

Reading 1

24 BIBLE & TREATY

By Keith Newman.

Marsden's challenge

The Clapham Sect restored a sense of democracy to Britain by challenging class and social structures, affirming that all people were equal under God. Rather than preaching in elaborate, architecturally designed churches from prepared intellectual sermons, the preachers of the 'Great Enlightenment' often spoke 'as the Spirit moved' in town squares or out in the field where the ordinary workers could hear the message.

Clapham Sect members were determined that the British would improve the treatment of indigenous people, and they seized on the opportunity to expand mission work throughout the Colonies. Their goal was to take the gospel to 'the heathen' (unbelievers) in obedience to the 'Great Commission' of Jesus Christ, recorded in Matthew 28:18–20, 'to make disciples of all nations'. To this end they formed the interdenominational London Missionary Society (LMS) and at the inaugural Missionary Society meeting in London in 1795, New Zealand was mentioned as a place where such work was required.

While they waited for official approval from the Church of England, a group of twenty-five members of the Clapham Sect got together on 12 April 1799 to form the Church Missionary Society to Africa and the East (later simply the CMS). The society was comprised mainly of Anglicans, but was determined to retain friendly relations with other denominations; although there was some tolerance for the Roman Catholics, they were excluded. The 'official' proposal from the LMS to have missionaries in New Zealand was made in the director's report at the sixth general meeting on 14 May 1800:

They [the Directors] have endeavoured to interest Governor King in favour of the Missionaries, and have requested his patronage to their design of establishing missions at New Holland, Norfolk Island, and New Zealand, whenever it may be practicable.²²

However, the bishops in Britain opposed the idea of ordaining ministers for missionary work. To get around the lack of ordained volunteers, John Venn, chaplain to the Clapham Sect reformers and first chairman of the CMS, suggested laymen with skills in various practical disciplines, such as building and farming, could help civilise those in primitive countries and pave the way for Christianity. They would be signed on as catechists, able to teach and pray, and if necessary baptise, but not to conduct the sacrament or communion. This ruling was designed to make mission work more attractive to those outside the realms of the well educated, and to pave the way to train ministers from among the 'native' populations.

The Church of England again railed against such a suggestion – no person could preach or teach or act in any respect like a minister, unless they had been trained in the classic Greek and Latin languages and had completed the rigid process of ordination. This held up the approval of the new society for more than a year. Although the CMS dropped the term 'catechist', it took three more years to find suitable recruits. Even then, after fifteen years it had sent out only twenty-four missionaries, eighteen of them German Lutherans and only seven Englishmen; three of those ordained were sent to Sierra Leone, the first established mission.

Samuel Marsden, a blacksmith's son, was a strong supporter of the 'civilise first' approach. In his youth he had close links with the Wesleyan Methodists, and he held them and their evangelical approach in high regard. He had been recruited into the Anglican Church in 1786 and two years later was sent to Magdalene College in Cambridge to train for the ministry. He was ordained a minister and chaplain in 1793.

Through the recommendation of William Wilberforce, Marsden cut his studies short and was appointed assistant chaplain to the newly established convict colony in New South Wales. In March 1794 he set sail for Sydney Cove, Australia with his wife Elizabeth and baby daughter Ann, the first of their eight children.

By 1800 Marsden was chaplain and magistrate to the colony. He stood no nonsense from the convicts; he detested their lawlessness, and the colonists' harsh treatment of the Aborigines. He gained a reputation as 'the flogging parson' after his use of the cat o' nine tails to punish those involved in the Irish uprising at the penal colony in 1804.

Marsden purchased 100 acres at Parramatta, west of Sydney, and began tilling and planting the land, providing vegetables, fruit, wheat and corn for the prison, for missionaries sent out to Australia and for the many immigrant families settling in the growing town of Port Jackson. He experimented with different grasses and cross-bred sheep to get the best wool, eventually preparing the first commercial wool shipment to England.

Marsden kept in close contact with his early sponsors in the Clapham Sect and was a director and agent for the LMS. In his role as principal chaplain, he was agent for its Tahitian mission, co-founder with Gidley King of the Female Orphanage, and an ardent campaigner against drunkenness and immorality.²³ He first learned of the Māori people through the whalers and trading ships that stopped off in Port Jackson loaded with spoil from New Zealand. His desire to take the gospel there was reinforced by personal encounters with a growing number of Māori fleeing from virtual slave labour or recuperating from their ill treatment at the hands of ships' crew.

Reading 2

Marsden, Samuel

by G. S. Parsonson

Biography

According to reliable sources Samuel Marsden was born on 25 June 1765, at Farsley, Yorkshire, England, the eldest of the seven children of Bathsheba Brown and her husband, Thomas Marsden. He was baptised at Calverley, near Leeds, on 21 July 1765. At the age of 14 or 15 he went to work in his uncle's smithy, and in 1786 was recruited by an Anglican evangelical group, who sent him to Magdalene College, Cambridge, in 1790. Two years later he accepted an appointment as assistant chaplain to the colony of New South Wales. In 1793 he was ordained, and at Hull on 21 April he married Elizabeth Fristan.

