeated people who had sunk to a lower state of existence and because of the sparse resources on the Chatham Islands

‘we cannot, therefore, wonder, that they are less advanced than the natives who conquered them; hence their inferiority in their garments, their houses, their canoes...their houses are miserable holes in the earth...even the Maori call them *Parakiwara* (back fellows).’⁹⁷

This part of Taylor’s work is written from an ethnographical perspective and does not concern his own personal dealings with Moriōri or his Christianity.

There were many views that incorporated Maori and other Polynesians into a Christian belief system. Samuel Marsden remarked that Maori were ‘wholly under the power and influence of the Prince of Darkness.’⁹⁸ Taylor took these types of views and amalgamated them into his ethnographical approach.⁹⁹ It was believed that Europeans, Asians, Africans/Melanesians and Polynesians all had different origins and this would explain why Europeans were superior to

⁹⁵ Selwyn, *A Journal*, p. 98.

⁹⁶ *Ibid*, p. 98.

⁹⁷ Taylor, *Te Ika A Maui*, pp. 7-8.

⁹⁸ Andrew Sharp, “Samuel Marsden and the Founding of the Kerikeri Mission,” in *Te Kerikeri 1770-1850: The Meeting Pool*, ed. Judith Binney, 40-46 (Wellington: Bridget Williams Books Limited, 2007), p. 40

⁹⁹ James Belich. 'European ideas about Māori', *Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand*, updated 9-Nov-12
URL: <http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/european-ideas-about-maori>

the other races. Taylor's theory had an inexplicable religious slant naming these races as descendants of the sons of Noah. He stated that the early races to dwell in New Zealand were descendants of Ham and were dark, brutish and hairy, this group included Moriori. The Maori were named descendants of Shem and Europeans the descendants of Noah's oldest son Japheth. As descendants of the oldest son it was the responsibility of Europeans to educate the lower races.¹⁰⁰ Taylor's ethnography has been influenced by his Christianity and as a consequence the Moriori have suffered by being placed below Europeans and Maori in a racial hierarchy. However, the use of racial hierarchies was popular amongst ethnographers at the time and Taylor could have reached this same conclusion without recourse to religion.

Within the family units on the Chatham Islands there were a small number of children. While some settlers had moved to the islands from elsewhere their children grew up calling the islands home. One child, William Baucke, son of German Missionary Johann Baucke and his wife Maria Müller was born in 1848. Another Alexander Shand, son of the Chatham Islands' first Resident Magistrate Archibald Shand, was born at Petone and came to the islands in 1855 at the age of fifteen. Both later wrote extensively on the Moriori using their own experiences and observations from this time. Their first-hand knowledge was something that many later scholars would not have and their observations would seriously influence later portrayals of Moriori. Although Baucke's unfavourable portrayal would appear to gain more traction than that of Shand. Shand's would be utilised by only a small handful of assiduous scholars.

As the son of a German missionary it would be expected that Christianity would have had an extensive influence on Baucke's work. As he grew up Baucke learnt to speak German and English but also mastered Maori and Moriori from the locals. He made comments of his childhood that show the Christian influence was prevalent in his early years, mainly through the work of his Mother.

'Our mother, entering on the labours of a mission wife, set apart one room for a daily school, at which this agglomerate of yellow, brown and white attended on equal terms. "For," said this pious soul, and impressed it upon her children, "if God created all things and saw that they were good, He created these pagans also."' ¹⁰¹

¹⁰⁰ J. M. R. Owens, *The Mediator: A Life of Richard Taylor 1805-1873* (Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2004), p. 218.

¹⁰¹ King, *Moriori: A People Rediscovered*, p. 98.

So Baucke's mother's Christian charity was one of the factors behind his adoption of native languages and his mingling and interest with Moriori. Her Christian charity is also responsible for many Moriori having a higher literacy rate than some Maori and being able to read and write during the 1870 Land Court cases. However, this reflects the same circumstances appearing on the mainland. Many Maori who learnt to read were either freed slaves or from a younger generation so the rate of Moriori literacy and learning was following a general trend.¹⁰²

In his youth Baucke helped his father run the mission station by writing letters, this includes a letter to Rakiura (Stewart Island) written for an elderly Moriori man who thought perhaps his deceased brother's soul dwelt there. Unlike the Hunt family, who attempted to stifle non-Christian Moriori belief wherever they found it, the Baucke family did not, regardless of whether conversion was the purpose of their being on the islands. Baucke's most popular work was published in the 1920s, when he was almost eighty years old, but it drew upon his notes from as far back as his childhood. Regarding the Moriori carvings on Karaka trees, Baucke explains that he tried to get the clearest explanation from a Moriori and that he made sure their answer was not intruded on by Maori lore, and was not what the Moriori thought a European would like to hear.¹⁰³ Like Taylor, Baucke's work is written from an ethnographical or anthropological point of view but unlike Taylor it is not troubled with the author's own personal feelings. However, it is also noted that such a familiar relationship with the Moriori over such a long period and the different period of writing, Baucke's views may have changed and developed to remove any Christian influence.¹⁰⁴

Alexander Shand began writing on the Moriori as early as 1868 but his works were only published by the Polynesian Society in the 1890s and the early 1900s. Shand died in a house fire on the islands in 1910 and it is believed a large number of unpublished articles perished with him.¹⁰⁵ What has survived is the largest collection of data on the Moriori from the time. Shand's description of the Moriori moral characteristics shows none of Baucke's biases. He

¹⁰² G. A. Phillipson, "Missionary Printer: William Colenso at Paiha, 1834-52," in *Building God's Own Country: Historical Essays on Religions in New Zealand*, ed. John Stenhouse and Jane Thompson, 127-138 (Dunedin: Otago University Press, 2004), p. 132.

¹⁰³ H. D. Skinner, William Baucke, *The Morioris* (Honolulu: Bishop Museum, 1926), p. 19.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

¹⁰⁵ Alexander Shand, *The Moriori People of the Chatham Islands: Their History and Traditions* (Wellington: The Polynesian Society of New Zealand, 1911), p. V.

does not refer to them as slothful or weak hearted but said that with the exception of some small incidents of intertribal warfare ‘their general life was a very peaceable one.’¹⁰⁶

While Selwyn worried the decrease in the Moriori population was possibly due to the restrictions on marriage, Shand deliberately blames Ngati Tama and Ngati Mutunga for the decrease and not only because of the ban on marriage. Shand asserts that the extremely tapu nature of Moriori society and the forced violation of this tapu by Maori was the cause of many Moriori deaths. ‘Some Maoris said of the Morioris, “It was not the number we killed that reduced them, but after taking them as slaves, we frequently found them of a morning dead in their houses. It was the infringement of their own *tapu* which killed them.’¹⁰⁷ This is a sympathetic view towards Moriori when compared with other writers of the time although this could be due to a number of factors. Shand was writing at a later time period and unlike Baucke he was not born on the islands nor was he the son of a missionary, so there was no strong Christian message early in his life. Also unlike Baucke, Shand met the Moriori and learnt their language and culture of his own volition not through the influence of his parents. When compared with Selwyn, Taylor and Baucke, Shand’s views show no signs of being influenced by a Christian belief and have the appearance of an ethnological approach. However, this would not help his views from being less influential than that of others with more unfavourable portrayals.

The advance of settlers on the Chatham Islands as traders, farmers and missionaries had an unavoidable toll on the Moriori. The religious views they brought with them, that at times combined with ethnographical writings, came into direct conflict with Moriori customs. The Christian views of settlers and visitors such as Hunt and his wife, Bishop Selwyn and Taylor had a serious influence on Moriori and drove many of their customs underground, contributing to the general decline of the Moriori race and their memory. However, others such as Shand and Engst who did not show a Christian bias in their works, although in the case of Engst it may well have existed, were sympathetic to the Moriori culture and custom. The age of the settlers, the time of their writing and the length of their interactions do not show a common development of their views with Baucke and Shand writing at a similar time and having drastically different views. While Christianity contributed to the decline of Moriori culture it was not a common factor amongst the interactions of settlers and Moriori or the settlers’ works.

¹⁰⁶ Shand, *The Moriori People*, p. 3.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid*, p. 4.

Chapter Three: The Native Land Court

Treatment of Moriori by Maori and settlers had, on the surface, been no different to what Maori were experiencing on the mainland. However, Mark Hickford writes that in the nineteenth century acts of negotiation were seen between Maori and Colonial institutions over issues of land titles and that the Native Land Court was the colonial governments' tool in these negotiations.¹⁰⁸ This chapter will show that during the Native Land Court hearings on the Chatham Islands in 1870 the negotiation between the Crown and Maori took the form of racial collusion. This exemplified itself through issues over 'right of conquest', natural slavery, usage of racially derogatory terms and attitudes towards half-castes. These are much more complex motives for the Court's decisions than modern scholars have allowed. The Court sessions on the Chatham Islands in 1870 brought a new perspective to light as the Court's rulings were remarkably in favour of Maori. This will show that the situation on the Chatham Islands differed from events on the mainland somewhat, although it did have similarities, and that the racial collusion aided the continued subjugation of Moriori identity.

Decades of enslavement, murder, and the subjugation of their culture had left the Moriori a broken people but not a defeated one. By 1860 they had begun to regroup and were enjoying a less stringent existence due to Ngati Mutunga and Ngati Tama allowing them their own small settlements and cultivations. The year 1862 saw the true revival of their interest in the question of land ownership. Under the leadership of Hirawanu Tapu they met at Te Awapataki, the same place they had decided not to show force towards the Maori in 1835, and wrote petitions to the Governor and Parliament imploring them to aid in the return of the islands to Moriori ownership. These petitions achieved nothing.

The Native Land Court, set up in 1865 under the Native Land Act, was to help solve land disputes between Maori and Maori, establish who owned the land and issue titles. For the iwi of the Chatham Islands the Court first sat in Taranaki. This prompted most of the Ngati Mutunga residents of the Chatham Islands to return to their former home and settle land issues there.¹⁰⁹ Because of this migration Moriori once again outnumbered Maori on the islands by at least seventy people, and they spread over the islands, with many returning to

¹⁰⁸ Mark Hickford, *Lords of the Land: Indigenous Property Rights and the Jurisprudence of Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 6.

¹⁰⁹ Tribunal, *Rekohu: A Report on Moriori*, p. 106.

their former homes or tribal areas. The Court sent Stephenson Percy Smith to the Chatham Islands in September 1868 to survey the land and divide the islands into large blocks.¹¹⁰ The Court sat at Waitangi and sorted through the various claims before announcing a final decision on each of these blocks. At the end of the ten day session the Court ruled in favour of Ngati Mutunga, awarding them almost complete control of the islands and only setting aside approximately one and a half thousand hectares for Moriori reserves. Most of these reserves were on wetlands or land that held little commercial value.¹¹¹

It is argued that the Moriori were cut out of land ownership purely due to the stigma of being Moriori or they did not understand the Court and its processes and were disadvantaged by their more experienced Maori competitors. The reasoning behind the Court's decisions are much more intricate in their understanding of Moriori than modern sources allow. The Rekohu report included in its findings that the Land Court was unfairly turned towards the Maori claimants. Judge Josh Rogan who was selected to preside over the Court at Waitangi had previously met Wi Naera Pomare, the chief Maori claimant, when Pomare had served as the native assessor for the Oakura case. Rogan was also responsible for advancing the '1840' rule in which those who controlled the land at the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi were held to be the rightful owners.¹¹² Rogan also decided he would announce all of his judgements as one at the end of the proceedings rather than block by block. King believed that Hirawanu Tapu was partially to blame for the Moriori loss as he did not understand the Court system and that 'he placed all his faith in a rosy concept of 'British Justice', which had been explained to him by a ship's captain at Kaingaroa.'¹¹³ This seems to be an unfounded argument formed by King in hindsight of the events. Tapu had been appointed 'tidewater' for the Owenga port in the mid-1860s and had been an assessor in the Circuit Court so was familiar with legal proceedings and debate.¹¹⁴

It appears that most sources focus on court rulings and how the Moriori lost because they were simply beaten by a court system that favoured the more experienced Maori claimants. This may, however, have run deeper than just the Court proceedings, and may have touched the values of the men involved through their ideals of racial hierarchy and culture. The Europeans involved in the Court and the Maori claimants may have found a common ground

¹¹⁰ Tribunal, *Rekohu: A Report on Moriori*, p. 108.

¹¹¹ Gould, *Te Iwi Moriori Claim*, p. 145.

¹¹² Tribunal, *Rekohu: A Report on Moriori*, p. 108.

¹¹³ King, *Moriori: A People Rediscovered*, p. 125.

¹¹⁴ Gould, *Te Iwi Moriori Claim*, p. 135.

to meet when the issue of race became involved. This may explain why the Court ruled so overwhelmingly in favour of Ngati Mutunga over the Moriori.

To understand the Court's decisions the session proceedings need to be examined. The Court sessions officially opened on 14 June 1870 but were adjourned for two days. Wi Naera Pomare spoke first for all Ngati Mutunga claimants on the Kerkerione block. He claimed the block 'on account of my [Pomare] long residence on it and having taking possession of the island.'¹¹⁵ When asked to clarify 'taking possession' Pomare stated 'By the power of my arm I took possession.'¹¹⁶ Meaning he claimed the island through right of conquest. The Court inquired whether Ngati Mutunga had discovered anyone already living on the islands. Pomare responded they had and that when they conquered the islands they took away the mana of the Moriori and made them slaves. Toenga Te Poki was the next to speak for Ngati Mutunga and he declared 'I took possession of these lands [Wellington, Queen Charlotte Sound and the Chatham Islands] according to ancient custom... I took possession of the land and also of the people.'¹¹⁷ Another claimant, Rakatau, espoused that 'Some [Moriori] ran away from us and these we killed but what of that it was in accordance with our custom.'¹¹⁸ However, he also admits that he is not aware of any Maori being killed by Moriori. The Moriori counter claim was begun by Timoti Tara and he, like most Moriori after him, claimed the land through continued residence and through his ancestry. He also claimed that continued requests by Moriori to have some small portion of land were denied as the Maori feared Moriori becoming possible business competitors.

Hirawanu Tapu spoke second for the Moriori and claimed the entirety of the Chatham Islands through his father and ancestors. During his claim he detailed the 1835 meeting at Te Awapataki in which two Maori men were captured and the Moriori congregation debated what to do with them. While some argued they should be killed they were set free. 'As a child I learned the history of our rights to this land and having compared our rights to land with those of the laws of England I was induced to write Governor Browne respecting our lands.'¹¹⁹ He next attacks the Maori leasing of land. He claimed that Maori had agreed to share the profits of land leasing with Moriori and that when the money was received the Maori refused to hand any over. However, later he states that the Maori gave Moriori a horse

¹¹⁵ Native Land Court Minutes Book, Chatham Islands Box 1. (Wellington: New Zealand National Archives), p. 5.

¹¹⁶ Ibid, p. 5.

¹¹⁷ Ibid, p. 6.

¹¹⁸ Ibid, p. 7.

¹¹⁹ Ibid, p. 15.

in lieu of cash.¹²⁰ Kerei, who spoke after Tapu added to the peaceful persona the Moriori portrayed to the Court, ‘The New Zealanders came here and killed the Morioris. The Morioris were killed by them without any provocation.’¹²¹ By not fighting back Moriori were observing their own custom and this is what they were demonstrating to the Court, that both Maori and Moriori had acted according to custom.

On 18 June Te Wetini, brother of Timoti Tara claimed land through ancestry. He repudiated the Maori claim through continued residence, asserting ‘The New Zealanders have all left the Chatham Islands and gone with the King.’¹²² Most Maori had left the islands and for a time been aligned with the Kingitanga movement in the Waikato. The final Moriori to lodge a counterclaim was Heremaia. When he was finished speaking Tapu attempted to speak again but his statements were not taken down by the Court.

Te Matarae was the smallest block surveyed by the Court and had few claimants. Those who did claim it followed the same lines of argument as the Kerkerione block. Despite this Katihe made an observation about the racial views of Maori. ‘The day after we landed we went and took possession of a place called Karewa. Four of us went on that expedition and caught some Morioris, we called them blackfellows.’¹²³ Karaka, a Moriori, was called as a witness to Katihe’s claim and he supported it fully, principally because he was being included by Maori as one of the claimants himself. Katihe’s claim was not universally supported and other members of Ngati Mutunga claimed a stronger link to the land through their fathers having conquered it before him. However, Hamuera Koteriki stated that because of his cultivations and residency on the block Katihe had a rightful claim.¹²⁴ The only Moriori to speak in reference to this block was Heta Namu, a half-Moriori half-Maori descendant. He was unable to clearly define his claim and the claims of those he supported although he heavily implied he was seeking ownership through the conquest by his parents, ‘(our Parents) took possession of this place in the first instance. My parents... were left in charge of this land.’¹²⁵ Namu’s claim was not supported by others.

Te Awapatiki was the third block observed by the Court and was of significant cultural value to Moriori being a sacred meeting ground. Hamuera Koteriki claimed the block through right

¹²⁰ Native Land Court Minutes Book, Chatham Islands Box 1. (Wellington: New Zealand National Archives), p. 18.

¹²¹ King, *Moriori: A People Rediscovered*, p. 129.

¹²² Land Court, p. 19.

¹²³ *Ibid*, p. 23.

¹²⁴ *Ibid*, p. 29.

¹²⁵ *Ibid*, p. 35.

of conquest, although conquest from Ngati Tama not from Moriori as they had already been subjugated. Pomare proclaimed that his evidence for the Kerkerione block would stand for this block as well. The Maori felt assured of their ownership. Court proceedings were delayed a day with the native assessor being unable to attend but two days later the Moriori made the same statement using evidence from Kerkerione to support the claim in the Te Awapatiki block. However, Tapu made it clear that the number of Moriori living on the block and the organisation of their settlements and cultivations made a difference to their needs pertaining to the land here. The Court briefly questioned Tapu over the Moriori leadership. He replied that while he was not a chief in the tribal sense he was considered leader of the Moriori people throughout these sessions.¹²⁶ Tapu also stated that although the land was taken by force the Moriori had remained there regardless.¹²⁷ Before moving on, the Court announced their judgements for the previous blocks. The Court awarded over thirty-nine thousand acres to Ngati Mutunga and only six hundred acres for Moriori. The only concession the Court made towards Moriori was the decree that the reserve could not be made inaccessible to them because of the sale of Maori land in other parts in the block. The Te Awapatiki block followed the same pattern but the Moriori reserve was increased to two thousand acres to accommodate the Moriori settlement.

For the Otonga block the Maori claimants changed their strategy and tried to counter any Moriori claim by demonstrating to the Court they had made concessions to the Moriori in the form of reserves. Ihakara Ngapuke was the only Maori claimant to speak, 'I have given a piece of land out of this block to my Morioris.'¹²⁸ Hori Rangi spoke for the Moriori and denied that any agreement had been made between Ngati Mutunga and Moriori. The Court questioned him 'Have you consented amongst yourselves to accept this block of land?'¹²⁹ He stated they had 'not fully consented because it is wet land.'¹³⁰ The case was adjourned to a later date.

The final block brought before the Court was the Wharekauri block which included almost the entire northern coast of the islands. Paimariki Raumoa informed the Court that of the owners of this block over two hundred were in Taranaki and could not attend the proceedings. This did not deter him from claiming the land through right of conquest and

¹²⁶ King, *Moriori: A People Rediscovered*, p. 130.

¹²⁷ *Ibid*, p. 131.

¹²⁸ Land Court, p. 43

¹²⁹ *Ibid*, p. 44.

¹³⁰ *Ibid*, p. 44.

continuous occupation, although others occupied the land on their behalf.¹³¹ Raumoa was questioned by the Court as to whether any agreements had been made with the Moriori on the block, he said there had. A Moriori, Hone Waiti Rueva, was called by the Court and he said he had accepted the arrangement.¹³²

Additional claims were heard for Rangatira and Pitt Islands. Mariu Te Taira and his wife, both Moriori, claimed this island as they had lived there before the invasion. Toenga refuted this claim as neither had been to the island in thirty years and had never cultivated there. At the time Frederick Hunt, a sheep farmer, was the only person working on the island and he asserted that no surveys had ever taken place. Because of this the Court dismissed this claim and adjourned for the day.¹³³ Ihapera Mariu spoke for Moriori on the Pitt Island claim. Her only claim was through her parents who had lived on the island. The Court cross examined her and she admitted she had no other ground for a claim.¹³⁴ Wiremu Wharepa established a claim through conquest and refuted that any Moriori claimants had lived on the island. Toenga Te Poki also refuted all Moriori claims and refused to set aside a portion of land for a Moriori reserve. After hearing this evidence the Court dismissed the Moriori claims completely and stated ‘the Court did not feel justified in making a reserve for Hirawanu as applied for by him.’¹³⁵

After ten days of proceedings the Court made its remaining judgements. In the case of Te Matarae the Court ordered two hundred acres be set aside for Moriori. For the Otonga block six hundred acres was set aside for Moriori. The Wharekauri block had the same outcome with six hundred and fifty acres being secured for Moriori. In the blocks where Moriori had accepted a prior agreement the outcome for them seemed far more rewarding than those where they had refused any concession from Maori.¹³⁶ This closed the Court’s proceedings on the Chatham Islands.