Marsden arrived at Sydney Cove on 10 March 1794 with his wife and new-born daughter, Ann, the first of their eight children. He took up residence at Parramatta in July, and concerned himself with the welfare of orphan children and female convicts. In October he took up a 100 acre block, where he quickly put to good use the gardening and farming implements he had brought with him. Late in 1795 he also consented to serve as a magistrate (gaining a reputation for severity) and as superintendent of government affairs.

In the next few years Marsden was very busy, not merely as chaplain and magistrate but as a rising landowner. However, he early felt the call to evangelise. He lent his warm support to the infant missions to the South Seas, and in 1804 took up the post of local agent for the London Missionary Society's Pacific operations. Marsden's attention gradually turned to the Māori of New Zealand as a promising people for evangelisation. He often accommodated visiting Māori, putting them up in his own house and teaching them, entirely at his own expense. As early as 1805 Te Pahi was a visitor.

The extension of the mission to New Zealand was another matter. In 1800 Marsden had been called on to act as sole chaplain for New South Wales, and it was not until 1807 that he was free to return to London to plead his cause before the Church Missionary Society. He then raised a band of lay settlers to prepare the way for ordained missionaries. They were William Hall, a joiner; Thomas Kendall, a schoolmaster; and John King, a ropemaker. It was not until August 1809 that Marsden left England aboard the *Ann* with Hall and King. Ruatara, of Ngāpuhi, who was discovered in England in a sick and neglected state, travelled with them and was to spend eight months with Marsden, to whom he taught the rudiments of the Māori language.

The establishment of the New Zealand outpost was further delayed. The missionary societies rejected Marsden's proposal to link Sydney, Tahiti and New Zealand, and, probably in February 1814, he was obliged to buy his own ship, the *Active*, for £1,400, most of which came out of his own pocket. The temporary Colonial Office veto of any further settlement in New Zealand almost proved the last straw. Hall and Kendall (who had come out in 1813) did not reach the Bay of Islands until June 1814; Marsden himself did not arrive until December.

On the face of it the new venture began well enough. On 20 December, at Matauri Bay, Marsden persuaded Ngāti Uru and Ngāpuhi to make peace. On the 22nd he landed at Rangihoua, Ruatara's place. On Christmas Day Marsden led off with the *Old Hundredth* (Psalm 100) and then preached from Luke 2:10 – 'behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy' – to a large, well-drilled congregation. Ruatara translated for him. On the 26th Marsden set up a charcoal forge to replenish his stock of axes; and on the 27th he went to Kawakawa to lay in a supply of kahikatea. Early in the new year he perambulated the bounds of his extended parish with Hongi Hika and Ruatara. On 13 January 1815 he went aboard the *Active* with Te Morenga of Taiāmai, near Waimate North, another old friend, to prospect the coast as far as the Thames. On 15 February he completed his cargo of flax and timber, and on the 24th, after buying the mission site of some 200 acres at Rangihoua, he cleared for Sydney.

All the same, success was far from assured. In his walks abroad Marsden had seen much want and misery. He had also been made aware of the inveterate jealousy of the hapū, their tendency to violence and revenge, their attachment to tapu and to their own gods. The death of Ruatara soon after Marsden's departure was a serious blow. The evil conduct of the crews of passing ships, the matching of violence with violence, was further cause for concern. In addition, the ever-increasing cost of blankets, clothes and tools for visiting chiefs at Rangihoua and Parramatta, rice and potatoes for Kendall's school, provisions for the mission village at Rangihoua, and the salaries of the New Zealand settlers, was soon a major worry. The *Active* had to be sent whaling to pay her way. There were, before long, personal difficulties with his missionaries. They seemed unable to work amicably together, or to agree on what should be done.

A year or two later things were no better. Marsden's chief ground for complaint at this stage was the private trade in firearms, which he had banned as early as 1815. In February 1819 he was obliged to entreat his settlers once again to desist. They all except Hall agreed to do so, and then promptly yielded to temptation once more. Marsden's own connection with the venture was also in doubt. In New South Wales his material success, and his violent disagreements with the governor, Lachlan Macquarie, and others had caused his missionary ventures to be regarded with suspicion and even contempt. In response to Macquarie's repeated refusal to grant him leave to revisit the Bay of Islands, Marsden took in increasing numbers of Māori at Parramatta and taught them fish-curing, ropemaking, and brickmaking. He also added to his properties so that he could employ all who came in gardening and agriculture, mixed with moral and religious instruction. He plied the settlers at

Rangihoua with advice, supplies, and extra hands at his own cost, and kept the Active going back and forth, to pick up pork and timber and more visitors.

In mid 1819, with the Church Missionary Society's blessing, Marsden moved to take an even firmer grip on the venture. In the course of his second visit to New Zealand, from 12 August to 9 November 1819, he dismissed two of the settlers and banned once more the traffic in powder and muskets. In February 1820, at the beginning of his third visit, he remonstrated in vain with Kendall about the latter's impending visit to England with Hongi. In June 1822 he suspended Kendall for adultery with a Māori woman. He also found himself obliged to report the disobedience of the Reverend J. G. Butler, the superintendent of the mission since July 1819.

In the same period he also set about strengthening the mission. In 1819 he established a new settlement at Kerikeri, and 'bought' from Hongi a 13,000 acre block of land there, which he thought might answer the needs of any poor colonising families the society might send out. In 1820 he stationed James Shepherd with Te Morenga at Taiāmai. In August 1823 he opened a further station at Paihia for the Reverend Henry Williams. He also gave what help he could to the infant Wesleyan Methodist mission established at Kaeo, near Whangaroa, in 1823.

The objectives of Marsden's visits to New Zealand at this stage were, however, very different in kind. He wanted to see the country and its people, and his remaining journals describe in vivid detail his long journeys, often in rugged, heavily bushed country where no European had ventured. On his third visit, from 27 February to 5 December 1820, he went as far as Tauranga, then back to Kaipara, accompanied by Te Morenga. He also wished to examine at first hand Māori economy, institutions and religious beliefs. Above all, he had come to teach and to preach. Wherever he went he talked, often far into the night, on all manner of subjects – agriculture, commerce, navigation, the principles of government – but especially on the absurdity of tapu, the root cause of all their wars, 'upon the works of Creation, the being and attributes of God, and the institution of the Sabbath Day, and the resurrection of the dead.' He also hoped to press ahead with the translation of the Bible into Māori.

In his latter years Marsden was still to suffer much pain and sorrow in the pursuit of what he deemed to be the Lord's will. The setting aside of his claims as archdeacon in 1824 he looked on as of small moment, but he was deeply distressed by W. C. Wentworth's libels in the third edition of *A statistical account of the British settlements in Australasia* (London, 1824), and a reprimand in December by Earl Bathurst, the secretary of state for the colonies, in response to Marsden's charges against the government official H. G. Douglass. He felt he had served his country faithfully and to the best of his ability for 34 years, and at the last had been held up as a promoter of public discord.

The crisis passed, and Marsden's publication in London in 1826 of *An answer to certain calumnies*, and the removal of Douglass from office in 1827, silenced his enemies and produced an effect in his favour in the colony. Even more happily, the

new governor, Ralph Darling, encouraged his missionary endeavours, although Marsden's advice to the New Zealand mission was not always accepted. The missionaries, under Henry Williams, often tended to go their own way.

Marsden's brief visits to the Bay of Islands were packed with action. On his fifth visit, in April 1827 aboard the *Rainbow*, he pointed out to various chiefs their crimes in robbing the Wesleyans at Whangaroa. On his sixth visit, with his daughter Mary, from March to May 1830, he played a vital part in restoring peace between the rival armies in the bloody Girls' War. A no less significant move was to set up a farm at Waimate North, to render the settlers less dependent on uncertain and expensive supplies from New South Wales and to set an example of peaceful, constructive industry. He threw himself into the work of teaching the small groups of anxious young inquirers who visited him in the evenings, and preaching in Māori to the crowds who gathered round him wherever he went.

Marsden never really retired, although in his latter years he began to show signs of wear and tear. In October 1835 Elizabeth Marsden died. She had been disabled since 1811. The following December Marsden himself was taken ill. He recovered, but still refused to rest. In February 1837, with his daughter Martha, he undertook yet another voyage to New Zealand, at his own expense. This visitation assumed the proportions of a triumphal procession. At Hokianga hundreds came to pay their respects to the grand old man. On his arrival at Waimate North, where he was borne on a litter through the bush, he was greeted with reverence. On 1 April he visited Kaitaia where Māori came in party after party. For all his physical weakness he nonetheless threw himself into the ordinary business of the mission. He not only spent endless hours at committee meetings on all manner of subjects, but ventured many times with Henry Williams into the rival grog-drenched, convict-infested pā, in a vain effort to negotiate an enduring peace between Pōmare II and Tītoke. More happily, he visited most of the mission stations within 100 miles of Waimate North, to teach and preach to their scattered parishioners and to lend the weight of his name to the rapid spread of the arts of reading and writing, the diffusion of peace and order and of the Gospels.

His final departure was on 2 June 1837 aboard the *Rattlesnake*, via the Thames and Cloudy Bay. On his arrival at Sydney he spoke of returning to New Zealand perhaps once a year. He became progressively more feeble, however, and on 12 May 1838, on a visit to Windsor, he breathed his last. He was buried in the churchyard of St John's Church, Parramatta.

Inevitably, Marsden was much misunderstood in his generation and just as often misrepresented. In essence he was simple-minded and honest, even to a fault. He was also open-handed, almost prodigal with his time and his money. If he apparently neglected to evangelise the Aborigines it was not from want of trying. He also looked with pity on the fallen and the lost; he often befriended convicts. He was extraordinarily generous towards those who disappointed him, or even those who hated him. As he was always ready to admit, he could make mistakes, from human

weakness, or from lack of counsellors in times of trouble. If he had a serious fault, it was his predisposition to take offence.