The Moriori did not appeal the Court’s decision and this has presented a quandary amongst scholars. Most have suggested that Moriori were shocked or stunned into disbelief and left in a state of irreversible defeatism. However, alternative views which rely less on speculation argue that Moriori did not know they could appeal the Court ruling and therefore they let the

¹³¹ Tribunal, *Rekohu: A Report on Moriori*, p. 121.

¹³² Land Court, p. 49.

¹³³ Ibid, p. 50.

¹³⁴ Ibid, p. 52.

¹³⁵ Ibid, p. 55.

¹³⁶ Ibid, p. 62.

issue rest. Although appeals at a later date do not seem to support this.¹³⁷ The more likely outcome was that Moriori were somewhat satisfied, at least temporarily. They had the land they required to survive and even began to re-site their reserves so that they had control of better land. However, this also supports the argument that Moriori had not yet developed an efficient means of protest and only began to articulate their demands effectively after the Court had closed proceedings. Economic moves such as re-siting and the requests made to have the new sites surveyed show that Moriori were contented for a time with their new situation which gave them more autonomy than they had enjoyed since 1835.¹³⁸

The racist undertone that endured throughout these proceedings was utilised both knowingly and unknowingly by the Europeans and Maori present. The Court's understanding of 'right by conquest' is an integral part of their decision making process and while most modern sources acknowledge this they do not endeavour to understand why this is, or how it may have created a connection between Europeans and Maori. Ngati Mutunga based most of their claims on the right of conquest, that they, a more advanced superior race had conquered a lesser people. This would have aligned with European thought at the time as in the nineteenth century 'right by conquest' was also an integral part of European custom, which the British themselves used to claim a quarter of the globe. Conquest at this time was viewed as a fundamental part of race dynamics. If the Maori had managed to invade and subdue the native inhabitants of the Chatham Islands then through their culture they were the more civilised and advanced race. The actions of Maori in this context also helped solidify the European sense of superiority; if Maori could conquer Moriori then European could conquer Maori.¹³⁹ This level of racial scrutiny and analysis meant that the origins of a race were considered more important than their current state or how they may adapt.¹⁴⁰ Moriori were viewed as the remnants of a lesser Melanesian 'Negroid' migration to New Zealand. The Reverend Richard Taylor purveyed these ideas as early as 1855 and they stuck within the European imagination.¹⁴¹

Moriiori argued that they were culturally distinct from Maori and that their culture did not recognise conquest but the European ideals of the time countered this argument. Moriori also attempted to argue carefully that the Maori on the islands had changed some of their own

¹³⁷ Ashley Gould, *Further Historical Evidence of Dr Ashley Gould*, Wai 64 Doc # G6, p. 24.

¹³⁸ *Ibid*, pp. 24-25.

¹³⁹ Howe, *Quest for Origins*, p. 166.

¹⁴⁰ Belgrave, *Historical Frictions*, p. 287.

¹⁴¹ Taylor, *Te Ika a Maui*.

cultural practices. This would mean their place in the racial hierarchy may have changed in relation to Moriori who had not altered their culture except when forced to. This is an unintentional side effect of the Court's position. After the conquest Ngati Mutunga should have been able to continue their occupation of the Chatham Islands uninhibited. However, the Court allowed a dynamic to occur in which a dialogue could be created between the opposing parties and a conquerors claim to the land could be challenged, this could also explain the eagerness of some Maori claimants to show they had made allowances for Moriori, an attempt to stop Moriori from making a challenge. Hirawanu Tapu only had a limited knowledge of Moriori and predominantly spoke Maori because of Ngati Mutunga forcing assimilation. Although language is never directly addressed in the Court proceedings the views popular at the time meant that adopting the language of a higher racial group would infer inferiority on the forgotten culture.¹⁴² The Maori on the islands had become followers of Te Whiti and most had converted to Christianity in the 1840s and 1850s adopting a peaceful ideology that did not reflect their previous actions on the islands.¹⁴³

Judge Rogan utilised the '1840' rule and pushed aside this argument from Moriori. The '1840' rule instigated by the Court was a formal way of recognising the Maori and Moriori in their original state, at the time the Treaty of Waitangi was signed, not as they were at the time of the Court sessions, allowing them to fit into European racial hierarchy neatly.¹⁴⁴ However, the Chatham Islands did not become a part of New Zealand until 1842, two years after the Treaty was signed, although at the time of the Treaty Moriori had already been enslaved for five years. It was Ngati Mutunga and Ngati Tama who had sovereignty over the islands and this meant the '1840' rule could still be applied neatly. Members of the Court referenced the Colonial Secretary Willoughby Shortland who wrote in 1843 'Any proof that an act of ownership...was once exercised without opposition by one of these ancestors is considered sufficient evidence of the right of his descendants to the land.'¹⁴⁵ So this view was by no means concocted by the Court hastily and was deeply rooted in colonial thought.

The rule itself was also an attempt by the Native Land Court to codify the notion that conquest was the paramount aspect of Maori land ownership. In Taranaki in 1866, where Judge Rogan himself had been present, there was the decree 'that before the establishment of

¹⁴² Thomas F. Glick, "The Anthropology of Race Across the Darwinian Revolution," in *A New History of Anthropology*, ed. Henrika Kuklick, 225-241 (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2008), p. 234.

¹⁴³ King, *Mori: A People Rediscovered*, p. 133.

¹⁴⁴ Tribunal, *Rekohu: A Report on Moriori*, p. 108.

¹⁴⁵ Grant Young, "Judge Norman Smith: A Tale of Four 'Take'," *New Zealand Universities Law Review* 21, no. 2 (2004), p. 320.

British Government in 1840, the great rule which governed Maori rights to land was force.’¹⁴⁶ The tribe that held sovereignty on the land at the time of the Treaty were considered the owners. Most importantly the Court ruled here that it was not their responsibility to improve Maori positions or return pre-British law ownership. As Judge Rogan was actively participating in these proceedings it was natural for him to implement them in the Chatham Islands.¹⁴⁷ Since Ngati Mutunga made claims following their original state on the island, as conquerors, they secured an easy victory.

More deeply imbued within these racial ideas was that by proving a race to be inferior, which the Court clearly thought Ngati Mutunga had with Moriori, they had the right to exclude them from history narrative. Anthony Pagden noted that Europeans felt an inferior race had no history worth noting until it came into contact with the more advanced civilisations.¹⁴⁸ The racial ideals apparent in the Court’s understanding of right of conquest clearly showed they had a prejudiced opinion and would inevitably lean towards the Maori claimants. This has not been addressed by modern sources except in passing and similar situations have not been noted.

The situation on the Chatham Islands is similar to events in the upper South Island on the Te Taitapu block. The use of the ‘1840’ rule meant that, like Moriori, the Kurahaupo iwi were completely excluded from making any substantial claims to the land. The extent to which the Court understood Maori customary law was also questioned on this block with Ngati Apa remaining on their land even though it had supposedly been conquered by others, much like some Moriori.¹⁴⁹ Unlike on the mainland, however, the Court did make an effort to ensure the Moriori reserves could not be alienated, this did not occur on the Te Taitapu block. Although the blocks in the upper South Island were substantial enough that they had open access to the sea and offered alternative routes to various settlements. The Moriori reserves were surrounded by land that they did not own and thus they could not get easy access to the sea.¹⁵⁰ However, there is a substantial difference between these claims. The claims in the upper South Island display the Court’s inability to comprehend Maori land custom and are

¹⁴⁶ Bryan D. Gilling, *The Native Land Court in the Chatham Islands: A Report to Te Iwi Moriori Trust Board*, Wai 64, Doc #A10, 1993, p. 15.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid*, p. 15.

¹⁴⁸ Anthony Pagden, “The Peopling of the New World: ethnos, race and empire in the early modern world,” in *The Origins of Racism in the West*, ed. Miriam Eliav-Feldon, Benjamin Isaac and Joseph Ziegler, 292-312 (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2009), p. 311.

¹⁴⁹ Waitangi Tribunal, *Te Tau Ihu O Te Waka A Maui: Report on Northern South Island Claims*, Wai 785 (Wellington: Legislation Direct, 2008), pp. 706-707.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid*, pp. 706-707.

between opposing Maori iwi. While in the Chatham Island claims, the Court again does not fully comprehend Maori land custom and completely refuses to acknowledge Moriori as having any custom of their own differing from the Maori practice.

An in depth survey of these prejudices in the context of the Court sessions is never discussed by King. This lack of context seems to detract from the understanding of the Court's motives and applies modern judgements onto an older system. Emanating from the 'right by conquest' argument is the belief in natural slavery. If one race can conquer another then the subdued return to their natural state as slaves. This was not a new development in European thought, it is traceable back to the remarks of John Major on the American Indians in 1519 and how they are by nature slaves, and was well entrenched by the time the Court sat.¹⁵¹ As the Moriori were seen as Melanesian or Negroid by Europeans, connotations of laziness were applied which in turn implied the inability to govern or support themselves.¹⁵² Moriori stated that Ngati Mutunga did not allow them to grow their own crops in any large quantity showing that Maori still had a large degree of control over their former slaves, so much in fact that the Moriori were still in a state of perpetual serfdom.¹⁵³ However, Moriori were still able to cultivate. What the Court saw was that they were forced into a predetermined place beneath Maori.

Any other agreements made between Maori and Moriori over the use of the land also ended in confrontation. In the course of discussing leases Tapu tried to tell the Court that he had attempted to reason with Maori over the sharing of the land and profits and that Maori had not agreed.¹⁵⁴ Why would Maori need to share with a people who would not be able to capitalise on the opportunity? However, the Court did see fit to grant the Moriori their reserves, although these reserves were only set where the Moriori were currently cultivating. While viewing Moriori as lesser than Maori the European ethic still placed an emphasis on the ability to work hard and rule by example. As Maori and Moriori were also cultivating the same land in places it seems the Maori enterprise had done some good for Moriori culture and removed them from the nomadic lifestyle they had previously.¹⁵⁵ Because of this the Moriori arguments in regards to slavery could easily be brushed-off by the Court as inconsequential.

¹⁵¹ Pagden, "The Peopling of the New World," p. 301.

¹⁵² George L. Mosse, *Toward the Final Solution: A History of European Racism* (London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd, 1978), p. 20.

¹⁵³ Pagden, "The Peopling of the New World," p. 301.

¹⁵⁴ King, *Moriori: A People Rediscovered*, p. 129.

¹⁵⁵ Mosse, *Toward the Final Solution*, p. 60.

The social organisation of the Moriori, both pre and post invasion, was referenced many times during the Court proceedings. It should have demonstrated that the Moriori had a hierarchy and social system as intricately structured as Maori, and therefore they would not need a ruler to govern them as their place in the racial hierarchy suggested. However, Tapu was not a chief of the Moriori and yet he represented them, this undermined their argument. Meanwhile Pomare was a high ranking member of Ngati Mutunga and widely considered their chief on the islands.¹⁵⁶ This would have been disadvantageous to Moriori as they demonstrated that their social structure had broken down since the invasion. The notion of ‘natural slavery’ also links to the notion of racial extinction. With their social structure falling apart and their culture being absorbed by more dominant Maori influences it seemed natural to most Europeans and the Court that the Moriori were a doomed race taking a natural course. This may explain why the Court did not feel they required land outside of their own immediate homes, why grant land to a doomed race?¹⁵⁷ ‘Natural slavery’ was to Europeans of the nineteenth century just that, natural, and was another way in which nature extended itself into mankind; the Native Land Court was certainly influenced by these racial beliefs.

While Ngati Mutunga had plainly shown their willingness to treat Moriori as lesser, they had still allowed them to live and cultivate within the same areas as their masters. Ngati Mutunga needed to show that they referred to Moriori as a separate and lesser people. Rakatau Katihe’s claim for Te Matarae was essential for this. He stated in front of the Court that in 1835 during the invasion he and others referred to Moriori as ‘Paraiwhara’ or blackfellows.¹⁵⁸ This trend lasted as Bishop Selwyn also noted on his visit in 1848 that this name was used extensively.¹⁵⁹ Although this was never mentioned in the Court hearings it reveals that this term and feeling was not short lived.

The name ‘Paraiwhara’ was a direct result of European influence. ‘Paraiwhara’ is a transliteration of ‘black fellow’ and this term was also used to describe Aboriginal Australians by Maori and Europeans respectively. The Maori origin of the word may not simply be a racial. The Maori proverb ‘Ma pango, ma whero, ka oti’¹⁶⁰ which Hazel Petrie explains as meaning the lowest in Maori hierarchy, slaves, were associated with the colour black while the higher order members were associated with red. From this origin the name

¹⁵⁶ King, *Moriori: A People Rediscovered*, p. 130.

¹⁵⁷ Howe, *Quest for Origins*, p. 166.

¹⁵⁸ Land Court, p. 23.

¹⁵⁹ Selwyn, *A Journal*, p. 98.

¹⁶⁰ Hazel Petrie, *Outcasts of the Gods?: The Struggle over Slavery in Māori New Zealand* (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2015), p. 20.

‘black fellows’ could be used to regard the Moriori position as a conquered people rather than a racial term.¹⁶¹ However, this does not explain why the term was used almost exclusively by Maori on the Chatham Islands to refer to Moriori. From 1790 the number of whalers travelling between New Zealand and Australia grew exponentially and these European men shared their unflattering views of Aboriginal Australians. But Maori also saw the Aborigines first hand. Tuki Tahua visited Port Jackson (Sydney) in 1793 and his description of Aboriginal Australians was far from favourable. Te Pahi visited in 1805 and was disgusted at their lack of agriculture and their dislike of killing enemies in battle.¹⁶² Maori were also not hospitable towards intermarriage with Aborigines. This bears a similarity to many Moriori being forbidden to intermarry with Ngati Mutunga and Ngati Tama.

European racial hierarchy places Maori high in the Aryan group while ‘negroids’ and Melanesians are positioned at the bottom.¹⁶³ With the exception of the single instance by Katihe the term ‘paraiwhara’ is not mentioned again and Maori claimants refer to the non-Maori as Moriori in the Court sessions. However, this would not have mattered. The Moriori were at the time of the Court sessions being classified as Melanesian and to hear Maori naming them as ‘blackfellows’ or ‘negroid’ as far back as 1835 would have given the Europeans the justification they wanted to view Moriori the same way. This in succession would have also justified the Court’s decisions in regards to the ‘right of conquest’ arguments and ‘natural slavery’. Therefore the Maori use of the term ‘paraiwhara’ may be an amalgamation of Maori pre-European and post-contact ideas.¹⁶⁴ This explains why Maori treatment of Moriori reflected European attitudes in Australia rather than just typical Maori custom, although their customs were present. This has not been referenced by many modern sources, with the exception of Petrie’s work and affected how scholars viewed the Court’s portrayal of Moriori.

King has noted the existence of Moriori half-castes with either mixed European or Maori heritage. The place of half-caste Moriori/Maori was noted in these proceedings as it seems that Maori and European ideas of racial identity and how they applied in a legal sense melded together. European views of half-castes were not completely unfavourable. They viewed half-castes as the inevitable amalgamation of the Maori race into European society and the

¹⁶¹ Petrie, *Outcasts of the Gods?*, p. 36.

¹⁶² *Ibid*, p. 35.

¹⁶³ Ronald E. Hall, *The Scientific Fallacy and Political Misuse of the Concept of Race* (Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2004), p. 51.

¹⁶⁴ Petrie, *Outcasts of the Gods?*, p. 28.

creation of a race that was by no means lesser to full-blooded Maori or Europeans.¹⁶⁵ As Europeans at this time viewed the Maori as the strongest, most intelligent Polynesians, and descended from the same Aryans that Europeans were descended from, the mixing of these races did not result in any undesirable outcomes. The life that white British settlers were making in New Zealand took some strenuous hardship and they came to view themselves as the best of the British. This meant there was no overarching social taboo against interracial relations such as there was in Australia.¹⁶⁶ Lachy Paterson has noted that cultural distinctions were far more important in determining race than the actual biology of a person. Electoral law of the time would differentiate between half-castes living as Maori and those living as Europeans to the point where living as a Maori could help you avoid taxes. Other laws would define a Maori as anyone living with a Maori community according to their customs.¹⁶⁷ Although Paterson has stated there was some tension between Maori and half-castes this was never a sizeable issue as long as they lived as a Maori. But this does not account for half-caste Maori-Moriori. This was not a combination of two great races but perceived as a mixture of a great people with a lesser one.

When Heta Namu claimed the Te Matarae block he did so through conquest on his Maori side and through continuous occupation on his Moriori side. Even in his claim Namu tried to cater to both sides of his lineage, he made it known he considered himself part of Ngati Mutunga and even referred to the Chatham Islands by their Maori name, Wharekauri.¹⁶⁸ However, he showed the Court he was living as a Moriori. Therefore, no matter his biology he was culturally still Moriori and therefore the European members of the Court would not have felt he was entitled to claims through right of conquest. No Moriori were willing to back Namu's claims, possibly because he did identify with this Maori ancestry more for the claims process than any other Moriori. Without support from either Maori, who viewed him unfavourably, or Moriori, his claims as a half-caste had no weight and could be dismissed without upsetting either side. For the claim he made for Te Awapataki he again clearly stated he lived at Ouenga with other Moriori and so again he could not claim land through Maori custom.¹⁶⁹ European and Maori were able to meet neatly over the issue of where to place

¹⁶⁵ Vicki Luker, "The Half-caste in Australia, New Zealand, and Western Samoa between the Wars: different problem, different places?" in *Foreign Bodies: Oceania and the Science of Race 1750-1940*, ed. Bronwen Douglas and Chris Ballard, 307-335 (Canberra: ANU E Press, 2008), p. 316.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 317.

¹⁶⁷ Lachy Paterson, "Hāwhekaihe: Māori Voices on the Position of 'Half-castes' within Māori Society," *Journal of New Zealand Studies* 9, (2010), p. 136.

¹⁶⁸ Land Court, p. 35.

¹⁶⁹ Land Court, p. 39.

half-castes, Maori were able to exclude claims of potential rivals and the Court could easily profile a claimant as either Moriori or Maori with no possibility of a serious backlash.

The European understanding of Maori culture and their custom of conquest meant that there was no way in which Moriori would be able to reclaim their land. The conquest was an example of nature taking its course and if the Court had granted the Moriori back their land it would set a precedent in which Maori land could be reclaimed from Europeans. Keeping the racial hierarchy intact was not only convenient it was also necessary to justify European actions on the mainland. The other positions that the Maori claimants expressed, slavery and the use of terms like 'paraiwhara', only further solidified the European racial mind set and showed that Maori and European ideals were not too far removed from one another. The position on half-castes followed the same course as it did on the mainland and it was nothing extraordinary for persons of mixed descent to be excluded because of the culture they predominantly identified with, and not their biology. Therefore it is no surprise the Native Land Court granted most claims to Ngati Mutunga and ignored the Moriori.

There was an obvious collusion between Maori and European racial beliefs and ideals in these court proceedings. Although it could not be said whether this was an intentional malicious act against the Moriori and their claims, or whether this was the result of years of Maori-European relations bearing their fruit. Modern scholars such as King have not noted this collusion in their review of the portrayal of Moriori presented by the Court and have therefore ignored deeper issues in the mind set of Maori and Europeans about Moriori. While the portrayal in discussed here is no more favourable than modern reviews it allows a greater understanding of the context and how similar issues may have affected others and not only Moriori.

Chapter Four: Ethnologists and Anthropologists

This chapter discusses the evolution of anthropologic and ethnographical ideas concerning the Moriori. The initial views that early scholars had of Moriori, and how they were viewed in conjunction with other Polynesian peoples, may have become common traits which were passed on to later writers. While some appeared harsh there were a small number who utilised archaeological and anthropological evidence to create a favourable view of the Moriori.

These few writers were overshadowed by those that used oral histories, chiefly Stephenson Percy Smith and Elsdon Best. With the value of hindsight and additional research unavailable to the scholars of the nineteenth century, modern scholars, such as King and Belich, have determined that these early writers were incorrect in many respects. However, correctness within individual works is not the focus of the study, but how the evolution of lingering ideas shaped understandings of Moriori.