His role in the gradual emergence of New Zealand is difficult to assess. Without him the conversion of Māori to Christianity might have been long delayed. Marsden also transformed the Māori economy and laid the foundations of New Zealand agriculture. It can be said, too, that he made a notable contribution to the debate which ended in the British annexation of New Zealand. In 1831 he urged Darling to put a stop to the growing trade in tattooed heads, and protested with great energy the participation of a British captain and crew in the abduction and torture of Tamai-hara-nui of Ngāi Tahu by Ngāti Toa. He urged the dispatch of a naval vessel with due power to restrain such scandalous misbehaviour, and recommended the appointment of a British Resident with proper authority, to whom Māori could appeal for redress.

In the last resort, however, as Marsden recognised, all this would hardly be enough. He was far from objecting to the occasional colonisation of thinly peopled or vacant districts, and opined that if 'a body of good men were to sit down as Colonists...it would prove a great blessing to the Island.' Whatever the case, it would be necessary for some power to take New Zealand under its protection if the anarchy that prevailed at Kororāreka (Russell) were not to become universal. That that power was ultimately Great Britain was in large measure due to the apostolic labours of Samuel Marsden.

Links and sources

Bibliography

Marsden, S. Letters and journals. Ed. J. R. Elder.
Dunedin, 1932

Marsden, S. Letters to Church Missionary Society,
1808–1837. MS. DUHO

Marsden, S. Letters to London Missionary Society,
1799–1835. LMS Archives, School of Oriental and
African Studies, University of London

Marsden, S. Papers, 1794–1837. Micro MS 743. WTU

Quinn, R., Samuel Marsden: altar ego. Wellington,
2008

Sharp, A. The world, the flesh & the devil: the life and
opinions of Samuel Marsden in England and the
antipodes. Auckland, 2016

How to cite this page:

G. S. Parsonson. 'Marsden, Samuel', Dictionary of New Zealand Biography, first published in 1990, updated May, 2013. Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand, <https://teara.govt.nz/en/biographies/1m16/marsden-samuel> (accessed 31 October 2022)

All text licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 3.0 New Zealand Licence (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/nz/deed.en>). Commercial re-use may be allowed on request. All non-text content is subject to specific conditions. © Crown Copyright.

Reading 3

"The Treaty of Waitangi - Texts and Translations"
By Ruth Ross, 1972.

136

R. M. ROSS

The Maori Text

The language of the Treaty of Waitangi is not indigenous Maori; it is missionary Maori, specifically Protestant missionary Maori. There is a tendency in New Zealand history to refer to 'the missionaries' when in fact only those of the Protestant missions are

⁴¹ At this stage Hobson appears to have had in his possession the following sheets of the treaty: the Waitangi sheet with the Kaitia signatures also attached, the two Bay of Plenty sheets, the *Herald* sheet, the Cook Strait sheet and the East Coast sheet, with a total of 484 names. If one adds the 39 names on the Waikato-Manukau agreement in the English language, the total is 523. It would thus seem that either in New Zealand or in the Colonial Office eleven names had been omitted in the processes of copying and counting, perhaps deliberately for, as 'signatures', some are indeed of very doubtful validity. The Manukau-Kawhia sheet, with 13 more names, came to hand later, and there is also a printed sheet (of the Maori text) with 5 more names, undated, making a grand total of 541 by my count, 502 (including both Te Rau-paraha's signatures) being appended to the Maori text, 39 to the agreement in the English language.

⁴² CO 209/7, p. 178.

⁴³ See n. 41 above.

⁴⁴ From the first signatures, taken at Waitangi on 6 February, to the last dated signature, at Kawhia on 3 September. The signatures on the printed sheet may have been added later still.

intended. This is a legacy of past usage. When Lord Normanby told Hobson 'you will, I trust, find powerful auxiliaries amongst the missionaries',⁴⁵ it was the English Protestant missionaries only, and of them the Anglicans in particular, whom he had in mind. To the Maori, also, the *mihinare*⁴⁶ was a member of the Protestant missions. When the first French Catholic missionaries arrived in New Zealand, clearly they were different, and so were given a different name, *pikopo*,⁴⁷ their leader being a bishop.

The 1830s had seen a great boom in Maori literacy, especially in northern New Zealand, which was both precipitated and nourished by the translations and publications of the Anglican and Wesleyan missionaries.⁴⁸ With the new skills of reading and writing came new ideas, not only about religious matters but also about manners and customs of peoples beyond the shores of New Zealand. The Maori was a great traveller, and an avid listener to travellers' tales. The translation of scriptural and liturgical texts, culminating towards the end of the decade with the printing of the entire New Testament in Maori,⁴⁹ opened up a new world to all who could read, but it was a world as strange and as liable to misinterpretation by the Maori reader as was the world of London or Port Jackson by the Maori traveller. It was in the light of his knowledge of these two worlds, the world from which the Pakeha in New Zealand had come and the world in which Christ had lived and died, that the New Zealander of 1840 had to judge the Treaty of Waitangi, a document which attempted to enunciate concepts of one of these foreign worlds in a language which, though supposedly his own, was actually the language of the Protestant translations.