In the centuries after New Zealand's discovery scholars from all over the globe ventured there to study its rich flora, fauna and the indigenous people and culture. Scholars in Europe became fascinated with these exotic worlds and examples of indigenous art were taken back for museums and private collections. The same occurred with the discovery of Rekohu and the Moriori people. When Lieutenant Broughton first sighted the islands in 1791 and noted the existence of indigenous inhabitants his first reaction was to go ashore and meet the inhabitants and possibly procure items of interest.¹⁷⁰ The first meetings were uneasy. The Moriori men seemed agitated by the presence of the Europeans and the crew were nervous at their open display of weaponry. However, a small number of items were traded. Eventually the presence of the strange guests led to confrontation and a small fight broke out when a sailor attempted to remove a fishing net from the water. One Moriori, Tamakaroro, was fatally shot.¹⁷¹

Despite this confrontation with the first European visitors, others travelled to the islands and continued to pursue the acquisition of Moriori artefacts and the study of Moriori society. The study of people had become of interest to Europeans who were beginning to acquire large overseas empires and take what they believed to be, as the most advanced civilisation on Earth, their rightful place as leaders of all the peoples of the world. Since the Moriori had

¹⁷⁰ King, *Moriori: A People Rediscovered*, p. 40.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid*, p. 44.

been conquered by Ngati Tama and Ngati Mutunga they were deemed to be a lower caste of men whose looming extinction was a natural consequence of their place in a racial hierarchy. In the nineteenth century the literature surrounding the Moriori began to grow with the work of Edward Shortland, Edward Tregear, Henry Travers and Julius von Haast appearing in the 1850s to 1880s. The literature peaked in the 1890s and early 1900s with the establishment of the Polynesian Society of New Zealand. The information available to the scholars of the nineteenth century was limited in its scope due to the small number of Moriori and the limitations imposed on contact between Moriori and Europeans by Ngati Mutunga and Ngati Tama. Moriori had been removed from their tribal areas to other parts of the islands and local knowledge was being forgotten. By the end of the century the dwindling number of Moriori and their advanced ages meant that information about various practices in hunting, woodcarving and tapu rites were also being lost. Thus the only sources available were the works of earlier European scholars.

Works from the period before the creation of the Polynesian Society built on the foundations already made by those who lived on the Chatham Islands or were familiar with Moriori. Most of these accounts have been lambasted by modern scholars who have compressed these works to a series of ideas. That is, the development of ‘The Great New Zealand Myth.’ The myth was a migration story that stated Maori arrived in New Zealand around AD 1150-1350 AD. When they arrived they found the land inhabited by a race they called the Moriori whom they battled enslaved, murdered and drove away.¹⁷² Edward Shortland was one of the first writers to try and describe the inhabitants of New Zealand to a foreign audience. His work *Traditions & Superstitions of the New Zealanders*¹⁷³ published in 1856 featured chapters on Maori tribal divisions, authorities, genealogies and even attempts to explain the system of tapu in reference to other Polynesian cultures.¹⁷⁴ The Moriori are only mentioned once. They are described as a quiet and peaceful race that was attacked by a well-armed and war hardened enemy. Unlike many others after him Shortland does not seem to agree that the Maori were the rightful owners of the Chatham Islands and instead states ‘they [Ngati Mutunga and Ngati Tama] had no difficulty in killing or making slaves of the more lawful owners of the soil.’¹⁷⁵ He makes no note of the differences between the Moriori and Maori as separate races. However, the information available to him would have been limited and

¹⁷² King, *The Penguin History*, p. 38.

¹⁷³ Edward Shortland, *Traditions and Superstitions of the New Zealanders: with Illustrations of their Manners and Customs* (Christchurch: Kiwi Publishers, 2001).

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid*, p. 53.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid*, p. 19.

Maori had not had a prolonged residency on the islands with their ownership still challengeable, even by their own standards. His differentiating between a warlike people and a peaceful race, comes at a time when European nations were colonising large areas of the globe through, sometimes, forceful means. Stating a culture is peaceful does not necessarily hold positive connotations. It could equally imply weakness or even incompetence.¹⁷⁶

In 1879 J. Turnbull Thomson read a paper to the Wellington Philosophical Society which he based on a vocabulary of Moriori words gathered by S. Deighton Esq. for the Native Department in Wellington. He used this to show the similarities between Moriori and other Polynesian and non-Polynesian languages with the purpose of determining the origins of these groups.¹⁷⁷ While the basis for his work is sound, the vocabulary having been gathered in the 1850s when a majority of Moriori were still familiar with the language, the connections he makes with other languages are based purely on sound and not linguistic factors. He links Moriori to Hawaiian and Maori, which are the same linguistically but then also links it to various languages from the Indian sub-continent.¹⁷⁸ By making these connections Thomson is giving Moriori the same treatment he gave other Polynesian races.

However, Thomson's description of the Moriori details them as previous inhabitants of New Zealand who were driven to the Chatham Islands by Maori. This shows he was a proponent of what would emerge as the 'Great New Zealand Myth' and this would have likely influenced his findings. His final conclusion is that Moriori were of a separate migration to Maori and were therefore different ethnically. He justifies this conclusion by claiming that Moriori and other 'primitive' Polynesians, such as Hawaiians, originated in 'Ancient or Non-Aryan India.'¹⁷⁹ Thomson's deliberate mentioning of Non-Aryan India shows he is trying to separate the Moriori and Maori by linking their origins to two different groups. Maori were being linked to an Aryan origin shared with Europeans while Moriori were linked with a supposedly less intelligent ancestor.¹⁸⁰ This would also elevate Maori above the Moriori and justify the conquest of the Chatham Islands. By identifying groups as Aryan or Non-Aryan, Thomson is making distinctions based on race, not culture or any other factors.

¹⁷⁶ Howe, *Quest for Origins*, pp. 166-167.

¹⁷⁷ Turnbull, J. "Moriori Connection." Article read before the Wellington Philosophical Society, 23rd Aug, 1879, p. 237.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid, p. 238.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid, p. 238.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid, p. 238.

W. T. L. Travers presented a letter written by his son Henry Travers to the Philosophical Institute of Canterbury in 1868. Unlike others Henry Travers did not theorise origins of the Moriori and noted the use of genealogical oral traditions as a source for determining the time of their arrival on the islands as dangerous. While they may have an element of truth this can be seriously diluted. He stated that their traditions presented a problem in that many of the names have changed since the arrival of the Maori tribes.¹⁸¹ The comparison he makes between Maori and Moriori oral traditions is that the Moriori tradition is defective because of this vagueness.¹⁸² He was aware of the hardship Moriori had endured having demonstrated the effect slavery had on the development of the Moriori language into a patois form and the loss of knowledge due to the declining Moriori population.¹⁸³ Travers was showing a Darwinian attitude. This is similar to Thomson although it goes a step further by not only stating the Moriori are different to Maori but that they are inferior.

W. T. L. Travers presented another paper in 1876 which he wrote himself. It is likely his son's earlier observations were a source for his research. He believed at some point Moriori and Maori interbred and the Moriori of his day were the descendants of that group. He compares the names of canoes taken by the first Moriori explorers and the names of the Chiefs to names found in New Zealand to support this claim.¹⁸⁴ He places emphasis on a specific instance recorded by Alexander Shand in which Moriori elders after finishing a canoe used the words 'totara' and 'pohutakawa' which they said were trees from the land of their ancestors.¹⁸⁵ Thus, he believed, Moriori and Maori had a common lineage. What Travers does not consider is that these Moriori were speaking quite some time after the invasion, if the residency of Alexander Shand is taken into consideration. This would mean they were familiar with Maori language, custom and with New Zealand.

Travers remarked that the initial group of canoes to discover the Chatham Islands settled some time before the canoes Rangimata, Rangihona and Orepuke arrived. He then stated that the first inhabitants called these arrivals 'Tangata tare' but that the people themselves used the name Moriori. This is a major discrepancy from Moriori knowledge at the time as the name Moriori was only coined when they first encountered Maori in the nineteenth

¹⁸¹ Henry H. Travers, "On the Chatham Islands," *Transactions and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New Zealand* 1, (1868), p. 175-176.

¹⁸² *Ibid*, p. 175.

¹⁸³ *Ibid*, p. 174.

¹⁸⁴ W. T. L. Travers, "Notes of the Traditions and Manners and Customs of the Mori-oris," *Transactions and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New Zealand* 9, (1876), p. 18.

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid*, p. 18.

century and even then it is a transliteration of the word Maori into Moriori.¹⁸⁶ Travers' research into other aspects of Moriori culture are descriptive, such as a description of their garments, huts and weapons but this dysfunctional attempt at explaining their origins casts a shadow over this work. He obviously favours the Maori version of events and the Maori culture. He presents his views about Moriori origins in such a way that Moriori are seen as weaker than Maori and this denigrating view contributed to the unfavourable views of them. Like his son, Travers is a believer in social Darwinism. He believes that the extinction of a race can only occur with the intervention of a superior race, so Moriori would not have been driven to extinction if not for Maori intervention. He demonstrated this when he attacked an essay by A. K. Newman in 1882, saying that native practices would not lead to the decline of the Maori race.¹⁸⁷

Travers' views are made clearer in his article submitted to the New Zealand Institute in 1870. Discussing the effect colonisation had on native lands and flora and fauna in New Zealand he notes the effect colonisation had had on Maori. When Nga Puhī were given firearms they had the weapons of civilised man and this placed them above others in a hierarchy. The hierarchy did not balance itself again until all Maori tribes had procured the same level of weaponry. He states this drove 'the whole native people to the alternative of either adopting a different system of living and of warfare, or of submitting to extinction.'¹⁸⁸ Maori remained below Europeans. The Moriori however, did not adopt a new way of living and therefore could not adapt to the new situation created by the invasion. As a natural consequence they were wiped out. These early views when amalgamated together form a basis of the 'Great New Zealand Myth' and its relationship to Moriori which was the focus of modern scholars such as King.

Travers' views were further developed by Edward Tregear. Tregear was one of New Zealand's most widely read, if not controversial, writers of the late nineteenth century. Tregear learnt the Maori language quickly upon his arrival in New Zealand and became well acquainted with Maori culture. His work as a surveyor saw him spend months at a time in isolated Maori communities. The controversy surrounding Tregear stemmed from his

¹⁸⁶ Travers, "Notes of the Traditions," p. 19.

¹⁸⁷ Tony Ballantyne, *Webs of Empire: Locating New Zealand's Colonial Past* (Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2012), p. 237.

¹⁸⁸ W. T. L. Travers, "On the Changes effected in the Natural Features of a New Country by the Introduction of Civilised Races," *Transactions and Proceedings of the New Zealand Institute 1870*, Vol. III (Wellington: James Hughes Printers, 1870), p. 334.

philological works and his advocating for the ‘Great New Zealand Myth.’¹⁸⁹ Tregear’s first published work was a continuation of the ideas espoused by Thomson. *The Aryan Maori*¹⁹⁰ was published in 1885 and did not mention the Moriori people. However, the racial congruence he theorised demonstrates his belief that Maori and Europeans shared Aryan origins. He states that the aim of the work was to show ‘1. That the Maori is Aryan. 2. That his language and traditions prove him to be the descendant of a pastoral people, afterwards warlike and migratory... Probably, 1. That he left India about four thousand years ago...’¹⁹¹ Tregear is, like Travers, thinking of Maori as above other races but still below Europeans.

Four years later Tregear presented a paper to the Wellington Philosophical Society which focused solely on the Moriori. Tregear seemed unsure on where to place Moriori in the ‘Great New Zealand Myth’. He asserted that the Moriori language was a mere patois form of Maori.¹⁹² He then went on to propose that Moriori share the same Polynesian roots as Maori.¹⁹³ But this seemed to contradict the works he had already written, along with the work of Thomson, as it does not fit within the ‘Great New Zealand Myth’. By naming the Moriori as an offshoot of Maori they will share the same origins and therefore the racial hierarchy in which Europeans and Maori stand above Moriori would be invalidated. Thomson does not specifically state that the Moriori are non-Polynesian either and this does not hinder portraying Moriori as an inferior people. At the time Tregear was writing, the ‘Great New Zealand Myth’ was not complete; or at least incomplete when regarding the Moriori place within a racial hierarchy.

The attempt to amalgamate Moriori into the ‘Great New Zealand Myth’ was continued by John White. He used the oral traditions of both Maori and Moriori to determine Moriori origins. ‘Tradition says that a canoe...went out from Para-kaka-riki...and when a long way off from the shore a violent north-west wind sprang up and drove them out to sea, and they were never heard of again. (It is not at all improbable that this canoe reached the Chathams, and that the crew became the progenitors of one section of the present inhabitants.)’¹⁹⁴ His source for most of these oral histories is Te Koti, a Maori Wesleyan minister who resided in

¹⁸⁹ M. P. K. Sorrenson, *Manifest Duty: The Polynesian Society Over 100 Years* (Auckland: The Polynesian Society, 1992), pp. 18, 26, 39, 42, 145.

¹⁹⁰ Edward Tregear, *The Aryan Maori* (Christchurch: Kiwi Publishers, 1995).

¹⁹¹ Tregear, *The Aryan Maori*, p. 8.

¹⁹² Edward Tregear, “The Moriori,” *Transactions and Proceedings of the New Zealand Institute* 22, (1989), p. 77.

¹⁹³ *Ibid*, p. 75.

¹⁹⁴ John White, *The Ancient History of the Maori, His Mythology and Traditions: Horo-Uta or Taki-Tumu Migration, Vol. III* (Wellington: Government Printer, 1887), p. 197.

the Chatham Islands for a small period. As Te Koti was Maori his use of Moriori oral tradition was clearly hindered by his own background and the connections he makes between Moriori names and Maori words.¹⁹⁵ This is clear in his use of the name Mamoa (sodden) and linking it to Mamoe (to cook till sodden). Mamoa is a transliteration of Moe, the ancient chief of Moriori oral traditions.¹⁹⁶ By starting with an already biased source White's work loses some credibility. It clearly shows the continued development of the 'Great New Zealand Myth' with Moriori now being set as the original inhabitants of New Zealand.

The earlier sources and their depictions of Moriori have been a major focus for modern scholars. However, it was the development of their ideas within the framework of the Polynesian Society and its members that caused later scholars to demonise almost all works from this period. In doing so more favourable portrayals seem to have been overlooked and the intricacies in developing these ideas have not been discussed. The negative stereotypes of the Moriori people would be reinforced with the creation of the Polynesian Society on 8 January 1892. The society was founded by Stephenson Percy Smith and Edward Tregear with the intention to retrieve, store and publish information regarding the indigenous races of the Pacific. It was believed that because of European colonisation Polynesian populations were declining and eventually would face extinction. The only reasonable action it seemed was to record their histories before they were lost forever.¹⁹⁷ Smith stated in 1898, 'Time was pressing - the old men of the Polynesian race from whom their history could be obtained were fast passing away - civilisation was fast extinguishing what little remained of ancient lore - the people themselves were dying out before the incoming white man.'¹⁹⁸ This was the Society's purpose and what Smith termed their 'manifest duty'.¹⁹⁹

Upon its creation the society had over one-hundred members, among their number was Queen Liliuokalani of Hawai'i, the Society's first patron, the Tongan monarchy also welcomed the creation of the Society. Of the initial one hundred and twelve members only around ten were themselves Polynesian. Two Maori, three Hawaiians and a Samoan have been confirmed as original members but there is little certainty over the ethnicity of others. Many of the original members were not professional ethnographers, anthropologists or historians but were employed in a position that had given them first-hand experience with

¹⁹⁵ White, *The Ancient History*, p. 197.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid, p. 197.

¹⁹⁷ Sorrenson, *Manifest Duty*, p. 24.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid, p. 24.

¹⁹⁹ Ibid, p. 3.

native peoples.²⁰⁰ Although its name suggests an interest solely in Polynesia, the Society's interest ranged into Melanesia and Micronesia as well. Because its headquarters were in New Zealand a large amount of its energy went towards Maori culture and heritage. Many members lived in different parts of Polynesia and it was determined that to help share information the Society would publish a journal.²⁰¹ Another project considered was the creation of a museum. This was never achieved because of the Society's growing ties with museums throughout Polynesia; especially the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum in Honolulu.

During the journals first twenty years numerous articles were published on the Moriori and they all followed the same trend as earlier scholars. This would also pass into the New Zealand school system and teach generations of New Zealanders a derogatory account of Moriori history. It was this account that has caused modern scholars, such as King and Belich, to condemn the work of many Polynesian Society members and largely ignore more favourable portrayals from the same period. Stephenson Percy Smith's articles on the Moriori were originally published in the *Journal of the Polynesian Society* Volumes VII and VIII but in 1904 were published as a single work entitled *Hawaiki: The Original Home of the Maori*.²⁰² Initially Smith links the sparse Moriori art forms to the lack of resources they faced on the Chatham Islands, unlike other Polynesian races they did not have abundant resources.²⁰³ Smith goes on to say, 'Sad to say, we must speak of Moriori in the past time, for there are not more than a dozen pure blood left out of the approximate number of 2,000.'²⁰⁴ This is in line with the thinking of the Society at the time, that Polynesian races would become extinct. He seems to lack any hope of their traditions being taken up by half-caste descendants and believes the races only chance of survival is through pure blood lines. This is a step further than earlier scholars who saw races as sharing common heritage; to Smith the race is hinged on its pureblood members.

Smith discussed the Polynesian notions of an afterlife in which he interprets the Moriori myth of spirits returning for Hawaiki from Te Raki Point in the North West of the islands to the Maori myth of spirits returning to Hawaiki from Cape Reinga and the Hawaiian notion of spirits doing the same at Leina-Kauhane.²⁰⁵ When venturing further Smith's use of oral

²⁰⁰ Sorrenson, *Manifest Duty*, p. 25.

²⁰¹ *Ibid*, p. 25.

²⁰² Stephenson Percy Smith, *Hawaiki: The Original Home of the Maori; With a Sketch of Polynesian History* (Wellington: Whitcombe and Tombs Limited, 1904).

²⁰³ *Ibid*, p. 10-13.

²⁰⁴ *Ibid*, p. 13.

²⁰⁵ *Ibid*, p. 44.

traditions seems to skew the origins of the Moriori. He uses the Moriori oral traditions to determine that they probably arrived at the Chatham Islands from New Zealand, and then supports this with their retaining of various place names in New Zealand, and knowing the names of various flora and fauna.²⁰⁶ Again it must be noted that he is writing at a time when very few Moriori knew these histories unadulterated by Maori traditions and knowledge.

Smith uses this in the wider context of Maori first arriving in New Zealand, where he states they found a peaceful race already inhabiting the islands and that this peaceful group were displaced and fled to the Chatham Islands where they retained their peaceful culture.²⁰⁷ This is another example of the ‘Great Fleet Myth’ developing. Like earlier versions it states Moriori and Maori were both Polynesian but uses oral histories in an attempt to explain why Moriori found themselves on Rekohu. Although this version has gone further and added that the Moriori were part of an earlier people and were forced to migrate. A similar view was adopted by William Pember Reeves in 1898 where he surmised that the Moriori people were displaced by the Maori in a protracted struggle between primitive and civilised races. Pember Reeves states that any attempt to link Maori and Moriori or any other Polynesians to Malay or Indian races was pure guesswork.²⁰⁸

It is in his later work that Smith’s mythical Moriori develops. In the 1903 work “Nuie-fekai (or Savage) Island and its People”²⁰⁹ Smith compared the Moriori and Nuiean language and culture, claimed that they were both of Melanesian origin and remarked that it was possible that they interbred with a Polynesian race at some point; accounting for some of their Polynesian physical attributes.²¹⁰ His later 1910 work would again reflect this hypothesis and he remarked that ‘no one at this date will probably deny that the Morioris represent most closely the ancient *tangata-whenua* of New Zealand.’²¹¹ How the Moriori came to be on the Chatham Islands Smith again attributes to a Maori invasion and the supplanting of one race by a more advanced people. He proposes that this took place during a period of unrest alluded to in Maori oral tradition, which can also be found in the Moriori traditions. However, the

²⁰⁶ Smith, *Hawaiki*, p. 220.

²⁰⁷ *Ibid*, p. 218-220.

²⁰⁸ William Pember Reeves, *The Long White Cloud: (Ao Tea Roa)* (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd, 1924), p. 47-49.

²⁰⁹ Stephenson Percy Smith, *Nuie-fekai (or Savage) Island and its People* (Wellington: Whitcombe and Tombs Limited, 1903).

²¹⁰ *Ibid*, p. 29.

²¹¹ Stephenson Percy Smith, *Maoris of the West Coast: Prior to 1840* (Christchurch: Kiwi Publishers, 1999), p. 22.

Moriōri traditions may have been altered by Maōri influence.²¹² Smith's reliance on these traditions reveals his conclusions are reflections of the views of earlier scholars and their ideas of racial hierarchy.

Smith also recounts the fleeing of the Moriōri from mainland New Zealand in his work *The Lore of the Whare-Wananga*, he states Te Tini-o-Maru-iwi was forced to migrate to the South Island and thence to the Chatham Islands in six canoes.²¹³ This links to Moriōri oral traditions which state they arrived at the Chatham Islands upon six canoes, although in their traditions these canoes arrived some time apart and were warring with each other, not a unified remnant of another race.²¹⁴ Smith's wording of these events reveals the misconception that Maōri already knew where the Chatham Islands were and where the Maruiwi were going. This cannot be the case as Maōri were completely unaware of their existence until after 1791. Like his other works Smith has placed a greater weight on Maōri traditions over Moriōri, an example of racial hierarchy affecting what sources are used as well as the conclusions being presented.

The work of Elsdon Best would take Smith's work further in denigrating Moriōri. Best was born in 1856 and lived most of his young life on the frontier. He was to continue to live on the frontier in his academic life as he worked closely with Maōri in collecting traditions and artefacts for study. Best grew up and matured around Maōri and Pakeha who still had fresh memories of the wars of the 1860s.²¹⁵ In the early years of the Polynesian Society Best wrote a collection of articles widely regarded as a single assessment of Maōri history and warfare. These Best titled *Notes on the Art of War*.²¹⁶ Like Smith, Best focused on using the oral traditions and accounts of Maōri to form a comprehensive history and Best always strove to remain impartial to what he was told. He was quoted as saying 'If you want to gain an insight into the occult lore of the Maōri it is not desirable to go to him as a missionary...treat him as your own folk, whose knowledge exceeds your own and whom you look upon as a master.'²¹⁷ Peter Buck remarked that 'He [Best] was honest to a degree, for when he found archaic terms

²¹² Smith, *Maōris of the West Coast*, p. 71.

²¹³ Stephenson Percy Smith, *Lore of the Whare-Wananga* (Hamilton: University of Waikato Library, 1997), p. 75.

²¹⁴ King, *A People Rediscovered*, p. 18.

²¹⁵ Jeffrey Paparoa Holman, *Best of both Worlds: The Story of Elsdon Best and Tutakangahau* (North Shore: Penguin Group (NZ), 2010), pp. 37, 79.

²¹⁶ Elsdon Best, *Notes on the Art of War: As conducted by the Māōri of New Zealand, with accounts of various customs, rites, superstitions, &c., pertaining to war, as practised and believed in by the ancient Māōri* (Auckland: Reed Publishing (NZ) Ltd, 2001), p. ix.

²¹⁷ Best, *Notes on the Art of War*, p. x.

and expressions in old-time songs and chants that his informants could not explain, he recorded the words but refused to guess at translations.²¹⁸ With praise such as this it would be expected that Best's work on the Maori and Moriori would be reliable but treatment of Moriori degraded them to the position of a mere remnant of a mythic race.

Best comments that the 'Maruiwi' tribe were driven from the Waimana district for slaying a Maori child.²¹⁹ Other stories are presented where a Maori captive and his son escape the Maruiwi with trickery or when a group of warriors outsmart the Maruiwi in combat.²²⁰ Best then describes the decimation of this tribe and their eventual disappearance. It is in a later article for the *Society Journal* that Best ties the Maruiwi tribe and the Moriori together as, supposedly, one and the same people. Best remarks that the Maruiwi must have been a lower form of people, as when the Maori arrived they found the Maruiwi had not preserved their lineages and constructed only crude housing.²²¹ Maruiwi words were preserved in some traditions and Best uses these words to create a link with the Moriori. 'Kohi mai' (Come hither) is one such term and Best says this is the same term and meaning used by Moriori.²²² While Best never uses phrases such as 'inferior' or 'lesser' the connotations of inferiority that are produced by linking the Maruiwi to Moriori undoubtedly reinforced a negative view of Moriori, especially within academic circles where Best was well respected. Other Polynesian races did not receive this harsh treatment from Best. This is remarkably similar to the work Smith was producing utilising oral traditions to prove racial hierarchies and the inferiority of Moriori through the 'Great New Zealand' myth which had been in development throughout the last century of scholarship.

The Dominion Museum's Bulletin No. 7 included a large work by Best titled 'The Maori Canoe.'²²³ Here appears Best's first description on the Moriori and not their ancestry. He describes Moriori canoes as a 'rude craft composed of flax-stalks, fern-stalks, and seaweed

²¹⁸ Te Rangi Hiroa (Peter Buck), 'The Late Elsdon Best', *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, vol. 41 (1932), p. 20.

²¹⁹ Best, *Notes on the Art of War*, p. 4.

²²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 120, 200.

²²¹ Elsdon Best, "Maori and Maruiwi: Notes on the Original Inhabitants of New Zealand and their Culture; on the Question of how that Culture affected the Later-coming Maori; and on the Existence in these Isles of Customs, Arts, an Artifacts not traceable to Polynesia," *Transactions and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 48, (1915), p. 436.

²²² *Ibid.*, p. 438.

²²³ Elsdon Best, *The Maori Canoe: An Account of Various Types of Vessels used by the Maori of New Zealand in Former Times, with some Description of those of the Isles of the Pacific, and a Brief Account of the Peopling of New Zealand* (Wellington: W. A. G. Skinner Government Printer Board of Maori Ethnological Research, 1925).

built up on a timber keel.’²²⁴ In the section on Moriori canoes, however, Best utilises the work of Alexander Shand and relies on his conclusions. He also uses the work of Lieutenant Broughton which offers a seemingly unprejudiced opinion being a simple record. The ancestors of the Moriori used larger seaworthy canoes and Best takes this into consideration, saying the Moriori canoes are an ‘illustration of how new forms may be invented under the stern law of necessity.’²²⁵ He acknowledges that these craft, which he evidently does not think highly of in comparison to Maori craft, are a product of necessity and not due to cultural degeneration. These views are still in line with Best’s previous works and the work of his associate Smith.

Maori Religion and Mythology Part 2 was set to be published in the Dominion Museum Bulletin at the end of 1929 but it remained unpublished at the time of Best’s death in 1931.²²⁶ The book discusses Moriori beliefs, including the linguistic difference between names such as Hine-nui-te-Po who Moriori called Rohe.²²⁷ Best even dispels the Moriori notion of punishment in the afterlife for wrongdoers as a late development brought about by missionary influence. This version of life after death is not seen elsewhere in Moriori traditions, so Best is making an observation here that is not fallacious.²²⁸ This account of Moriori may be due to the influence of Alexander Shand’s research. When discussing the Maui myths in Maori tradition and their counterparts in Moriori tradition Best discloses that he used the versions of these myths as recorded by Shand.²²⁹ However, when referring to the Maruiwi in Maori legend he uses terms such as ‘refugees’ which have negative connotations and although he does not link Maruiwi and Moriori in this work it is already an established part of his thought process.²³⁰ Best’s linking of Maruiwi and Moriori conjured an image of an inferior Moriori in relation to Maori and handing down a mythic basis to the work of other scholars. As he merely developed the myth formed by Smith and earlier writers, Best has not received as harsher reviews in modern works. Yet his refusal to deviate from the myth and his adding of several elements still contributed to the hostile view of Moriori.

²²⁴ Best, *The Maori Canoe*, p. 143.

²²⁵ *Ibid*, p. 148.

²²⁶ Elsdon Best, *Maori Religion and Mythology: Being An Account of the Cosmogony, Anthropogeny, Religious Beliefs and Rites, Magic and Folk Lore of the Maori Folk of New Zealand Part 2* (Wellington: Te Papa Press, 2005), p. 10.

²²⁷ *Ibid*, p. 73.

²²⁸ *Ibid*, p. 73.

²²⁹ *Ibid*, p. 351.

²³⁰ *Ibid*, p. 466.

Between 1915-1922 the *Journal of the Polynesian Society* published articles authored by South Islander and amateur ethnologist and anthropologist James Herries Beattie. The Publisher's preface to *Traditions and Legends of the South Island Maori* recorded Beattie's main area of interest as Southland and Otago in the lower South Island and observing the Maori and pre-Maori culture in those areas.²³¹ Initially it would seem that Beattie's small notes on the Moriori within his work attempt to create an overview of the origins of the Moriori. Upon closer inspection it is revealed that his work is overwhelmingly influenced by Stephenson Percy Smith. Beattie's small passage on the differences between names in the Southern and Northern Island Maori traditions is compared to the difference between Hawaiian and Moriori words when juxtaposed with Maori equivalents.²³² He states at the start of this section that 'Mr S. Percy Smith writes to me that...'²³³ showing clearly where he retrieved his information. Beattie also utilises the same oral traditions seen in Smith's work, where the Moriori are forcibly removed from the mainland. The original editor of these articles when they were published by the Polynesian Society was Smith himself who felt it prudent to add numerous 'editors' notes' throughout.

As Beattie recounts the landing of various Maori leaders in the South Island Smith interjects and states that 'these descendants of Rakaihautu were probably of the same branch as the Moriori, i.e. with a Melanesian element in them.'²³⁴ A later editor's note remarks how strange it is that a certain Maori legend is known to both the natives of Manihiki Island off Rarotonga and the Moriori.²³⁵ While these notes are not written by Beattie and should not be considered his work they demonstrate the trust Beattie had in the work of Smith and how far reaching information from Smith was. It can also explain why modern scholars have viewed most of the sources from this period critically.

Possibly the most significant work from this period was *The Morioris of Chatham Islands* written by H. D. Skinner. This work has received some attention from modern scholars such as King but because of the large number of harsher portrayals of Moriori Skinner has been neglected and pushed aside in many works. With the exception of the publications of Alexander Shand, Skinner's work, published in 1923, is the earliest to focus solely on the Moriori people and offer a survey of their culture. The starkest part of the work is the

²³¹ James Herries Beattie, *Traditions and Legends of the South Island Maori: Collected from Natives of Murihiku (Southland, New Zealand)* (Christchurch: Cadsonbury Publications, 2004), p. iii.

²³² Ibid, p. 86.

²³³ Ibid, p. 86.

²³⁴ Ibid, p. 104.

²³⁵ Ibid, p. 196.

introduction in which Skinner states ‘My attention was first turned to the material culture of the Morioris about the year 1906. The view that then prevailed in New Zealand, a view which has been supported by the weighty authority of Percy Smith ..., was that the ancestors of the Morioris were representatives of the earliest ethnic wave into New Zealand...’²³⁶ Skinner has observed that such a view was supported by one of the most respected scholars of the time and further remarks that if that viewpoint was correct then the Moriori were the most important material culture for those studying New Zealand. However, he makes a bold statement and rejects this interpretation of events. Skinner states that while Moriori traditions have become vague and much has been lost it does not make the traditional Maori telling of Moriori origins any more definitive. He comments that the Maori tradition calling the first people primitive may have influenced scholars to label the Moriori culture as primitive. He asserts Moriori culture is only simpler, not more primitive, than Maori culture.²³⁷

Skinner is careful to not repudiate the work of Best and Smith. In his first chapter he includes two origin stories, a Moriori account, which he admits is based on resources collected by Alexander Shand, and a Maori account compiled by T. Whatahoro which was supported by Best and Smith. Although he only brushes over this version enough to give due credit to those he calls his ‘friends to whom I [Skinner] owe much.’²³⁸ Skinner is acknowledging the work of previous scholars but he has not taken on any of their cultural or racial prejudices. He instead proceeds to dismantle the Maori tradition saying it would have been unlikely for a Melanesian fishing boat to have taken aboard women and abundant supplies for a trip between Melanesia and New Zealand.

The physical appearance of Maruiwi and Moriori in the Maori tradition compiled by Whatahoro called them ‘very dark-skinned folk of repulsive appearance, tall, spare, and spindle-shanked, having flat noses, with up-turned nostrils... they had curious eyes...An idle folk and chilly...They did not preserve their traditions as we do.’²³⁹ The same source also states that ‘On account of their peculiarities, our ancestors called them *kiri whakapapa* and *pakiwhara*... The last that was seen of them were six canoes which were observed passing through Cook Strait on their way to Wharekauri.’²⁴⁰ Skinner dismantles Whatahoro’s tradition stating the name Wharekauri was used by mistake in the early 1830s and was not

²³⁶ H. D. Skinner, *The Morioris of Chatham Islands* (Honolulu: Bernice P. Bishop Museum, 1923), p. 3.

²³⁷ *Ibid*, p. 3.

²³⁸ *Ibid*, p. 17.

²³⁹ *Ibid*, p. 18.

²⁴⁰ *Ibid*, p. 18.

part of the original tradition. The names *kiri whakapapa* and *pakiwhara* are modern nicknames given to the Moriori after the invasion of the Chatham Islands in 1835, therefore the Maori tradition has changed and should not be considered a reliable source.²⁴¹

Skinner additionally indicates that the Maori description of Maruiwi does not show any likeness to Moriori and that the Moriori have numerous references to cultivated plants in their language while the Maruiwi were said to never cultivate.²⁴² Unlike many others, who mentioned Moriori dwellings as a primitive lean-to structure, Skinner describes the various types of house the Moriori built and speculates that some rectangular houses must have been of a considerable size to accommodate the ceremonies that were held there.²⁴³ No other scholar had yet mentioned these other forms of dwelling and those omissions would help maintain a façade of Moriori primitive life. Skinner's work was a direct contradiction to previous findings and his refusal to use Maori traditions as a source also called into question the conclusions of his colleagues Best and Smith. His work did not follow the trend identifying Moriori as ethnically and culturally inferior to Maori, this can also be attributed to his use of the work of Shand and not that of members of the Polynesian Society. What may have also contributed to Skinner's fresh outlook is that he met Moriori first hand, unlike Best. Skinner does not seek to glorify the Moriori and degrade other Polynesian groups in a racial hierarchy.

After the publishing of Skinner's work some smaller articles that supported his position appeared in the *Journal of the Polynesian Society*. These articles viewed Shand and Skinner as the most reliable sources. One author, W. J. Phillipps, wrote on the nature of Moriori burial chests or *hakana* of which, it was suspected, only one example still survived. This short article merely states the dimensions of the chest and theorises that the protruding ends could be hands or representative of the end of a canoe.²⁴⁴ The use of Skinner and Shand's work was to determine whether their observations held true for this specimen. Concerning Skinner, Phillipps states that the samples Skinner used were smaller and possibly of a different era as they only had one arm. Shand is quoted as saying 'The bodies of the dead were always placed in internment facing the west, as the way back to Hawaiki...the direction

²⁴¹ Skinner, *The Morioris*, p. 18.

²⁴² *Ibid*, p. 19.

²⁴³ *Ibid*, p. 75.

²⁴⁴ W. J. Phillipps, "The Moriori Hakana or Burial Chest," *The Journal of the Polynesian Society: Containing the Transactions and Proceedings of the Society* 34, no. 134 (1925), p. 181.

from which the canoes came.’²⁴⁵ This is what Phillipps used to justify theorising the chest is intended to look like some form of spiritual canoe. There is no mention of race in this article and the use of Skinner and Shand’s works has blocked out many of the comments on Moriori carving and building found in Smith and Best’s work.

Another article to arise in the *Journal of the Polynesian Society* in this period was “Maruiwi, Maori and Moriori” by T. W. Downes, an amateur ethnologist and river works supervisor. His initial statements sum up the oral traditions collected by Best and Smith, among others, and he does not omit that there are conflicting versions of these traditions. Regarding the name Maruiwi used by Best, Downes states that the name possibly comes from the Maori sources Best used or the traditions themselves which recognise Maruiwi as an ancestor of the pre-Maori inhabitants.²⁴⁶ He raises a point made by Skinner that it would be foolish to accept all of these traditions as historical fact although he mentions Skinner as saying that they are an invaluable source that has huge historical significance.²⁴⁷ He then asks the question, ‘was there Melanesian blood in the Maruiwi tribes?- and if so was it passed on to the Moriori?’²⁴⁸ Downes seems to support the proposition that they were Melanesian. He recounts the works of Best, Smith, Baucke, Travers and Skinner which all support the Melanesian strain.

Downes does recognise that Skinner only touched on this subject before attempting to disprove it. Downes describes Skinner’s work as misleading stating that Shand had described two different Moriori groups, although Shand never defined these groups along racial lines. Downes also asserts that Skinner made a mistake in his work in that only Shand made this comparison, yet within the same work Downes states that both Best and Smith did as well, contradicting himself.²⁴⁹ The work of Best and Smith and the earlier scholars who influenced them was far reaching and continued to sway younger generations of scholars even after new evidence and theories had come forward.

Skinner’s theory that early moa-hunters were Tahitian and therefore Polynesian in origin is criticised by Downes stating ‘I contend that this theory is of little value.’²⁵⁰ He concedes his own lack of knowledge on the topic of Moriori origins when discussing Skinner’s work further and being unable to determine whether the Maruiwi were Melanesian or Polynesian.

²⁴⁵ Phillipps, “The Moriori Hakana,” p. 181.

²⁴⁶ T. W. Downes, “Maruiwi, Maori and Moriori,” *The Journal of the Polynesian Society: Containing the Transactions and Proceedings of the Society* 42, no. 167 (1933), pp. 156-157.

²⁴⁷ Ibid, p. 158.

²⁴⁸ Ibid, p. 159.

²⁴⁹ Ibid, pp. 162-163

²⁵⁰ Ibid, p. 165.

Yet Downes quotes a line attributed to Toi which says ‘You are strangers to this land and to us.’²⁵¹ Which he asserts clearly shows the people were from different origins. The conclusion Downes arrives at, is that the Maruiwi-Melanesian origin is not proven, but that it stands up against the evidence thrown at it by Skinner. His work is a conglomeration of ideas from Smith, Best and others who supported their theories and relies on the oral traditions of Maori sources rather than Moriori traditions or physical evidence. These smaller articles began an incredibly one-sided dialogue where Skinner and his supporters were easily overwhelmed by other works. Although they still endured, modern scholars, while acknowledging Skinner’s work, have not acknowledged its importance in completely refuting the ideas left by popular scholars such as Best and Smith.

The anthropologists, ethnologists, ethnographers and other scholars who studied the Moriori throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth century contributed to an increasingly negative understanding of Moriori culture and origins. They emphasised the cultural differences between Moriori and other Polynesians, mostly Maori, and bolstered the idea that Moriori were culturally and ethnically inferior to Maori. This also reinforced the older views of settlers on and off the Chatham Islands. The work of Shortland and Thomson featured the racial hierarchies typical of European scholarship at the time. The work of Travers began a dependence on Maori oral traditions that continued through the work of Smith and Best. These two cemented the myth of Moriori being a pre-Maori Melanesian race and continued to portray Moriori as inferior in relation to other Polynesians. Their work had far reaching effects through academic circles such as the Polynesian Society and influenced future scholars such as Beattie and Downes, whose works overshadowed those of others who gave differing portrayals of Moriori culture. They also solidified the desire from scholars to trust oral traditions and their rendition of events, which would only be seriously challenged by H. D. Skinner.

²⁵¹ Downes, “Maruiwi, Maori and Moriori,” p. 165.

Chapter Five: The Recovery, 1940-1989

In the space of little over a century the Moriori people had been attacked, brutalised, enslaved and cannibalised. The scholarship focusing on their culture and origin had beaten them down and portrayed them as nothing more than a racial cul-de-sac in the development of the ‘superior’ Maori people. This chapter will observe the change in scholarly works in their portrayal of Moriori and how a schism created a two school system after this change. This schism will show that the unfavourable literature King alluded to did exist but was not an unstoppable force. The eventual fading of the ideas left by older scholars in light of archaeological evidence will support this. The unfavourable portrayals of Moriori and the conclusions of scholars may be explained by the racial and cultural views present at the time the scholars were writing rather than on empirical evidence. Having no help for their cause and being classed as culturally and ethnically inferior the Moriori were perceived as extinct when the last full blooded member of their race, Tommy Solomon, died in 1933.²⁵²

There were others that had been expected to take up the mantle of the Moriori cause. Of these men Rakete Tipene, Joe Ashton and Joe Mapu had died in the years leading up to Solomon’s passing. Tamihana Heta, another well-known Moriori identity passed away in 1934 and three of his sons had predeceased him in a boating accident in 1931. Bill Davis left the Chatham Islands permanently in the Second World War and a son of Joe Ashton was killed during that conflict.²⁵³ Arthur Lockett, a three-quarter Moriori who took Tommy Solomon’s place as a magnet for scholars interested in the Moriori, died childless in 1957.²⁵⁴ This period took a serious toll on the Moriori as a people and effectively ended Moriori working as a cohesive unit to preserve their heritage and customs. The interest in the Moriori as a topic of study had slowed, many felt that what could be collected on the Moriori had been completed and as they were ‘extinct’ no new information would ever arise, although there were still scholars who dedicated their time to the Moriori history. A glimmer of hope emerged in the scholarship after 1940 and building over the next five decades culminated in Michael King’s 1989 work *Moriori: A People Rediscovered*.