In his biography of his father-in-law, Hugh Carleton subsequently wrote: 'In this translation, Mr. Williams had the assistance of his son Edward, *facile princeps*, among Maori scholars, in regard to the Ngapuhi dialect,—generally admitted, except in Waikato, to be the Attic of New Zealand.'⁵⁰ Presumably the old Etonian thought that this signified something, but in its New Zealand context this

⁴⁵ GBPP, 1840, XXXIII [238], p. 38.

⁴⁶ A transliteration of 'missionary', applied first to the Protestant (especially Anglican) missionaries, and then to their converts.

⁴⁷ A transliteration of *episcopus*, applied first to Bishop Pompallier, then to his converts.

⁴⁸ See H. W. Williams, *A Bibliography of Printed Maori*, Wellington, 1924, and *Supplement*, Wellington, 1928, also C. J. Parr, 'A Missionary Library. Printed Attempts to Instruct the Maori, 1815-1845', *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, LXX (1961), 429-49. By January 1840 the Catholic mission had only one small booklet of prayers and instruction in print, the content of which would not have affected Maori understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi text.

⁴⁹ On 30 December 1837, Colenso entered in his 'Day and Waste Book': 'Finished printing the New Testament, 5,000 copies demy 8vo., Glory be to God alone!' (Quoted in A. G. Bagnall and G. C. Petersen, *William Colenso*, Wellington, 1948, p. 49.) But before all these 5000 Testaments were available to *mihinare* readers, they had to be bound and this took time.

⁵⁰ Carleton, II, 12.

comment was pretentious and misleading. In 1840, Edward Williams was a green young man of twenty-one; his spoken Maori was very probably more fluent than his father's, his ignorance of English constitutional law and convention almost certainly greater. Neither father nor son was an experienced translator, but those who were—William Williams, Maunsell and Puckey among the Anglicans, Hobbs of the Wesleyans—were not at hand in the Bay. Colenso, the mission printer, far more aware than anyone else of the problems of understanding involved, was neither considered for nor consulted in the task of translation. His public intervention on the morning of 6 February, just as Hone Heke was about to add the first Maori signature to the treaty, seems to have raised no real doubts in the minds of Hobson, Busby or Williams about whether in fact the New Zealanders understood what they were doing. Yet Colenso then posed as a possibility the very objection which before long was levelled against the Protestant missionaries: 'the missionaries should explain the thing in all its bearings to the Natives, so that it should be their own very act and deed. Then, in case of a reaction taking place, the Natives could not then turn round on the missionary and say, "You advised me to sign that paper, but never told me what were the contents thereof."⁵¹ Of even greater significance than the fact that the Treaty of Waitangi was written in *mihinare* Maori was the monopoly which the Protestant missionaries had of interpretation and explanation. Henry Williams filled this role at a number of later meetings as well as at Waitangi itself. His son Edward was interpreter on the signature-gathering cruise of HMS *Herald*. Anglican and Wesleyan missionaries acted as interpreters at all the treaty meetings in their respective areas, with the exception of those in the eastern Bay of Plenty, conducted by a young trader, James Fedarb, on instruction from the Anglican missionaries at Tauranga, and at the second Manukau meeting when W. C. Symonds, a government official, was without missionary Hamlin's assistance as interpreter. Except at Waikato Heads in mid-March and at Manukau in late April, the Maori text of the Treaty of Waitangi itself was read and explained to the chiefs assembled at all treaty meetings.⁵²

⁵¹ Colenso, *Authentic and Genuine History*, p. 33.

⁵² At Symond's first Manukau meeting on 20 March, Hamlin acted as his interpreter and three signatures were obtained on a copy of the Maori text which Symonds subsequently forwarded to the Wesleyans at Kawhia. (This is the Manukau-Kawhia sheet.) At Waikato Heads, Symonds found that Maunsell had held a meeting in mid-March and had obtained a number of signatures, which were witnessed by Maunsell and Ashwell on 11 April. These signatures were to an agreement in the English language. Symonds took this document back to Manukau with him and there obtained some more signatures to it on 26 April. On this latter occasion, Symonds was without a Maori text and without Hamlin's services as interpreter. Posterity therefore is as much in the dark about what the signatories at this second Manukau meeting thought they were signing as about those who had signed at Waikato in mid-March.

Although challenged at Waitangi, Williams seems to have had no qualms about his competence as translator, nor about his performance as interpreter: 'In this translation it was necessary to avoid all expressions of the English for which there was no expressive term in the Maori, preserving entire the spirit and tenor of the treaty,—which, though severely tested, has never yet been disturbed, notwithstanding that many in power have endeavoured to do so.'⁵³

About Busby's contribution, Williams was equally positive: 'On a careful examination of the translation of the treaty by Mr. Busby, he proposed to substitute the word *whakaminenga* for *huihuinga*, which was done and approved of.'⁵⁴ So much for Busby's claim to have 'drawn the treaty'.



154

The signatories of 1840 were uncertain and divided in their understanding of its meaning; who can say now what its intentions were? Ratification is a legal and constitutional process; a treaty—if this was indeed a treaty—can surely be ratified only in the terms in which it was signed.

However good intentions may have been, a close study of events shows that the Treaty of Waitangi was hastily and inexpertly drawn up, ambiguous and contradictory in content, chaotic in its execution. To persist in postulating that this was a 'sacred compact' is sheer hypocrisy.

McLean, translating Gore Browne's opening speech at the Kohimarama Conference, called the treaty *te Kawenata o Waitangi*,¹¹⁶ the covenant, the promise of Waitangi. If Waitangi 1840 held any real promise for the future, it was perhaps in Hobson's few words of halting Maori to each man as he signed: *He iwi tahi tatou*.¹¹⁷ 'We are one people'.

R. M. ROSS

Weymouth

¹¹⁶ *Te Karere Maori*, 14 July 1860, p. 6.

¹¹⁷ Colenso, *Authentic and Genuine History*, p. 35.

Once the treaty had been read in English and Māori, an invitation was made for any issues to be raised. Busby explained that the governor had not come to take away land from the Māori but to give them security over what they had not sold. Land unfairly acquired would be returned to those who rightfully owned it. This was confirmed by Hobson.

Neither up nor down?

Suddenly Te Kemara, a chief of the Ngāti Kawa, rose and in an animated outburst said he did not wish the governor to remain in the country. If everyone was to be equal perhaps he would consent to this, but not if the governor was 'high up, up, up, and Te Kemara down low, small, a worm, a crawler. No, no, no. O Governor . . . my land is gone, gone, all gone. The inheritances of my ancestors, fathers, relatives, all gone, stolen, gone with the missionaries. Yes, they have it all.'

He pointed the finger at Busby and Williams, and with his eyes rolling in his head and extravagant gestures and grimaces, said that even the land under his feet was his and he wanted it returned. He ran up to Williams pointing, 'Thou, thou, thou bald-headed man, thou hast got my lands. O Governor! I do not wish thee to stay. You English are not kind to us like other foreigners. You do not give us good things. I say, Go back, go back, Governor, we do not want thee here in this country.'

Rewa, chief of the Ngāpuhi subtribe of Ngāitawake, arose and, opening his speech, said in English, 'How d'ye do, Mr Governor?', which immediately turned the atmosphere to one of humour. Then he continued in similar fashion, urging the governor to return to his own country.

Let my lands be returned to me which have been taken by the missionaries, by Davis and by Clarke, and by who and who besides. I have no lands now . . . Foreigners come; they know Mr Rewa, but this is all I have left, a name!

What do Native men want of a Governor? We are not whites, nor foreigners. This country is ours, but the land is gone. Nevertheless we are the Governor, we, the chiefs of this our fathers' land. I will not say 'Yes' to the Governor's remaining . . . What! this land to become like Port Jackson and all other lands seen [or found] by the English. No, no. Return. I, Rewa, say to thee, O Governor! go back.²¹

Moka, chief of the Patuheka tribe, continued the tirade, urging Hobson to leave the people alone, return the lands and go back to his own country. Hobson assured him that 'all lands unjustly held would be returned and that all claims to lands, however purchased, after the date of the Proclamation would

not be held to be lawful'. Moka continued, 'There! Yes, that is as I said. No, no, no; all false, all false alike. The lands will not return to me.'

Which land is my land?

After further discussion, including claims that Henry Williams wasn't interpreting everything said by the Māori chiefs, Williams had his turn. He said a commission of inquiry was already underway into land held by missionaries, and this would be done with the same strictness as the investigation into all other land titles. He had already applied to have his titles validated.

While much had been said about the missionaries holding land, and about their farming, Williams reminded everyone that they would not be there on this day if it had not been for the missionaries, and if anyone was entitled to land, surely it must be the missionaries who had laboured for many years 'when others were afraid to show their noses'.

Williams explained that he had a large family of eleven children, and the land that had been signed over to them was for their provision so that they might earn a living when he had passed on. 'I hope that all who hold lands obtained from the Natives will be able to show as good and as honest titles to the same as the missionaries can do to theirs.'

Busby also defended his land ownership. He insisted that any land he had was 'pressed' on him by Māori and he had 'paid them liberally'. He had not made any extensive purchases until he was out of office, and after having 'served the government for fifteen years' he realised that no provision had been made for him. In all his purchases, he said, he had given portions back to Māori for their residence and cultivation.

Tamati Pukututu, chief of Te Uri o te Hawato tribe, changed the tone by urging the governor to remain as 'a father to the people' so that the lands would remain with the people and those 'fellows and creatures who sneak about, sticking to rocks and to the sides of brooks and gullies, may not have it all'. He claimed that those who wanted the governor to leave had sold all their possessions and were filled with foreign property and hadn't any more to sell. 'What of it? Sit, Governor, sit. You two stay here, you and Busby, and they also, the missionaries.'