²⁵² King, *Moriori: A People Rediscovered*, p. 186.

²⁵³ *Ibid*, p. 187.

²⁵⁴ *Ibid*, p. 187.

A major schism appeared amongst these scholars and a two school system developed. The older school was represented by scholars whose works continued the older portrayal of Moriori. These scholars based their writing on ideas left by Elsdon Best and Stephenson Percy Smith. To think that the theories of the last century had simply disappeared or would not influence others would be unwise. The new school began to challenge the analysis of the events on the Chatham Islands as presented by Best, Smith and others. These men were contemporaries of Best and Smith and many were members of the Polynesian Society who were not just refuting the work of other scholars but the work of close friends and associates. The use of oral histories as evidence for ethnological, anthropological and historical debates also began to wane as scholars in the new school ceased to use these alone and instead used them in conjunction with other sources. Te Rangi Hiroa, Alfred Reed and many others all wrote within this school. Meanwhile the use of oral histories within the old school continued and as a consequence the old school barely altered the conclusions of Smith and Best.

The centenary of the Treaty of Waitangi was celebrated in 1940 and the views espoused by Smith were still very much alive amongst the general public. This includes public opinions in newspapers and speeches made at special events. In the Bay of Plenty a memorial obelisk was unveiled by the Centennial Committee to mark the centenary.²⁵⁵ At the ceremony the Minister for Native Affairs Frank Langstone recounted the history of Maori exploration in New Zealand, including the work of Toi and Whatonga. He said these early Maori found an indigenous population already in New Zealand and that they ‘married these simple folk and this was the origin of the mixed tribes.’²⁵⁶ His description of these people as ‘simple’ carried with it connotations of inferiority and reveals the enduring influence of Smith’s work outside of academic circles. In the same year, Dorothy Wiseman wrote a small biography of Edward Baucke, focusing on his early life in the Chatham Islands. Wiseman does not delve deeply into the history of the Moriori, only mentioning their history following the invasion of 1835 while placing an emphasis on their peaceful culture and custom of one-on-one combat to settle tribal disputes.²⁵⁷ Wiseman makes no mention of the Moriori being an inferior people but does state ‘that the fierce and warlike Maoris found them easy victims!’²⁵⁸ This does not allude to any of Smith or Best’s work and it is an extremely short excerpt in a much larger

²⁵⁵ William Renwick, “Commemorating other Places and Days,” in *Creating a National Spirit: Celebrating New Zealand’s Centennial*, ed. William Renwick, 112-127 (Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2004), p. 113.

²⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 114.

²⁵⁷ Dorothy Wiseman, “Early days in the Chatham Islands: The Son of a Missionary Looks Back,” *The New Zealand Railways Magazine* 14, no. 10 (1940), pp. 28-29.

²⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 29.

article. However, it demonstrates that while the views of Smith and Best were still an impressive force other views were being published, although not always as large works. These smaller excerpts have been largely ignored by modern scholars, unless they have been used to demonstrate the ingrained hostile portrayal of Moriori by the public.

As with all scholarship new ideas would slowly appear, encroach and overtake older ideas either by offering a conflicting view or building their research further. However, Smith and Best were such popular authors their works were constantly being reissued, reprinted and correlated into new collections. In 1942, eleven years after Best's death in 1931, numerous articles that he had contributed to the Dominion Museum and the Polynesian Society printed as a single volume, and republished in 1977.²⁵⁹ Another of Best's works *The Maori Division of Time* was republished in 1959.²⁶⁰ These republished works did not contain the scolding review of the Moriori found in Best's other works. The first volume mentioned a Moriori legend of a large bird inhabiting the Chatham Islands; it then compares the legends of this bird to Maori legends of the Moa on the mainland.²⁶¹ *The Maori Division of Time* lists the Moriori names for various stages of the moon; the list was initially compiled by Alexander Shand. Best's comments on the list do not show his usual perspective, instead he remarks on the curious nature of the Moriori language in comparison to Maori and the difference between their names for the stages of the moon. Most of the work being republished focuses on the Maori and not the Moriori. While Best's works may be enduring, his views on the Moriori are not. This would allow newer or more favourable views of Moriori to take the place of Best's work, although his work would still be accepted as part of the zeitgeist of the 1890s to 1920s.

The first scholar with a connection to the Polynesian Society to work on the Moriori in the 1940s was Te Rangi Hiroa, also known as Peter Buck. His work has been a focus of modern sources and his view of Moriori could be seen as favourable, although he does not attempt to dispel the denigrating views of Moriori held by others. Buck was in residence at the Bernice P. Bishop Museum in Honolulu but that did not disconnect him from other scholars. He kept a lengthy contact with Apirana Ngata and his own work steadily found its way into the *Journal of the Polynesian Society*. *An Introduction to Polynesian Anthropology* was

²⁵⁹ Elsdon Best, *Forest Lore of the Moari: With Methods of Snaring, Trapping, and Preserving Birds and Rats, Uses of Berries, Roots, Fern-root, and Forest Products, with Mythological Notes on Origins, Karakia Used Etc* (Wellington: E. C. Keating Government Printer, 1977).

²⁶⁰ Elsdon Best, *The Maori Division of Time* (Wellington: R. E. Owen, Government Printer, 1959).

²⁶¹ Best, *Forest Lore of the Moari*, p. 124.

published in 1945 and offers less than a page concerning the Moriori. Buck begins by stating the island was too cold for the sweet potato and other Polynesian plants offering an explanation as to the lack of cultivation by Moriori.²⁶² When concerning the Moriori directly Buck states ‘The people and the language were Polynesian. Some statements as to Melanesian affinities are disproved by the skeletal material.’²⁶³ This is the polar opposite of Smith and Best’s stances. Buck supported his claims through physical evidence, however, he does still utilise the oral traditions to pinpoint the date of settlement by Moriori, which he places before the later migration to New Zealand, around 1350. This shows how the scholarship concerning the Moriori was changing in comparison to earlier views.

When discussing Moriori canoes Buck’s wording is noteworthy. He states that ‘suitable trees for canoes were lacking, and the people were reduced to making rafts from bundles of the dry flower stalks of the native flax.’²⁶⁴ He states it was the lack of resources that caused Moriori to build their canoes out of reeds, not an inferior biology as so many others had suggested. Buck drew attention to the similarities between Moriori and other Polynesian artefacts in 1944 for the Bernice P. Bishop Museum Bulletin. Here he noted the Moriori adze had two nodules on the head of the tool and that this was similar to that seen in Uvea, Rarotonga and in a less obvious form in the South Island of New Zealand. Many of the samples he gives are cited as first being noticed by H. D. Skinner.²⁶⁵

Buck’s short word on the future of the Moriori is the most contrasting to earlier works. Unlike others he does not state that the Moriori became extinct with the death of Tommy Solomon, although he does say Solomon was the last full blooded Moriori, but that intermarriage had taken place with the invading Maori tribes and their descendants. Recognising the descendants as part Moriori and therefore continuing the legacy of their ancestors is significant considering most scholars had given up the Moriori for extinct.²⁶⁶ Buck doesn’t offer any judgements on the works of others. However, he places an emphasis on the works of Alexander Shand and H. D. Skinner citing them as valuable memoirs and collections of first-hand accounts. The works of Smith and Best are also cited but only as sources for Skinner and Shand. Skeletal material collected by Professor John H. Scott is noted as a valuable also. Buck placed an emphasis on physical evidence and works of those

²⁶² Peter Buck, *An Introduction to Polynesian Anthropology* (Honolulu: Bishop Museum, 1945), p. 112.

²⁶³ *Ibid*, p. 112.

²⁶⁴ *Ibid*, p. 112.

²⁶⁵ Te Rangi Hiroa, *Arts and Crafts of the Cook Islands* (Honolulu: Kraus Reprint Co., 1971), p. 155.

²⁶⁶ Buck, *An Introduction to Polynesian Anthropology*, p. 112.

who knew Moriori or studied their culture as an anthropologist rather than the work of ethnologists who focused almost exclusively on oral tradition. Buck has still utilised the oral traditions but only in so much that it supports physical evidence.

Arguably Buck's most significant work was *The Coming of the Maori* which encapsulated the arguments used to debunk Smith and Best previous works and the works of later writers. Buck begins with the 'Tangata Whenua' the supposed pre-Maori race. Here he uses the term Maruiwi but only as the name for a Chief, not a name for the entire race. This was where it was believed Best found the term for his pre-Maori people.²⁶⁷ Buck includes a segment on the Moriori within his first chapter as he argues 'traditional and genealogical evidence points to their having left New Zealand before the arrival of the Fleet in 1350.'²⁶⁸ Because of this, like Smith and Best, Buck regards the Moriori as the closest pure descendants of the first people. However, he does not assign them the same Melanesian origins that others argued. The genealogies of Moriori traditions recorded by Shand began with Tu, Rongo, Tane and Tangaroa, who were all deities in Moriori culture and wider Polynesia. Buck argues that this genealogical evidence points to central Polynesia being the original home of Moriori, not Melanesia.²⁶⁹ Buck is again using Shand as a source over Smith or Best and is using Moriori culture as a focus of his study rather than biology or race.

The treatment of Moriori housing was identified as unfair by Buck who states that while their primary habitation was a lean-to this structure was designed to be temporary and more permanent rectangular structures, similar to Maori roofed store pits, were also built.²⁷⁰ Buck's source for this statement was Skinner, as neither Smith nor Best cover Moriori housing extensively, other than declaring the lean-to the product of an inferior Melanesian culture. The Melanesian argument was one that Buck was careful to disprove, ensuring that both physical and genealogical evidence was used. He also proffered an explanation as to why the argument gained traction in the first place. He attributed the origin of this myth to a Maori house of learning which described the early peoples as dark, with flat noses and thin calves. Although it continued by stating these peoples had straight hair which Buck contends could not be found in any Melanesian peoples today.²⁷¹ Hence when scholars declared Melanesian traits in Moriori it was accepted as confirmation of the myth. Further evidence was

²⁶⁷ Peter Buck, *The Coming of the Maori* (Wellington: Whitcoulls Limited, 1949), p. 10.

²⁶⁸ *Ibid*, p. 13.

²⁶⁹ *Ibid*, p. 18.

²⁷⁰ *Ibid*, pp. 114-115.

²⁷¹ *Ibid*, p. 65.

dolichocephalic skulls (elongated skulls) which many scholars accepted as traits of Melanesians, but Buck points out the trait could easily be found throughout the Pacific, including in Maori.²⁷² Buck's portrayal of Moriori is more focused on Moriori culture than on hierarchical comparisons. This would be expected as many of his sources came from Shand and Skinner's works. However, the lingering sentiments of Smith's work are still the focus for most scholars.

The traditions used by Smith came from Hoani Te Whatahoro who in turn acquired them from Matorohanga, a tohunga from Ngati Kahungunu. The story of Kahu, as presented by Matorohanga, included information that did not arise until after the invasion in 1835 and the rest, Buck claims, is too convenient. David Simmons and Bruce Briggs who partially defended Smith's usage of these traditions did admit that the original documents spent fifty years in the possession of Te Whatahoro and then were selected by the Tāne-nui-a-rangi council along with two other accounts to be sent to the Dominion Museum.²⁷³ According to these traditions the Maori name for the Chatham Islands, Wharekauri, was coined after Kahu the first visitor to the islands arrived and built a house out of Kauri, hence the name meaning 'house of Kauri'. However, the name Wharekauri was only first mentioned when two members of Ngati Tama and Ngati Mutunga returned from the islands to the North Island.²⁷⁴ It was also well known that Matorohanga exchanged information freely with the Taranaki tribes, so that name came from a Taranaki source and was added to the tradition much later than previously thought.

Another source of Matorohanga's traditions were two Whanganui chiefs who said that an ancestor of theirs, Akaaroroa travelled to the Chatham Islands and remained there. But four generations later his descendant, Te Hautehoro, built a canoe and returned to Whanganui and resettled there. This tale cannot have been true purely due to the fact that the Chatham Islands offered no resources to build a canoe that could survive a journey to New Zealand. Buck states this 'imposes another burden on our credulity.'²⁷⁵ Buck's work not only moved away from the myths proposed by the older school of Smith and Best, he based most of his findings on Skinner and Shand, but also went about systematically dismantling their arguments through careful analysis of their sources. His other sources delved into Moriori material,

²⁷² Buck, *The Coming of the Maori*, p. 70.

²⁷³ D. Simmons, B. Briggs, "The Sources of 'The Lore of the Whare-Wānanga,'" *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 79, no. 1, p. 24, pp. 22-42.

²⁷⁴ Buck, *The Coming of the Maori*, p. 17.

²⁷⁵ *Ibid*, p. 18.

culture and the resources available to them as explanation of their differences to other Polynesians rather than pointing to biological traits as proof of racial inferiority.

For all Buck's effort there were still those who were continuing to use the 'Great Fleet Myth' as a definitive account of Moriori origins even while Buck was endeavouring to show it was fictitious, A. H. Reed was one such scholar. Reed himself was an outspoken Christian but found a career as a publisher and entrepreneur with an interest in the histories and biographies of Missionaries. His company managed to procure the publishing rights to James Cowan's work and this inspired Reed to branch into authorship in 1935.²⁷⁶ One of his early works, published in 1945, was written as a complete history of New Zealand. The Moriori only feature in a single paragraph in the description of the early history of the Maori. Reed follows the same general story as Best and Smith referring to a pre-Maori people as 'the Tangata-whenua, or Morioris, who were not a warlike people...'²⁷⁷ The Moriori, according to Reed, then set out in their canoes for the Chatham Islands. He makes no mention of the invasion, instead stating they dwindled in numbers and intermarried with Maori. He ends by referring to the Moriori as extinct.²⁷⁸ His 1946 work *Myths and Legends of Maoriand* becomes more intimate with the views of Smith. He referred to the Moriori as of Melanesian origin and described them as shiftless and despised being quickly exterminated by the Polynesians who arrived after them.²⁷⁹ Reed's work is a reflection of the earlier myth based works of Smith and offers no aid to the rejuvenation of the Moriori historiography.

Roger Duff was born in 1912 and completed a BA in 1935 at Otago University where he studied anthropology under the tutelage of H. D. Skinner. Since anthropology was not available for postgraduate study Duff completed his MA with education as the major and his thesis topic, the sociology of the Tuahiwi Maori, revealed a keen interest in Maori and their history.²⁸⁰ It is Duff's work that truly created the schism in scholarship on the Moriori with the impact of his work helping to change portrayals of Moriori. In his 1950 work, *The Moa-hunter Period of Maori Culture* Duff's first use of the term Moriori is to cite his objections to the hijacking of the name 'which to the man on the street has come to mean the tribes

²⁷⁶ Dennis McEldowney, "Publishing, Patronage, Literary Magazines," in *The Oxford History of New Zealand Literature in English*, ed. Terry Sturm, 545-600 (Auckland: Oxford University Press, 1991), pp. 566, 580.

²⁷⁷ A. H. Reed, *The Story of New Zealand* (Wellington: A. H. Reed & A. W. Reed Publishers, 1955), p. 35.

²⁷⁸ *Ibid*, p. 35.

²⁷⁹ A. H. Reed, *Myths and Legends of Maoriand* (Wellington: A. H. Reed and A. W. Reed Publishers, 1946), p. 117.

²⁸⁰ Janet Davidson. 'Duff, Roger Shepherd', from the Dictionary of New Zealand Biography. Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand, updated 7-Jun-2013
URL: <http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/biographies/5d27/duff-roger-shepherd>

immediately preceding the Fleet, but almost invariably with the implication that they were an inferior Melanesian people who thoroughly deserved their fate.²⁸¹ Duff indicated the effect that previous scholarship had had on the term Moriori and the connotations of inferiority that had been tethered to the name Moriori. Another objection Duff had was that no Maori traditions from before the 1835 invasion mention the Chatham Islands or their inhabitants, so the term Moriori must have been a recent development. While this is a different view to previous scholarship Duff states that the Moriori culture was only identifiable between 1791 and 1835 and he believed that the term Moriori must be used for only this people during this time alienating their descendants.²⁸²

The work of Smith and Best is briefly addressed by Duff and he portrays them as the twisters of Maori traditions whose conclusions were long disproven by the work of Skinner. Using Skinner as a basis for his argument Duff stated the Moriori culture was undeniably Polynesian and theorised that the South Island and Cook Strait shores of the North Island were all part of a separate ‘Southern culture.’²⁸³ Moriori genealogical traditions from before 1835 make no mention of the Fleet or any of the canoe names while South Island traditions do. However, both traditions contained Kahu who supposedly attempted to introduce the kumara to the Chatham Islands. The last moment of contact between the Chatham Islands and New Zealand had to have been before the Fleet’s arrival. These commonalities, according to Duff, reveal the shared origin of South Island Maori and Moriori and that the Moriori are distinctly Polynesian with an isolated development of culture.²⁸⁴

Duff’s work references the original inhabitants of New Zealand whom he names the ‘Moa-hunters’. They take the place of the original ‘Tangata Whenua’ discussed by Smith and Best, although Duff clearly remarks ‘that the culture does not in any way support the theory of the alleged Maruiwi migration from a Melanesian or even Western Polynesian source.’²⁸⁵ A review of Smith and Best is given in a later chapter. Duff explains that the largest priority of most research into the origins of the Maori, at his time of writing, was to show that the early settlers were not Melanesian. He clearly blames Best for this as he states ‘since Best (1915) gave an unfortunate twist to the Maori legends of these people, spreading the belief that they

²⁸¹ Roger Duff, *The Moa-Hunter Period of Maori Culture* (Wellington: E.C. Keating, Government Printer, 1950), p. 14.

²⁸² Ibid, p. 14

²⁸³ Ibid, p. 265.

²⁸⁴ Ibid, pp. 17-18.

²⁸⁵ Ibid, p. 7.

were of Melanesian type...²⁸⁶ Alternatively Skinner is praised for his work in the Otago region and his leadership in academic circles as they were started ‘in a decade when the effects of Best’s and Smith’s unfortunate introduction of the belief in Melanesian first settlers still hung like a cloud over New Zealand ethnography.’²⁸⁷ Smith’s reliance on Whatahoro and Matorohanga is called into question when Duff describes the accounts of Maori genealogies they provided as ‘controversial’. Duff is dissatisfied with Smith’s account of where these genealogies originated from as he states they were hitherto unshared with Europeans. However, J. M. Jury, a European and father of Whatahoro, was clearly given this information as early as 1840.²⁸⁸ Duff’s work clearly worked against the continuing influence of the old school and was a driving force in rehabilitating Moriori. However, many modern scholars have not acknowledged how his work debunked the myths of Smith nor how he built on the works of Buck to bring the favourable portrayal of Moriori to the forefront of scholarship.

In education the momentum of Smith’s ‘Great New Zealand Myth’ in the 1916 School Journal carried the idea into its second generation and no new school publications halted its advance. The Post-Primary School Bulletin of 1951 focused on the first arrivals in New Zealand, although purely in relation to the Maori with no mention of the Moriori. ‘We can say with some confidence that the first inhabitants of New Zealand were ancestors of the Maori as we know him.’²⁸⁹ It is accepted that this was neither an academic article nor a large work by any means, the glossing over of the early inhabitants of New Zealand does not show any attempt at a comprehensive explanation of the history of Maori and it also removes any link to the Moriori.

The decade of the 1970s showed clearly that the on-going struggle of Moriori identity was being split between academics, who now largely supported the view of Moriori as a Polynesian people, and the public who for almost three generations had learnt of Moriori as an inferior pre-Maori Melanesian race. This is best exemplified in an article to the *New Zealand Listener* by Hilda Phillips. Phillips was arguing against what she saw as racially based laws designed to give privilege to Maori land owners, whom she believes do not exist as there are ‘less than 200 full-blooded Maoris in New Zealand today- of a total population of

²⁸⁶ Duff, *The Moa-Hunter Period*, p. 264.

²⁸⁷ Ibid, p. 264.

²⁸⁸ Ibid, p. 318.

²⁸⁹ W. P. Morrell, “A Short History of New Zealand Life: New Zealand Before the Treaty of Waitangi,” in *Post-Primary School Bulletin* 5, no. 10 (Wellington: School Publications Branch, New Zealand Education Department, 1951), p. 197.