Kawiti, chief of the Ngāti Hine tribe, began his oratory performance, saying that Māori did not wish to be tied up and trodden down:

Let the missionaries remain, but, as for thee, return to thine own country. I will not say 'Yes' to thy sitting here . . . to be fired at when quietly paddling in our boats and canoes by night! . . . I, Kawiti, must not paddle this way, nor paddle that way, because the Governor said 'No', - because of the Governor,

his soldiers, and his guns! No, no, no. Go back, go back; there is no place here for the Governor.'²²

Getting things straight

Wai, a chief of the Ngāitawake tribe, asked the governor if he would provide a remedy for the 'selling, exchanging, cheating, lying and stealing of the whites'.

O Governor! yesterday I was cursed by a white man. Is that straight? The white gives us Natives a pound for a pig; but he gives a white four pounds for such a pig. Is that straight? The white gives us a shilling for a basket of potatoes but to a white he gives four shillings for a basket like that one of ours. Is that straight? No, no; they will not listen to thee; so go back, go back. If they would listen and obey, ah! yes, good that; but have they ever listened to Busby? And will they listen to thee, a stranger, a man of yesterday? Sit, indeed! What for? Wilt thou make dealing straight?

Hakiro, the son of Tareha, also opposed the governor's presence. 'The missionaries and Busby are our fathers. We do not want thee; so go back, return, walk away.' Then Tareha, chief of Ngāti Rēhia – described by Colenso as by far the largest Māori in the district 'with a deep sepulchral voice' – began his oration. He wore a filthy piece of coarse old floor-matting tied round his middle. He said the Māori would not be ruled over by a foreigner setting himself up higher than the chiefs who had already lost their land. 'Dost thou think we are poor, indigent, poverty-stricken, that we really need thy foreign garments, thy food?'

Tareha then held up a bundle of dried fern and a canoe paddle.

See, this is my food, the food of my ancestors, the food of the Native people. Pshaw, Governor! To think of tempting us Natives with baits of clothing and of food! Yes, I say we are the chiefs. If all were to be alike, all equal in rank with thee . . . up high-up, up, as this tall paddle and I down, under, beneath! No, no, no . . . Let me see you [all] go, thee and thy ship. Go, go; return, return.

Hoani (Hone) Heke, a chief of the Matarahurahu tribe, attempted to summarise the feeling of the meeting and the views of the different speakers. If the governor were to leave and then return again he might find the Māori race completely decimated, 'utterly gone, nothinged, extinct. What, then, shall we do? Who are we?' He urged the governor to remain as a father to the people.

Then, addressing the tribes, Heke said the treaty was a good thing.

It is even as the word of God. Thou to go away! No, no, no! For then the French people or the rum-sellers will have us Natives. Remain, remain; sit, sit here; you with the missionaries, all as one. But we Natives are children, yes, mere children. It is not for us, but for you, our fathers, you missionaries, it is for you to say, to decide, what it shall be. It is for you to choose . . . You, our fathers, you missionaries. Sit, I say, Governor, sit! A father, a Governor for us.

Tamati Waka Nene, chief of Ngāti Hau, also tried to gain a consensus on how the gathered tribes should act.

Is not the land already gone? Is it not covered, all covered, with men, with strangers, foreigners, even as the grass and herbage over whom we have no power? We, the chiefs and Natives of this land, are down low; they are up high, exalted. What, what do you say?

Waka Nene continued to say that if in the old time the traders and grog sellers had been turned away, it would have been correct and straight to turn away the governor, but now things were different and he feared the people would be left sick and dead if the governor were to leave. Turning to Hobson, he concluded:

O Governor! Sit, I, Tamati Waka, say to thee, sit. Do not thou go away from us; remain for us, a father, a judge, a peacemaker. Yes, it is good, it is straight. Sit thou here; dwell in our midst. Remain; do not go away. Do not thou listen to what [the chiefs of] Ngapuhi say. Stay thou, our friend, our father, our Governor.

Eruera Maehe Patuone, Waka Nene's elder brother, who had recently arrived from Waiheke Island, added his words:

What shall I say on this great occasion, in the presence of all those great chiefs of both countries? Here, then, this is my word to thee, O Governor! Sit, stay, thou, and the missionaries and the Word of God. Remain here with us, to be a father for us, that the French have us not, that Pikopo [Catholic], that bad man, have us not. Remain, Governor. Sit, stay, our friend.

At that point Te Kemara, who had been the first to speak, jumped up again in his excitable manner, asking for his land to be returned and refusing to come under the governor's leadership. Then he ran up to Hobson and, crossing his wrists in imitation of a man handcuffed, with fiery flashing eyes exclaimed 'Shall I be thus, thus? Say to me, Governor, speak. Like this, eh? Like this?'