227,741...²⁹⁰ The feature point of her argument is that Maori should not be given special privilege because ‘The Moriori were here before them.’²⁹¹ To use the name Moriori to refer to a pre-Maori people in New Zealand shows the on-going influence of Smith’s ‘Great New Zealand Myth’ in the mind of the public.

An article by Sheila Natusch followed two months later filled with social Darwinian apologetics. Her article began and ended with the assumption that Darwinism played out as it always had in human civilisation and a weaker people were destroyed by a stronger one, much like the views of the old school. The introduction of disease by Europeans is described as ‘nobody’s fault’²⁹² and the killing of a Moriori in the initial contact with Broughton in 1791 is given the same dismissal. Much of her information regarding Moriori burial rites and language is correct and came from the same sources that Shand and Skinner utilised, with the exception of her using the name ‘Maoriori’ instead of Moriori.²⁹³ The invasion is not portrayed as a horrific event because ‘one cannot blame the Maori invaders for behaving according to their survival-of-the-fittest code.’²⁹⁴ It may appear that Natusch is making an oversimplification of Maori war practice rather than justification for the invasion. However, her final statement, which describes the Moriori council at Te Awapataki in 1835, shows clearly her support for the old view of Darwinian survival of the fittest. ‘Some were for breaking the old rule of non-resistance, even though they knew it would do no good in the end; but the final decision was to let the inevitable take its course.’²⁹⁵ This neglects the care provided for the Maori tribes upon their landing on the Chatham Islands by Moriori and seems to deliberately twist the story by stating the Moriori knew they could not win when accounts of that night show that those who argued for war genuinely believed they could fend off the invaders.

D. R. Simmons, an obvious admirer of Smith’s work, wrote *The Great New Zealand Myth* in 1976, a work which taught the same traditions as Smith. Douglas Sutton would later write that these traditions were twisted and ‘reflect late Victorian racial attitudes and not historical truth.’²⁹⁶ Simmons detailed the purpose of his work as examining the origin stories of the

²⁹⁰ Hilda Phillips, “Racial Degrees: More Equal than Equal,” in *New Zealand Listener*, Mar 30, 1974.

²⁹¹ Ibid.

²⁹² Sheila Natusch, “Maori and Maoriori,” in *New Zealand Listener*, May 25, 1974.

²⁹³ Ibid.

²⁹⁴ Ibid.

²⁹⁵ Ibid.

²⁹⁶ Douglas G. Sutton, “A Culture History of the Chatham Islands,” *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 89, no. 1, 1980, p. 68.

Maori, and to observe the doubt thrown on these traditions through simple re-examination, not the use of archaeology. However, he does little in the way of re-examining the pre-Maori people of New Zealand and follows Smith's lead in saying the '*tangata-whenua* fled in seven canoes upon the sea...in search of the Chatham Islands.'²⁹⁷ Simmons does not name this people specifically, avoiding the names Moriori or Maruiwi. However, the inclusion of the escape to the Chatham Islands segment of the myth when other scholars have shown its fabrication would seem to include him in the list of writers who followed in the footsteps of Smith.

In a later chapter Simmons draws upon Buck's work and writes that of the various traditions the story of Toi and the discovery and settlement of the Chatham Islands only appears in the manuscript used by Smith and not in that used by Best. He was also doubtful of Matorohanga's source for this story due to dating issues and instead believes 'Smith deliberately overlooked the declared source and dating and was so eager to include the material in the *Lore* that he attributed it to Te Matorohanga.'²⁹⁸ Simmons did offer an examination of the traditions surrounding Moriori but this information was already recorded in Buck's works and therefore Simmons did not offer anything new to the discussion. This is a contradiction in his work. He follows Smith's lead in the origins of the Moriori and yet throws doubt onto Smith's sources, showing the serious difficulties and differences between the two schools.

By 1980 those who had known Smith and Best personally were passing away and even those who knew men such as Peter Buck were dwindling in number. However, this opened the way for new scholars who had been raised in a different academic climate to rise and share their work. Douglas Sutton was one such scholar. His contributions on Moriori culture and history in the *Journal of the Polynesian Society* began in the 1980s and were part of a definite upswing in knowledge and attitude on the subject. Sutton's 1980 article "A Culture History of the Chatham Islands"²⁹⁹ observed the various similarities between Moriori and other Polynesian cultures to analyse the early development of their economies. Sutton's work does not use oral traditions and instead focuses on scientific and archaeological evidence such as simulated voyages in the Pacific and around New Zealand. These simulated voyages clearly supported the stance that return voyages from the Chatham Islands to New Zealand were

²⁹⁷ D. R. Simmons, *The Great New Zealand Myth: A Study of the Discovery and Origin Traditions of the Maori* (Wellington: A. H. Reed & A. W. Reed, 1976), p. 5.

²⁹⁸ Simmons, *The Great New Zealand Myth*, p. 66.

²⁹⁹ Sutton, "A Culture History," 1980.

impossible and the changes in canoe design show that Moriori must have arrived in the Islands before AD 1400.³⁰⁰ Linguistic data and change also supports the conclusion that the Moriori were Polynesian and shared ancestry with the Maori as they have similarities with South Island Maori but also with North Island East Coast Maori. While some Moriori artefacts do not show similarities with Maori artefacts Sutton points out that they show similarities with Tongan and Tahitian items from earlier periods. Skeletal material with the distinct frontal flattening of the skull is seen to be the result of isolated development but still a part of Polynesian physicality.³⁰¹

Concerning Moriori culture Sutton relies heavily on the works of Skinner and Shand. He comes to the conclusion that the absence of intricate design in Moriori carving and clothing was not solely due to lack of resources or the harshness of their existence but was because of the singular importance they placed on birds and seals as a source of food. Seal skins were made into clothes and feathers were used for headdresses. Almost all surviving examples of Moriori wood carving feature birds and nothing else.³⁰² The non-violence of the Moriori was noted by Sutton as not being exclusive and that it had been observed elsewhere in the Pacific where food resources were scarce and there was no potential for food to be cultivated.³⁰³ This is using most of Skinner and Shand's conclusions, but these conclusions do not align with the thinking of older scholars and are instead a new development.

Sutton's later article "The Whence of the Moriori" was not so much concerned with the new findings and discussion about the Moriori but with the 'Great New Zealand Myth' which 'although rejected by scholars...persists in the public mind and in some school curriculae.'³⁰⁴ Sutton combats this myth in two sections, one that refutes the myth's four main points and then the second which offers an alternative for Moriori origins. He states that the first settlers of New Zealand were certainly Polynesian and linguistic, anthropological and archaeological evidence clearly supports this. The peacefulness of this first people is doubtful due to archaeological evidence and the fleeing of the first people to the Chatham Islands due to warfare is also doubtful as Simmons demonstrated the lack of reliability of Smith's sources.

³⁰⁰ Sutton, "A Culture History," p. 70.

³⁰¹ Ibid, pp. 75-79.

³⁰² Ibid, p. 84.

³⁰³ Ibid, p. 87.

³⁰⁴ Ibid, p. 3.

And finally the notion that the Moriori did not change from their arrival in the Chatham Islands to European discovery is completely ludicrous in light of archaeological work.³⁰⁵

Moriore culture adapted to the non-violent non-hierarchical structure due not to the lack of resources but due to how spread out the resources were and the ready accessibility. No chiefly authority could restrict access to the food and therefore could not ensure its own supremacy. The separation of Moriore into smaller settlements and their food gathering technique coupled with the non-violent culture was optimum according to Sutton and displayed an intelligent culture.³⁰⁶ Sutton then blames the invention of the simple-minded, nomadic and inferior Maruiwi on European contact and the racial hierarchy that they brought with them. Cultures placed at the bottom of the racial hierarchy were seen as stagnant and unable to change without help from an external source, so a geographically isolated culture was a death sentence. Again referring to Smith, Sutton states that he saw the Moriore personally at a time when they were only a remnant of their pre-contact culture and accuses him of trying to justify this in his works by marking them as inferior.³⁰⁷ Best's work is finally noted as 'novel observations... as accurate as the premises upon which they are based.'³⁰⁸ Sutton's work features both new conclusions and ideas in the discussion of Moriore culture and history, although it is still afflicted by the necessary action it takes to refute Smith and Best. Having to still argue against scholars whose works are over sixty years old shows the magnitude of Smith and Best's influence over the subject and how that influence lingered.

This was typical of the post-Best era. After Best's death there was a break in the study of Maori culture where a small group began to rely on archaeology while the rest continued to use tradition. Skinner's *The Morioris of Chatham Islands* is considered a seminal work in this school of thought with Skinner's students, such as Duff, continuing to develop his conclusions. However, Peter Gibbons notes that decades after Duff many still felt the weight of Best's work and felt pressured to continue to refute his findings, not because any scholars still argued them with the same zealotry that Best had, but because the legacy was still strong even when their own research was progressing into new areas.³⁰⁹ Sutton was considered by King to be the pivotal scholar in this era because of the detail he went into

³⁰⁵ Sutton, "A Culture History," pp. 4-6.

³⁰⁶ Douglas G. Sutton, "The Whence of the Moriore," *The New Zealand Journal of History* 19, no. 1 (1985), p. 7-10

³⁰⁷ Ibid, p. 12.

³⁰⁸ Ibid, p. 13.

³⁰⁹ Peter Gibbons, "Non-fiction," in *The Oxford History of New Zealand Literature in English*, ed. Terry Sturm, 25-104 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 85.

concerning archaeology on the Chatham Islands. However, King does not mention Sutton's work any further, including Sutton's arguments against the mythic tradition.³¹⁰

Moriore themselves did not say much in this period as they were not a united group and many admitted later that they felt ashamed or were made to feel ashamed of their heritage.³¹¹ After 1980 Maui Solomon began to organise family ties and proposed erecting a statue of Tommy Solomon. This caused a domino effect in which family members and others began to search deeper into their heritage and discovered more Moriore links through the Preece and Ropiha families. By 1988 they had begun to form an iwi organisation to petition the Crown for past grievances. They did not publish any literature in this period; most of it was published in the late 2000s, although they contributed to Michael King's research for his work in 1989.

The period from 1940-1989 is defined by a large schism between two different schools of thought. Those who supported the older works of Smith and Best, which relied on oral traditions and caused a falsified version of Moriore history to seep into the public mind, and those who supported newer evidence from archaeology, anthropology and re-examination of older sources. This is not to say that these schools only used these sources exclusively but that their conclusions were usually based on that form of evidence. The older school slowly lost support in academic circles as shown by Buck's re-examination of oral traditions, Duff's distaste for the inferiority the Moriore had been marked with, Simmons' evaluation of Smith's sources and finally Sutton's refuting of old myths and offering new alternatives. The lingering of the mythic ideals in the public consciousness demonstrates that while academics were moving on, the consensus was remaining divided between the academic circles and the public. This period followed a general upturn in the social wellbeing of the Moriore people who through the 1970s and 1980s regrouped and began to work towards a revitalisation of their heritage. The works of those who supported their history and place in New Zealand was a much needed life line to a people who were being abandoned and forgotten.

³¹⁰ King, *Moriore: A People Rediscovered*, p. 28.

³¹¹ Maysmor, *The Moriore of Rekohu*, p. 34.

Chapter Six: Newspapers and Public Perception

When commenting on the effect scholarship had on the New Zealand public Michael King omitted the role of newspapers as a major outlet not just for current events but for other information about New Zealand. Many newspapers contained articles either about or in reference to the struggle of the Moriori and may have shown a different representation of them than that in various scholarly works. Some articles even recommended scholarly works on the topic for further reading giving the public greater access to information. This chapter will examine the role of newspapers in presenting the Moriori to the New Zealand public and how these articles may or may not have followed a common trend set by the representation of Maori. Letters to the editor will also give an insight into the opinions of the public with many defending one account of Moriori history and attacking those who partook in another, particularly the mythic histories put forward by Stephenson Percy Smith and others. However, some articles were not specifically written for the newspaper and were just excerpts from scholarly works.

The public misconceptions about the nature and origins of the Moriori were blamed in part, by King, on the 1916 Department of Education School Journal. The Journal written by Smith espoused his ‘Great New Zealand Myth’ to hundreds of thousands of New Zealand school children for over half a century. The Journal stated the Moriori ‘were a race inferior to the Maoris...were of Melanesian, not Polynesian origin...They were slight in build, and had dark skins, upstanding or bushy hair...In their new home [The Chatham Islands] they became peace-loving, timorous and lazy.’³¹² King was extremely critical of this work saying its contents were ‘demonstrably wrong’³¹³ and that it became ingrained in the national mind-set because of constant reinforcement by primary school teachers. King’s statements regarding the School Journal’s message implies that the public had simply no chance of recognising a different rendition of Moriori history as written by other scholars and that the ‘Great New Zealand Myth’ was going to become a perpetual idea.

In King’s final chapter of *Moriori: A People Rediscovered*, which covers the Moriori renaissance and Waitangi Tribunal claim, he wrote that part of the Moriori claim against the Crown was for group defamation through official publications, of which the School Journal

³¹² King, *The Penguin History*, p. 45.

³¹³ *Ibid*, p. 46.

was one. This group defamation was, King stated, ‘unparalleled in New Zealand and equalled elsewhere by only by the kinds of savage myths generated by anti-Semitism.’³¹⁴ However, the public had access to other sources of Moriori history and knowledge and they were not confined to what they had learnt in school or read in the works of Smith.

Before the publication of the Education Journal in 1916 newspaper articles on the Moriori varied in their content, from current events in the Chatham Islands to ethnological pessimism at the circumstances Moriori were in, to outright acceptance that they were a doomed race and no action could save them. The *Nelson Examiner and New Zealand Chronicle* was the first to note the existence of Moriori in an article that included a report to the Commissioner of Customs in Auckland from Surveyor William Shed. It was reported that the Moriori were held in slavery for over thirty years but that as of 1862 their situation was much improved. Although it states their situation was improved the article doesn’t try to represent the circumstances of Moriori as good, especially when many Moriori were still held in a serf like bondage. It even makes special notice of the marriage laws that Moriori are forced to endure. Especially that since Moriori had been allowed to marry again there had only been two instances of Moriori men marrying Maori women, one of whom was also a freed slave in her own right.³¹⁵

Many articles drew interest towards Moriori by commenting on or reviewing scholarly works. In the 1860s Frederick Hunt’s autobiography received notoriety being reviewed in the *Daily Southern Cross* and the *Wellington Independent*. Hunt is described as a writer of ‘the utmost naiveté and truthfulness’³¹⁶ and that he is ‘endowed with natural shrewdness.’³¹⁷ The review is overwhelmingly enthusiastic and while it features excerpts from the work it does not question any of his stories nor his portrayal of either Maori or Moriori. However, a later review states that Hunt’s stories could be ‘painfully ludicrous’³¹⁸ and looks upon his work in a sceptical manner.

Portraying the Moriori as victims of invasion was not unheard of in this period, although it is not a focus amongst the media. The *Lyttelton Times* acknowledged in 1866 that some Moriori were still being held as slaves, ‘The population of Waitangi, including a few Moriori slaves,

³¹⁴ King, *Moriori: A People Rediscovered*, p. 192.

³¹⁵ *Nelson Examiner and New Zealand Chronicle*, 19 Feb 1862, p. 3.

³¹⁶ *Daily Southern Cross*, 20 Oct 1865, p. 6.

³¹⁷ *Ibid*, p. 6.

³¹⁸ *Wellington Independent*, 12 Apr 1866, p. 12.

number one hundred and fifty all told.³¹⁹ This led into the issue of land settlement in the media. Land settlement was of wide interest throughout New Zealand as wars drew to a close and compensation courts and land courts were created to determine ownership and hear claims. The Chatham Islands were no different and the proceedings there received wide coverage. The initial land claims were reported in the *Taranaki Herald* and were viewed in conjunction with the Ngati Mutunga claims in Taranaki. The state in which Moriori were held was observed as the article noted use of the term Paraiwhara which was explained to mean ‘blackfellows.’³²⁰ Articles from the 1870s report on the Legislative Council debating whether or not petitions and claims had been received from the Chatham Islands and it appears again that the Moriori were not forgotten as the article clearly states that the Honourable Mr Acland enquired ‘Whether any applications have been received from any of the Natives of the Chatham Islands, either Maori or Moriori.’³²¹ Another article notes the satisfaction which Moriori and Maori had after the Land Court proceedings, although this is the only mention of Moriori in the entire article, the rest being devoted to the Taranaki tribes.³²²

A turning point in news coverage of the Moriori arose in 1887. From there onwards most coverage was related to the works of ethnologists and ethnographers, this has made these articles a focus of modern scholars such as King, as the academic views they disagreed with appear in abundance. *The Observer* presented an article that was rife with the ideas of the ‘Great New Zealand Myth’ where the Moriori were called an inferior Melanesian race.³²³ The *New Zealand Herald* featured articles on the Moriori between 1890 and 1916. These articles presented the Moriori as an almost extinct race with no hope for survival. In 1890 the Moriori vocabulary was sent to Oxford to be added to their library, it was described as an act of saving the language from ‘that inevitable shipwreck’³²⁴ the Moriori. Another article remarks that there are only twenty full-blooded Moriori left, as of 1902, and the youngest is expected to be the last of his race. The pessimistic tone continues in a short article about Tommy Solomon where he is described as the last of the Moriori and extinction is seen as inevitable.³²⁵

³¹⁹ *Lyttelton Times*, 9 Apr 1866, p. 2.

³²⁰ *Taranaki Herald*, 9 Jun 1866, p. 3.

³²¹ *Wellington Independent*, 15 Aug 1867, p. 4.

³²² *Hawke's Bay Herald*, 9 Sep 1870, p. 3.

³²³ *Observer*, 25 Jun 1887, p. 21.

³²⁴ *New Zealand Herald*, 27 Jan 1890, p. 6.

³²⁵ *Ibid*, p. 6.

Various other articles featured a telling of Moriori origins in the vein of Smith with them being used as an example of a megalithic race from a pre-Maori era.³²⁶ However, not all newspapers accepted these theories out of hand. An article for the *Auckland Star* published in 1912 said that ‘They [The Maruiwi] were not the Moriori of the Chatham Islands, as some may be disposed to fancy.’³²⁷ This article was written by James Cowan who would later write works with scathing reviews of those who linked Moriori to Maruiwi, this article represents the beginnings of his views on Moriori origins.

An article from just two years before the *Education Journal* was released stated that the Moriori had been killed off, not because of any persons fault but because it was how nature worked. A species or race could develop in isolation but the moment an outside influence interrupted them they would fall into decline. How fast was determined by the strength of the interruption.³²⁸ This article is attributed to W.B., William Baucke, this was how he signed the works he submitted to various newspapers. This article reflects the views Baucke had as they would eventually be published in larger works however, it was not only English language newspapers that were interested in the Moriori. There was also an interest, however slight, from Maori newspapers such as *Waka Maori* which reported the death of a Moriori Chieftain in 1876.³²⁹ This newspaper was edited by James Grindell and was heavily criticised for presenting a Government slant in its stories so it should not be accepted as Maori interest in Moriori events.

After the release of the *Education Journal* there was a steady increase in newspaper interest concerning Moriori, this interest mainly focused on Tommy Solomon. Portrayals of Solomon in the media were similar to portrayals of older Maori. Solomon’s identity as the last pure blood Moriori and his death, arguably one of the most significant events of modern Moriori history, was of extreme interest to newspapers across the country, all of whom used similar language to describe him. The *New Zealand Herald* reported just two years before Solomon’s death ‘Tame Horomona, the surviving full-blooded member of the ancient Moriori race... notable principally for his tremendous geniality... no one would begrudge the last of the Morioris his contentment.’³³⁰ Another article from the same time stated ‘Only one Moriori of

³²⁶ *Manawatu Times*, 8 Mar 1910, p. 4.

³²⁷ *Auckland Star*, 12 Jul 1912, p. 2.

³²⁸ *Auckland Star*, 28 Feb 1914, p. 13.

³²⁹ *Waka Maori*, 3 Oct 1876, p. 236.

³³⁰ *New Zealand Herald*, 22 Jul 1931, p. 6.

pure blood survives in the Chatham Islands.’³³¹ The attention here is being drawn to both Solomon’s place as the last of a race and his temperament, as if his own personal happiness could help justify the actions of others. A similar article also from the *New Zealand Herald* details the passing of Te Waha Pango in 1932. Pango was a chief of Ngati Kahungunu and he is described as ‘one of the last of the old Maori pioneers of the Heretaunga natives.’³³² He is also described as being of a kindly nature and a great friend to many, both Maori and Pakeha. This is the same way Solomon was treated with Pango’s place as the last of a group and his disposition being the major focus. King notes that this is typical of this era for Maori. Many writers were driven by what they saw as a form of preservation, recording the Maori race’s existence before it was lost. This is not to say that the race would go extinct but that the culture, as practiced by those who endured little interruption from Europeans, would die out.³³³ The Victorian notion of Maori as a dying race was still alive among many New Zealanders and so the death of a chief such as Pango was seen as a notable event.

After Solomon’s death in 1933 *The Evening Post* ran a small obituary for him stating ‘Tommy Solomon, the last of the Moriori race, whose death is reported.’³³⁴ *The Press* added more information by including Solomon’s Moriori name, Tame Horomona Rehe, and the location of his death, the Chatham Islands.³³⁵ Both of these small notices included a picture of Solomon and the intent here is similar to that of the previous articles, preservation. They are an attempt to capture the last moments of a race before they are lost forever. King draws the similarity between the efforts of writers to preserve a culture and the works of painters such as C. F. Goldie. Goldie had attempted to memorialise what he saw as the untainted Maori culture before it disappeared. The publishing of these pictures of Solomon, who had been influenced by Maori and European cultures, was an attempt to at memorialise Solomon as more than just a single man, especially since most obituaries at the time did not include pictures.³³⁶ An article with similar content was published in the *New Zealand Herald*. It too focuses on Solomon’s racial identity and his kind hearted nature. Like other articles it also gives a description of Moriori history. However, this article ends with a more personal note, ‘His passing will be deeply regretted... but because of the kindly and genial qualities of the

³³¹ *Evening Post*, 16 Mar 1933, p. 12.

³³² *New Zealand Herald*, 24 Nov 1932, p. 10.

³³³ King, *The Penguin History*, p. 371.

³³⁴ *Evening Post*, 21 Mar 1933, p. 5.

³³⁵ *Press*, 21 Mar 1933, p. 14.

³³⁶ King, *The Penguin History*, p. 371.

man that left pleasant memories with all who met him.³³⁷ While the article mentions his position as the last of his race the final touch leaves an impression of concern for Solomon as a man.

However, drawing attention to the race of Solomon or even to Maori was not uncommon in the 1930s and was a continuation of a British colonising doctrine. Most newspapers would not feel it necessary to mention the ethnicity of a European New Zealander, or at least a British descendant because the newspapers themselves were products of colonialism. Articles would label people as Chinese, Polish or even half-caste allowing them to be viewed as different from the mainstream population of New Zealand. The *Evening Post* reported in 1933 that the body of a woman discovered under Panmure wharf had not yet been identified as ‘a European, a Maori or a half caste.’³³⁸ Her ethnic identity was of the predominant importance. The same article identified a missing girl as a ‘half caste Maori’³³⁹ so even though she may be half European also, although the article does not specify this, she is still classed as Maori and therefore different. In the case of Solomon and many Maori they were being forced into the still prevalent notion of racial hierarchy so their labelling and identification would be seen as necessary to record this.³⁴⁰ Matters such as this did not receive widespread attention in King’s work, although he did touch on them. Understanding media relations to Solomon could have given a greater insight into why Moriori were portrayed as they were.

Current affairs were not the only focus of the media’s interest in Moriori. There was also an interest in Moriori culture and Moriori history. However, these articles usually remarked that the Moriori were intellectually stunted compared to Maori and were a lost cause. The ongoing influence of William Baucke is imperative to understanding the public perception of Moriori after 1916. Alongside the work of Smith and Best, Baucke’s work is some of the most damaging of the Moriori people. His collaborative work with H. D. Skinner diluted many of his prejudices; his regular contributions to newspapers had no such hindrance. In 1922 he described the Moriori custom of keeping birds alive to be plucked as barbaric as killing a man, and describes the Moriori, ‘Just consider the creature- hirsute, smoke-grimed...a brute appetite for food and sex and sleep.’³⁴¹ An article from later in the year

³³⁷ *New Zealand Herald*, 20 Mar 1933, p. 10.

³³⁸ *Auckland Star*, 6 Jun 1935, p. 7.

³³⁹ *Ibid*, p. 7.

³⁴⁰ Lloyd Jones, *Images of Maori in the Pakeha Press* (Auckland: The University of Auckland, 1998), p. 62.

³⁴¹ *New Zealand Herald*, 22 Jul 1922, p. 1.

Baucke is quoted as saying ‘my experience is proved that when an aborigine has a name for something, he has had knowledge of it for a long time; even an intellectual dullard like the Moriori.’³⁴² Although, in an article printed only a month and a half later Baucke seems to recant this and portrays the Moriori as somewhat ingenious, ‘...what he lacked in weapons he eked out in wiles- in incantations- in the peril of experience.’³⁴³

In the arena of published works rebuttal and debate occur through the publishing of new ideas. Newspapers present a more immediate solution, letters to the editor. These letters are a window into the mind of the public and how they perceived Moriori, more importantly they would show whether there was a debate amongst the public over their perception. One letter arose after Baucke’s attacks on the Moriori and the author claimed to have lived for twenty years on the Chatham Islands when a considerable number of Moriori were still living. This cannot be verified as the letter was submitted anonymously but if it is true then the author must have been of a similar age to Baucke as Moriori numbers were dwindling quickly. The last time there had been a significant population was in the 1880s and earlier. The anonymous writer accuses Baucke of having a prejudice against the Moriori and that Baucke’s talk of the Moriori ‘appetite’ is unwarranted as ‘such characteristics never came under the observation of the present writer.’³⁴⁴ This may appear to be a defence of the Moriori, and though it certainly is aimed at protecting them from Baucke the writer suffers from many of the same prejudices as those reporting on Tommy Solomon. The letter begins by stating that Baucke shows little gratitude to a disappearing race that was very friendly to visitors. This is the same language used in the articles about Solomon and shows the same Victorian era apologetic undertones, marking the Moriori as a dying race who need to be recorded accurately.³⁴⁵

Not all articles focused on the Moriori under such light. Some viewed the Moriori as a righteous and moral people by the standards when they were written. One stated ‘In theory the attitude of the Moriori towards war was ethically correct...The Moriori had never heard of Christ or the Sermon on the Mount, yet in their island home a hundred years ago the altruistic tenets of Christianity were in actual existence, which is more than can be said of any civilised country at the present day-’³⁴⁶ The view of the Moriori culture of peace in

³⁴² *New Zealand Herald*, 26 Aug 1922, p. 1.

³⁴³ *New Zealand Herald*, 14 Oct 1922, p. 1.

³⁴⁴ *New Zealand Herald*, 9 Aug 1922, p. 3.

³⁴⁵ Bronwen Douglas, “Climate to Crania: science and the racialization of human difference,” in *Foreign Bodies: Oceania and the Science of Race 1750-1940*, ed. Bronwen Douglas and Chris Ballard, 33-96 (Canberra: ANU E Press, 2008), p. 71.

³⁴⁶ *Auckland Star*, 10 Mar 1923, p. 17

comparison to Christianity is a by-product of post-First World War New Zealand. As Paul Moon indicates Christianity was still a potent force in New Zealand in the interwar period when many were disillusioned with the death and sacrifice the First World War had cost.³⁴⁷ A similar theme is found in an article from 1936 where the Moriori are described as courageous for being willing to carry out a pacifist belief even though it cost them their freedom. This was from a year when the shadow of conflict was beginning to appear again.³⁴⁸ Marking a peaceful culture as seemingly flawless in the wake of such destruction would be expected. It demonstrates how the opinions of the public could be influenced by contemporary events as well as the views of scholars.

An article that does not conform to this inter-war admiration for the Moriori culture appeared in 1930. It was an account of a bishop's visit to the Chatham Islands and it included a small excerpt on Moriori culture, only it stated that the Moriori practice of one-on-one combat and ending the fight after first blood was because they could not stomach the sight of blood and would flee the moment it was drawn.³⁴⁹ While they are being presented as courageous pacifists they are also being portrayed by others as cowards. Works on the temperament and mind set of the Moriori in newspapers presents a deluge of different views influenced by different events. The work of Baucke which was readily presented was a continuance of Victorian ideas of racial hierarchy and the presentations of Moriori as a peaceful people were both products of interwar attitudes.

However, there were articles that seemed completely ignorant of the Moriori culture of peace, probably the starkest feature of their culture in comparison to other Polynesian groups. One article states it was unclear how the Maori had managed to conquer the islands and enslave the Moriori, it theorises strength of numbers, ingenuity or better weapons. But it does not mention the fact that Moriori refused to fight back, indeed it seems to suggest some form of war broke out between Maori and Moriori when no such event occurred. Even this ignorant article appears to convey the older racial views of earlier editions. 'The Maoris are a sturdy race and are increasing rather than diminishing in numbers.'³⁵⁰ This submits to the view that

³⁴⁷ Paul Moon, *New Zealand in the Twentieth Century: The Nation, The People* (Auckland: HarperCollins Publishers, 2011), pp. 142-143.

³⁴⁸ *New Zealand Herald*, 29 Feb 1936, p. 1.

³⁴⁹ *Press*, 10 Mar 1930, p. 18.

³⁵⁰ *Evening Post*, 4 Dec 1926, p. 17.

Maori as a stronger race had the right to survive in lieu of weaker less advanced races which is the favoured view of the nineteenth to early twentieth centuries.³⁵¹

The fields of archaeology and anthropology were also noted in newspapers. However, the articles usually only expressed the views of well-known scholars removing the speculative theories of journalists and other misinformed parties. For instance a 1919 article tells of the superiority of Moriori stonework in relation to other Polynesian races but then states that they had fallen behind when it came wood carving. It then asserted that the Moriori language was not a sub dialect of Maori but a language in its own right.³⁵² These assertions are extremely different from the ones made in previous articles. However, considering the authors were H. D. Skinner and the Archdeacon Williams, Skinner especially being well-known for his favourable view of Moriori, these comments come as no surprise.

A 1923 article reported on a seminar that had been given, the seminar focused on the weaving abilities of the Maori. It compared Maori weaving to the Moriori use of seal-skin clothing, that is, until ‘they exhausted the supply.’³⁵³ This is a misinterpreting of events, blaming the Moriori for the lack of seal skins and ignoring years of sealing and whaling on and around the islands does not present a cohesive rendition of events. The final line concerning the Moriori was ‘he was trying to reinvent weaving when the Maori descended on him and solved his problems in a different way.’³⁵⁴ A complete lack of knowledge of the history of the Moriori is revealed here. The author of the seminar being reported on was Peter Buck. However, the view he gave of Moriori was usually more favourable as he based a lot of his research on the findings of Skinner. It is possible that as Skinner’s work was only being published this year Buck had not yet been exposed to his ideas. The more likely answer is that the ideas Buck presented had been diluted by the writer of the article who may have misinterpreted his presentation.

Some articles were not as disposed as these others in that they used the term Moriori as a name for a pre-fleet people but did not link this group to the Moriori of the Chatham Islands. Statements such as ‘Moriori remains have been found in association with those of Moa’³⁵⁵ and ‘Steps are being taken ... to proclaim as an historic reserve an area in the Weka Pass that

³⁵¹ Belgrave, *Historical Frictions*, p. 288.

³⁵² *Sun*, 6 Feb 1919, p. 11.

³⁵³ *Northern Advocate*, 20 Jan 1923, p. 6.

³⁵⁴ *Ibid*, p. 6.

³⁵⁵ *New Zealand Herald*, 7 Sep 1925, p. 10.

contains examples of Maori, or possibly Moriori, rock paintings³⁵⁶ do not conjure the same sentiment of other articles. However, the name Moriori was already being widely accepted as a name of an uncivilised race. This along with the view of the Chatham Islands Moriori as inferior meant that regardless of whether the Chatham Islands Moriori were named specifically the connotations of inferiority may have already been apparent in the readers mind.

After the death of Solomon exhibitions about the Moriori were advertised extensively. These articles offer an interesting view of Moriori as they demonstrate what other forms of information the public had access too. An exhibition at the Canterbury Museum was advertised in 1940 and it presented an accurate description of Moriori culture. This would be expected as the exhibition was prepared by Roger Duff whose published works involving the Moriori presented them in a favourable light, not following the views of other scholars. Once again the older views of racial hierarchy and superiority seem to break through in the article, although in a more restrained way. ‘The history of the now extinct Moriori race is given in a series of pictures and artifacts [sic], these latter including some of the very best in existence.’³⁵⁷ While earlier articles spoke of the Moriori as a dying race and saw their extinction as a natural consequence of their interaction with Maori the article on this exhibition presents the end game of those views, the preservation of Moriori artefacts after extinction.

Similar scenarios were apparent across the country for Maori. The acquisition of Maori artefacts may have been done with the intentions of preserving the items. However, some exhibition articles debate preserving some artefacts over others with very little reasoning. ‘All the objects actually found in Otago are in the Otago Museum, so that even though Otago had a comparatively small and unimportant Maori population, they have made the most of their discoveries.’³⁵⁸ The museum is making the decision between which artefacts are important and which are not and by extension are arguing which should be preserved and which should be discarded. The preserving of these artefacts can be seen as the preservation of historical items but also an attempt to preserve the race that made them. The use of the term Maori in these exhibitions over that of the term ‘native’ is a change that suggests a

³⁵⁶ *Evening Post*, 19 Jan 1931, p. 10.

³⁵⁷ *Auckland Star*, 6 Aug 1940, p. 3.

³⁵⁸ *Press*, 24 Nov 1938, p. 10.

wider acceptance of the importance of Maori identity and the preservation of that identity.³⁵⁹ Maori portrayal in media when concerning archaeological matters was different to the treatment of Moriori. Although this seems to be due to the situations the two groups were facing, with Moriori now being seen as extinct there was no longer a need to preserve their identity, just their artefacts. The consequence of this difference is not noted by King so the depths of Moriori portrayal in museums and articles on the exhibitions are not explored in union with his work.

Newspaper interest in Moriori also extended to their language, one article seemed especially interested in Moriori traditions that included the term 'Moa'. Various names were traced through the Pacific to determine the course of Polynesian explorers such as the Maori name 'ruru' for owl and how the same bird is named 'lulu' in other Polynesian cultures. 'Moa' in Moriori culture is taken by one article to be the name for a species of large fowl, as in many Pacific islands. This in term would show that the Moriori were closely related to Polynesian cultures.³⁶⁰ The article using this information was written by R. A. Falla a noted ornithologist. His interest is in the birds rather than the Moriori, although this does not diminish the effect portrayals such as this, where Moriori are acknowledged as Polynesians, could have.

The representation of Moriori in the media was dialectic and while some had favourable views, there were still those that presented a portrayal of an inferior Moriori. When a skeleton was discovered in 1920 it was quickly questioned whether or not it was the remains of a Moriori which the article further postulated were 'red-haired savages who dwelt here prior to the Maoris' arrival.'³⁶¹ Other articles in relation to the appearance of Moriori and the theory of a pre-Maori people did not hold this view. 'This fancy that the Moriori were the ancient inhabitants of New Zealand is a popular misconception.'³⁶² Elsdon Best's name for the pre-Maori people, Mouriuri, was not widely accepted and one article, while still accepting the Moriori as a pre-fleet people, separates them from the name Mouriuri and presents two distinct people. These were the Mouriuri who were Melanesian and remained in New Zealand, and the Moriori who were Polynesian.³⁶³ So while some were debating the exact nature of Moriori origins through archaeological discovery there were still those that followed racial characteristics similar to those put forward by Smith and Best.

³⁵⁹ Jones, *Images of Maori*, p. 4.

³⁶⁰ *New Zealand Herald*, 11 Apr 1936, p. 10

³⁶¹ *Poverty Bay Herald*, 16 Jun 1920, p. 7.

³⁶² *Auckland Star*, 9 Jun 1928, p. 8.

³⁶³ *New Zealand Herald*, 7 Nov 1930, p. 8.

King's assertion that the literature surrounding the Moriori was unfavourable in its portrayal appears justified when considering newspaper representations of Moriori. These representations would have widely affected the opinions and views of the general public as the information was more accessible than that written in books or academic journals. However, the reporting of Tommy Solomon's place as the last full-blooded Moriori showed the same treatment that was being afforded to Maori elders who were also seen as the last of their kind. Moriori were not being singled out for any harsher treatment. Articles concerning the Moriori culture of peace and artefacts that were discovered offered a similar notion as that of the Solomon articles, which is the older Victorian notion of race and racial hierarchy. Maori were also here given the same treatment as Moriori, the only difference being they were placed above Moriori in this hierarchy.

Artefacts were memorialised as exhibits in pseudo homage to Moriori and an affirmation of European racial superiority. Archaeological and anthropological views in newspapers closely followed those of scholars writing at the time and as such they presented the Moriori as a degraded, racially stunted group. The challenges offered to these views gave favourable representations of the Moriori and their culture. However, these challenges were not numerous enough to break through the layer of mainstream ideals and become a force of change. Newspaper articles undoubtedly should shoulder some blame for the degradation of Moriori in this period but they are the product of the thoughts of the people, not the other way around. The writers of the articles, who followed older scholarly ideas, including those such as William Baucke, are the ones who allowed the denigrating view of Moriori to flourish and grow in the public mind. As they are the same scholars who presented an inferior Moriori elsewhere, the newspaper representation of Moriori should be considered an extension of their scholarly work, or an outcome of that works publishing rather than a separate force within the literature canon. These issues have not been widely scrutinised in reviews of the historiography and therefore many of the notions of how the unfavourable view of Moriori gained such traction amongst the public are not explained or developed further.

Chapter Seven: Conclusion

This study has shown that the literature devoted to the Moriori people, history and culture, which was written by numerous scholars, was far more dynamic and revitalizing than the static and stagnant portrayal it was given by Michael King. Over a two hundred year period from the European discovery of the Chatham Islands to the release of *Moriori: A People Rediscovered* the literature ranged from the personal diaries of settlers, to official Court documents, and academic works. While King did not give this literature an approving review it is clear that such a blanket statement, stating it was all unfavourable, does not do justice to the more intricate views of many scholars and authors. Taking into consideration the various circumstances that may have influenced the views of those writing, a more favourable literature did exist but in conjunction with representations that did not follow the same pattern.

The work of settlers on the Chatham Islands, those such as Hunt, Shand, and Engst did not show a clear pattern that would suggest Christian views influenced representations of Moriori for better or for worse. Hunt's writing presented a caring and nurturing people that needed to be helped to achieve a civilised existence. Shand and Engst's writings held an account of Moriori circumstances at the time and did not impose any Christian view onto their culture. The work of clergy members contributed to a decline in Moriori culture due to the ignorance and vision of Selwyn and the mixing of religion and racial hierarchies by Taylor. The similar circumstances of Shand and Baucke's upbringings do not show a common development of their representations of Moriori. However, it did show that the Christian upbringing did not necessarily mean the representation would be more sympathetic to the Moriori. Christian belief was not a common factor amongst the writings of early settlers and visitors to the Chatham Islands. These sources did not contribute strongly either way to how Moriori were represented with both open Christians and others giving a variety of overlapping portrayals.

Official proceedings and documents such as the minute books of the Native Land Court presented an interesting challenge to modern writers such as King. The judgements of the Native Land Court on the Chatham Islands undoubtedly added to the humiliation felt by the Moriori people. The Court's judgement hindered any chances they had of reclaiming land through the judicial system and aided in the downfall of their culture and social organisation, ensuring they would not pose a serious challenge to Maori dominance on the Islands for over

a century. The positions of the Court and Maori to slavery, terms such as *paraiwhara*, ‘right of conquest’, and the exclusion of half-castes, revealed a racial collusion between the two groups that had not been witnessed elsewhere, although there were similarities to proceedings in the northern South Island of New Zealand. The racial collusion, however, was a continuation of already developed European racial hierarchy and Maori racial belief and it benefitted both parties. While modern writers such as King did note the impact of the Court’s rulings on Moriori, they did not acknowledge the racial collusion as the fostering of already apparent racial ideas and not a malicious covenant against the Moriori. The minutes of the Native Land Court sessions do still appear unfavourable in their treatment of Moriori even after these factors are considered.

The scholars of the successive fifty years who viewed Moriori from ethnological and anthropological standpoints continued the downward slope in portrayals of the Moriori, claiming them to be an inferior Melanesian people and a racial and cultural dead end. Moriori were being constantly compared to other peoples, namely Maori, and the cultural differences, not similarities, were highlighted in these works. This reinforced an already growing denigration of Moriori identity. The later works of Smith and Best would develop the works of Shortland, Thomsom and Travers forming a reliance on Maori oral traditions. These oral traditions were used to complete histories of the Moriori and determine their origins, even after they had been altered and were no longer completely reliable sources. This would continue to develop in the works of Beattie and others who would carry these hypotheses into the twentieth century and portray Moriori as inferior to Maori and other Polynesians. However, while this represents a greater part of the literature from this period other writers, such as H. D. Skinner, utilised a different method of approach than that of Smith and Best. They portrayed Moriori as a Polynesian race who had been unfairly treated by scholars and by Maori.

The later period, from 1940-1989, was defined by more favourable portrayals of Moriori, possibly bolstered by the reorganisation of Moriori descendants in the 1980s. King’s heavy focus on the works of scholars who followed in the footsteps of Smith and Best, those who used oral traditions and the Melanesian hypothesis, seemingly blinded him to the works of Buck, Duff, Simmons and Sutton. These latter scholars re-examined the sources of older works, relied on different forms of evidence and offered new alternatives to views that were considered set in stone. While a majority of the literature in this period portrays Moriori unfavourably, to view the literature as a dialogue between two opposing schools allows the

favourable portrayals of Moriori to shine through, rather than them being lost in a large conglomerate.

Not all works on Moriori came from academics, those studying anthropology, ethnology, or ethnography, and the works from outside the academic circles would provide insight into the understanding others had of Moriori. To assert the role of newspapers in contributing to the literature of the Moriori was small does not do justice to their place as providers of public information and opinion. The portrayal of Moriori in newspapers would have moulded the views of the general public and as most of the views presented were from sources such as Baucke and Smith, who did not write favourably of Moriori, it is not surprising to find that many other articles followed suit. Many articles, while unfavourable or following older racial ideas, dealt with Moriori by reflecting the same attitudes used towards Maori. Tommy Solomon was presented in the same way as an elderly Maori Chief and the use of their artefacts also followed suit. However Moriori were still portrayed as racially inferior and culturally underdeveloped. The more favourable representations of Moriori were not numerous enough, like the wider academic literature, to be especially noticeable. But as with other articles, they followed the views of various scholars, only they presented the views of scholars who did not share the views of Smith and Best.

With these factors taken into consideration it can be argued that the literature surrounding the Moriori was more favourable than King and other contemporaries have stated or insinuated. By understanding the influences of the early settlers, and the Native Land Court, Moriori could be argued as unfortunate victims of circumstance, and that the views of these settlers and European members of the Court were not restricted to just Moriori or the Chatham Islands. The literature would then appear more favourable. Although the racial collusion of the Court would have been impossible on the mainland as the cases were between different Maori claimants and not Maori and Moriori, however, there were similarities in some cases, adding another element. The vast literature developed by those who propagated the notion that Moriori were Melanesian, culturally inferior and weak greatly outweighed those who wrote of Moriori as Polynesian up until 1940. While the positive elements were glossed over by King the large collection of negative work and the willingness of others to continue and develop those makes viewing the literature as positive impossible.

After 1940 the evolving dialogue between the older views and newer research, and the eventual development of the newer literature to the point where it is the mainstream academic

view, showed that in the latter half of the twentieth century it would be possible to argue the literature was much more favourable than previously thought. Although if it was viewed in association with the older literature the unfavourable literature would again outweigh the favourable. The views espoused in newspapers follow the same trend as the predominant academic views of their time. While some favourable literature was covered in the media a majority was unfavourable towards Moriori. The treatment of Tommy Solomon in the 1930s was similar to treatment of Maori and this detracts from the unfavourable element by displaying that Moriori were being treated no worse than other native peoples. It would be viable to argue that the literature was more favourable in its portrayal of Moriori than King indicated, but to argue that this was the set dynamic throughout its two hundred year existence would be a step too far. While there is a limitation on the sources pertaining to the Moriori, the limitation is not that there are too few sources. It is that Moriori were players in a much larger narrative, that included Maori and European, where seeing them as a lesser people culturally and ethnically suited the purpose of that narrative.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Engst, Johannes Gottfried. *Engst, Johannes Gottfried, 1819-1910: Notebook*. Wellington: National Library, record ID MSX-6305.

Engst, J. G. Manuscript in Florance Collection, Canterbury Museum Library, Christchurch.

(i) Waitangi Tribunal and Claimant Reports

Gilling, Bryan D. *The Native Land Court in the Chatham Islands: A Report to Te Iwi Moriori Trust Board*. Wai 64 Doc #A10, 1993.

Gould, Ashley. *Te Iwi Moriori Claim Rekohu/Wharekauri (Chatham Islands)*. Wai 64 Doc # F3.

Gould, Ashley. *Further Historical Evidence of Dr Ashley Gould*. Wai 64 Doc #G6.

Native Land Court Minutes Book, Chatham Islands Box 1. (Wellington: New Zealand National Archives), p. 5.

Waitangi Tribunal. *Rekohu: A Report on Moriori and Ngati Mutunga Claims in the Chatham Islands*. Wellington: Legislation Direct, 2001.

Waitangi Tribunal. *Te Tau Ihu O Te Waka A Maui: Report on Northern South Island Claims*, Wai 785. Wellington: Legislation Direct, 2008.

(ii) Newspapers and Magazines

Auckland Star

Daily Southern Cross

Evening Post

Hawke's Bay Herald

Lyttelton Times

Manawatu Times

Nelson Examiner and New Zealand Chronicle

New Zealand Herald

Northern Advocate

Observer

Poverty Bay Herald

Press

Sun

Taranaki Herald

Waka Maori

Wellington Independent

(iii) Secondary Sources

Anderson, Atholl, Judith Binney, Aroha Davis. *Tangata Whenua: An Illustrated History*. Auckland: Bridget Williams Books, 2015.

Anderson, Atholl. "Emerging Societies: AD 1500-1800." In *Tangata Whenua: An Illustrated History*, ed. Atholl Anderson, Judith Binney and Aroha Davis, 102-132. Auckland: Bridget Williams Books, 2015.

Anderson, Atholl "Speaking of Migration: AD 1150-1450." In *Tangata Whenua: An Illustrated History*, ed. Atholl Anderson, Judith Binney and Aroha Davis, 42-70. Auckland: Bridget Williams Books, 2015.

Beattie, James Herries. *Traditions and Legends of the South Island Maori: Collected from Natives of Murihiku (Southland, New Zealand)*. Christchurch: Cadsonbury Publications, 2004.

Ballantyne, Tony. *Entanglements of Empire: Missionaries, Māori, and the Question of the Body*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2015.

Ballantyne, Tony. *Webs of Empire: Locating New Zealand's Colonial Past*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2012.

Belgrave, Michael. *Historical Frictions: Maori Claims and Reinvented Histories*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2005.

Belich, James. *Making Peoples: A History of the New Zealanders*. Auckland: Penguin Books, 1996.

Belich, James. "European ideas about Māori." Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand. URL: <http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/european-ideas-about-maori>

Belmessous, Saliha. "Introduction: The Problem of Indigenous Claim Making in Colonial History." In *Native Claims Indigenous Laws against Empire 1500-1920*, ed. Saliha Belmessous, 3-18. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Berger, Stefan. "Comparative History." In *Writing History: Theory and Practice*, ed. Stefan Berger, Haiko Feldner, Kevin Passmore, 161-179. London: Hodder Arnold, 2003.

Best, Elsdon. "Maori and Maruiwi: Notes on the Original Inhabitants of New Zealand and their Culture; on the Question of how that Culture affected the Later-coming Maori; and on the Existence in these Isles of Customs, Arts, an Artifacts not traceable to Polynesia." *Transactions and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 48, (1915), 435-447.

Best, Elsdon. *The Maori Division of Time*. Wellington: R. E. Owen, Government Printer, 1959.

Best, Elsdon. *The Maori Canoe: An Account of Various Types of Vessels used by the Maori of New Zealand in Former Times, with some Description of those of the Isles of the Pacific, and a Brief Account of the Peopling of New Zealand*. Wellington: W. A. G. Skinner Government Printer Board of Maori Ethnological Research, 1925.

Best, Elsdon. *Forest Lore of the Moari: With Methods of Snaring, Trapping, and Preserving Birds and Rats, Uses of Berries, Roots, Fern-root, and Forest Products, with Mythological Notes on Origins, Karakia Used Etc*. Wellington: E. C. Keating Government Printer, 1977.

- Best, Elsdon. *Maori Religion and Mythology: Being An Account of the Cosmogony, Anthropogeny, Religious Beliefs and Rites, Magic and Folk Lore of the Maori Folk of New Zealand Part 2*. Wellington: Te Papa Press, 2005.
- Best, Elsdon. *Notes on the Art of War: As conducted by the Māori of New Zealand, with accounts of various customs, rites, superstitions, &c., pertaining to war, as practised and believed in by the ancient Māori*. Auckland: Reed Publishing (NZ) Ltd, 2001.
- Boas, Franz. "Human Faculty as Determined by Race." In *The Shaping of American Anthropology 1883-1911: A Franz Boas Reader*, ed. George W. Stocking Jr., 221-242. New York, NY: Basic Books, Inc., 1974.
- Buck, Peter. *An Introduction to Polynesian Anthropology*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum, 1945.
- Buck, Peter. *The Coming of the Maori*. Wellington: Whitcoulls Limited, 1949.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. "History and the Politics of Recognition." In *Manifestos for History*, ed. Keith Jenkins, Sue Morgan and Alun Munslow, 76-86. Oxon: Routledge, 2007.
- Davidson, Janet. "Duff, Roger Shepherd", from the Dictionary of New Zealand Biography. Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand, updated 7-Jun-2013 URL: <http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/biographies/5d27/duff-roger-shepherd>
- Domanska, Ewa. "Historiographical Criticism: a manifesto." In *Manifestos for History*, ed. Keith Jenkins, Sue Morgan and Alun Munslow, 197-204. Oxon: Routledge, 2007.
- Douglas, Bronwen. "Climate to Crania: science and the racialization of human difference." In *Foreign Bodies: Oceania and the Science of Race 1750-1940*, ed. Bronwen Douglas and Chris Ballard, 33-96. Canberra: ANUE Press, 2008.
- Downes, T. W. "Maruiwi, Maori and Moriori." *The Journal of the Polynesian Society: Containing the Transactions and Proceedings of the Society* 42, no. 167 (1933), 156-166.

- Duff, Roger. *The Moa-Hunter Period of Maori Culture*. Wellington: E.C. Keating, Government Printer, 1950.
- Firth, Raymond. *Economics of the New Zealand Maori*. Wellington: A. R. Shearer, Government Printer, 1972.
- Gibbons, Peter. "Non-fiction." In *The Oxford History of New Zealand Literature in English*, ed. Terry Sturm, 25-104. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Glick, Thomas F. "The Anthropology of Race Across the Darwinian Revolution." In *A New History of Anthropology*, ed. Henrika Kuklick, 225-241. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2008.
- Hall, Ronald E. *The Scientific Fallacy and Political Misuse of the Concept of Race*. Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2004.
- Hickford, Mark. *Lords of the Land: Indigenous Property Rights and the Jurisprudence of Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Hiroa, Te Rangi. *Arts and Crafts of the Cook Islands*. Honolulu: Kraus Reprint Co., 1971.
- Hiroa, Te Rangi. 'The Late Elsdon Best', *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, vol. 41 (1932), 1-49.
- Holman, Jeffrey Paparaoa. *Best of both Worlds: The Story of Elsdon Best and Tutakangahau*. North Shore: Penguin Group (NZ), 2010.
- Howe, K. R. *Quest for Origins: Who First Discovered and Settled New Zealand and the Pacific Islands?* Auckland: Penguin Books, 2003.
- Hunt, Frederick. *Twenty-Five Years' Experience in New Zealand and the Chatham Islands*. Wellington: William Lyon, 1866.
- Jones, Lloyd. *Images of Maori in the Pakeha Press*. Auckland: The University of Auckland, 1998.

- Jordanova, Ludmilla. *History in Practice*. London: Arnold, 2000.
- King, Michael. *The Penguin History of New Zealand*. Auckland: Penguin Books, 2003.
- King, Michael. *Moriori: A People Rediscovered*. Auckland: Penguin Books, 2000.
- King, Michael, Morrison, Robert. *A Land Apart: The Chatham Islands of New Zealand*. Auckland: Random House Printing Ltd, 1990.
- Luker, Vicki. "The Half-caste in Australia, New Zealand, and Western Samoa between the Wars: different problem, different places?" In *Foreign Bodies: Oceania and the Science of Race 1750-1940*, ed. Bronwen Douglas and Chris Ballard, 307-335. Canberra: ANU E Press, 2008.
- Maysmor, Bob. *The Moriori of Rekohu: T'chakat Henu - People of the Land*. Wellington: Pataka Porirua Museum of the Arts and Cultures, 2010.
- McEldowney, Dennis. "Publishing, Patronage, Literary Magazines." In *The Oxford History of New Zealand Literature in English*, ed. Terry Sturm, 545-600. Auckland: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Moon, Paul. *New Zealand in the Twentieth Century: The Nation, The People*. Auckland: HarperCollinsPublishers, 2011.
- Morrell, W. P. "A Short History of New Zealand Life: New Zealand Before the Treaty of Waitangi." In *Post-Primary School Bulletin* 5, no. 10. Wellington: School Publications Branch, New Zealand Education Department, 1951.
- Mosse, George L. *Toward the Final Solution: A History of European Racism*. London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd, 1978.
- Natusch, Sheila. "Maori and Maoriori." In *New Zealand Listener*, May 25, 1974.
- Owens, J. M. R. *The Mediator: A Life of Richard Taylor 1805-1873*. Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2004.

- Pagden, Anthony. "The Peopling of the New World: ethnos, race and empire in the early modern world." In *The Origins of Racism in the West*, ed. Miriam Eliav-Feldon, Benjamin Isaac and Joseph Ziegler, 292-312. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Paterson, Lachy. "Hāwhekaihe: Māori Voices on the Position of 'Half-castes' within Māori Society." *Journal of New Zealand Studies* 9, (2010) 135-155.
- Petrie, Hazel. *Outcasts of the Gods?: The Struggle over Slavery in Māori New Zealand*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2015.
- Phillips, Hilda. "Racial Degrees: More Equal than Equal." In *New Zealand Listener*, March 30, 1974.
- Phillipps, W. J. "The Moriori Hakana or Burial Chest." *The Journal of the Polynesian Society: Containing the Transactions and Proceedings of the Society* 34, no. 134 (1925), 180-181.
- Phillipson, G. A. "Missionary Printer: William Colenso at Paiha, 1834-52." In *Building God's Own Country: Historical Essays on Religions in New Zealand*, ed. John Stenhouse and Jane Thompson, 127-138. Dunedin: Otago University Press, 2004.
- Phillipson, Grant. "'High and even Holy Purposes': Selwyn in Treaty History." In *A Controversial Churchman: Essays on George Selwyn, Bishop of New Zealand and Lichfield, and Sarah Selwyn*, ed. Allan K. Davidson. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2011.
- Plato. *The Dialogues*, trans. B. Jowett. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1875. vol. 4.
- Reed, A.H. *The Story of New Zealand*. Wellington: A. H. Reed & A. W. Reed Publishers, 1955.
- Reed, A.H. *Myths and Legends of Maoriand*. Wellington: A. H. Reed and A. W. Reed Publishers, 1946.

- Reeves, William Pember. *The Long White Cloud: (Ao Tea Roa)*. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd, 1924.
- Renwick, William. "Commemorating other Places and Days." In *Creating a National Spirit: Celebrating New Zealand's Centennial*, ed. William Renwick, 112-127. Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2004.
- Richards, Rhys. *Manu Moriori: Human and Bird Carvings on Live Kopi Tress on the Chatham Islands*. Wellington: Paremata Press, 2007.
- Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1993.
- Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. London: The Penguin Group, 2003.
- Scott, Joan W. "History-writing as critique." In *Manifestos for History*, ed. Keith Jenkins, Sue Morgan and Alun Munslow, 19-38. Oxon: Routledge, 2007.
- Selwyn, George. *A Journal of the Bishop's Visitation Tour Through His Diocese, Including A Visit to the Chatham Islands, In the Year 1848*. Christchurch: Kiwi Publishers, 2002.
- Shand, Alexander. *The Moriori People of the Chatham Islands: Their History and Traditions*. Wellington: The Polynesian Society of New Zealand, 1911.
- Sharp, Andrew. "Samuel Marsden and the Founding of the Kerikeri Mission." In *Te Kerikeri 1770-1850: The Meeting Pool*, ed. Judith Binney, 40-46. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books Limited, 2007.
- Shortland, Edward. *Traditions and Superstitions of the New Zealanders: with Illustrations of their Manners and Customs*. Christchurch: Kiwi Publishers, 2001.
- Simmons, D. R. *The Great New Zealand Myth: A Study of the Discovery and Origin Traditions of the Maori*. Wellington: A. H. Reed & A. W. Reed, 1976.
- Simmons, D., Briggs, B. "The Sources of 'The Lore of the Whare-Wānanga.'" *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 79, no. 1, 22-42.

- Skinner, H. D. *The Morioris of Chatham Islands*. Honolulu: Bernice P. Bishop Museum, 1923.
- Skinner, H. D., Baucke, William. *The Morioris*. Honolulu: The Bishop Museum, 1926.
- Smith, Stephenson Percy. *Hawaiki: The Original Home of the Maori; With a Sketch of Polynesian History*. Wellington: Whitcombe and Tombs Limited, 1904.
- Smith, Stephenson Percy. *Lore of the Whare-Wananga*. Hamilton: University of Waikato Library, 1997.
- Smith, Stephenson Percy. *Maoris of the West Coast: Prior to 1840*. Christchurch: Kiwi Publishers, 1999.
- Smith, Stephenson Percy. *Nuie-fekai (or Savage) Island and its People*. Wellington: Whitcombe and Tombs Limited, 1903.
- Sorrenson, M. P. K. *Manifest Duty: The Polynesian Society Over 100 Years*. Auckland: The Polynesian Society, 1992.
- Southgate, Beverley. *Why Bother with History? Ancient, modern and postmodern motivations*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2000.
- Southgate, Beverley. *History: What and Why? Ancient, Modern and Post-Modern Perspectives*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Southgate, Beverley. *Postmodernism in History: Fear or Freedom?*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Stocking, George W. "Essays on Culture and Personality." In *Malinowski, Rivers, Benedict and Others: Essays on Culture and Personality; History of Anthropology Volume 4*, ed. George W. Stocking Jr., 3-12. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1986.
- Sutton, Douglas G. "A Culture History of the Chatham Islands." *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 89, no. 1, (1980), 67-94.

- Sutton, Douglas G. "The Whence of the Moriori." *The New Zealand Journal of History* 19, no. 1 (1985), 3-13.
- Taylor, Rev. Richard. *Te Ika A Maui: New Zealand and its Inhabitants*. Wellington: A.H and A.W Reed Ltd, 1974 (1855).
- Te Miria Kate, Wills Johnson. *The People of the Chathams: True Tales of the Islander's Early Days*. Martinborough: GWJ Publications, 1994.
- Travers, Henry H. "On the Chatham Islands." *Transactions and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New Zealand* 1, (1868), 173-180.
- Travers, W. T. L. "Notes of the Traditions and Manners and Customs of the Mori-oris." *Transactions and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New Zealand* 9, (1876), 15-27.
- Travers, W. T. L. "On the Changes effected in the Natural Features of a New Country by the Introduction of Civilised Races." *Transactions and Proceedings of the New Zealand Institute* 1870, Vol. III. Wellington: James Hughes Printers, 1870.
- Tregear, Edward. *The Aryan Maori*. Christchurch: Kiwi Publishers, 1995.
- Tregear, Edward. "The Moriori." *Transactions and Proceedings of the New Zealand Institute* 22, (1989).
- Turnbull, J. "Moriori Connection." Article read before the Wellington Philosophical Society, 23rd August, 1879.
- Wanhalla, Angela. "The Natives Uncivilise Me: Missionaries and Interracial Intimacy in Early New Zealand." In *Missionaries, Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Exchange*, ed. Patricia Grimshaw and Andrew May, 24-36. Eastbourne: Sussex Academic Press, 2010.
- White, John. *The Ancient History of the Maori, His Mythology and Traditions: Horo-Uta or Taki-Tumu Migration, Vol. III*. Wellington: Government Printer, 1887.
- Williams, Vernon J. *Rethinking Race: Franz Boas and His Contemporaries*. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1996.

Wiseman, Dorothy. "Early days in the Chatham Islands: The Son of a Missionary Looks Back." *The New Zealand Railways Magazine* 14, no. 10 (1940), 28-30.

Young, Grant. "Judge Norman Smith: A Tale of Four 'Take'." *New Zealand Universities Law Review* 21, no.2 (2004), 309-330.