He then seized Hobson's hand with both his and shook it heartily, roaring out in broken English, 'How d'ye do, eh, Governor? How d'ye do, eh, Mister Governor?' over and over again. The governor seemed to take it in good spirit and soon the whole gathering was convulsing in laughter. The incident with Te Kemara ended the meeting; Hobson announced they would reconvene on Friday 7 February.²³

THE WILLIAMS MUSEUM

Home	Introduction	The House & Surrounds	The Collection	The People	Williams & Māori	The Trust
------	--------------	-----------------------	----------------	------------	------------------	-----------

Williams and Land

Missionaries purchased land for the Church Missionary Society (for mission churches and buildings) and later to put land in reserve for Maori when settlers moved in. Private missionary land purchases were controversial from the outset. A few missionaries thought it wrong to buy or own land under any circumstances; the Church Missionary Society issued confused policy on the subject; and there was settler and New Zealand Company resentment. Missionaries who bought land did so to provide for their families. They argued their case with earnest conviction, but in Henry Williams' case, to no avail – ultimately he was disconnected from the Church Missionary Society, until later reinstated. This section of the website examines the land purchases and the argument for them.

Henry Williams and Land

In December 1830, in a letter to his brother-in-law Edward Marsh, Henry Williams foresaw the need to buy land for his children, who at fifteen would cease to be supported by the Church Missionary Society, and become a burden on their parents. In a virtual absence of potential occupations, farming was a solution. "We have written to the Society respecting the propriety of purchasing land on their [the children's] account; we do not wish to commence anything of the kind without their approbation. At the same time I do not see what else can be done".[1] His first purchase, from Te Morenga and others, was made in 1833, at Talamai (Titirangi).[2] Subsequent purchases were made in 1835, 1836, 1838, and 1839, more or less in step with sons and daughters turning fifteen. The properties were later put into trusts for his children with, in 1861, some 800 acres placed in trust for the Church. Land discussed here does not include purchases made on behalf of the Church Missionary Society for mission stations, or land bought in trust for Maori. The table below shows the parcels bought by Henry Williams and the acreage finally confirmed by Commissioners examining pre-1840 claims in 1844.

Claim number	Purchase date	Name of land	Size in acres	Turton, pages	Deed number
245	12.12.1833	Titirangi	1000	109,110	100
245a	21.01.1835	Pouerua	3000	120,121	113
245c	18.04.1836	Pukeawa	2000	144,145	139
245d	18.04.1836	Te Hihi	500	146	140
245b	15.05.1838	Pakaraka	500	170	172
245e	28.05.1838	Pareparea	2000	189,190	203

The locations are more or less south and west of the Waitangi River including or bordering on areas known today as Pouerua, Pakaraka, Waiarue, Puketona, Ohaeawae, and Oromahoe.[3]

Although his purchase at Titirangi was ostensibly for his children, Henry Williams hinted at some sort of community development there, building schools and ultimately a town.[4] In 1834, Te Morenga and his people were already present and actively working on the land. This notion, of continuing to involve the previous owners with the land, was present in other Missionary –Maori transactions.[5] An interesting insight comes in 1837 from the testimony of John Flatt before a House of Lords Select Committee, in which he described Maori labouring on land they had sold, receiving payment in goods, thus obtaining a supplementary return.[6]

Goods, and sometimes money and stock, were used in exchange for the land. The goods included tools of various sorts, iron pots, blankets, tobacco and pipes, and clothing – jackets, trousers and gowns. Horses and cattle appeared in some exchanges. Various currencies were used in the Bay of Islands in the 1830s, when the presence of a large number of American whaling ships contributed to the pool of dollars. Silver Spanish dollars – 'pieces of eight' – then had the status of an international currency.[7]

A contemporary assessment of the price paid to Maori by the missionaries showed that it was substantially more than that paid by the New Zealand Government (after 1840) and the New Zealand Company, being equivalent to 3s 4d per acre, as opposed to 3d and ½d per acre respectively.[8] The Land Commissioners examining Henry Williams' holdings in 1841 estimated that the value of goods and money given in exchange for the land amounted to £1722.[9] Williams himself valued his contribution at £1000.[10] Money spent on farm purchases, improvements, and working costs was later estimated by Henry Williams to be around £6000 to which legacies and gifts were said to contribute [11] – we can assume that this was expended over more than 10 years by himself and his sons. There is no evidence that he sold land for a profit, and any proceeds from the farm were reinvested in improvements. He claimed not to have received any payments from that source. The land was not sold for decades after he died. Descendants still farm in the area.

Generally, the land purchased was said to be unimproved, in scrub or bush, and of variable quality. Some land was purchased for access to other parcels. The areas purchased totalled 11000 acres, reduced after 1840 to 7010 acres by the Commissioners investigating pre-1840 claims, and then restored in 1844 to 9000 acres on the recommendation of Commissioner Fitzgerald, authorized by Governor FitzRoy.[12] By 1844, all but four of Henry and Marianne's children had turned fifteen, and were no longer receiving financial support from the Society. As none of them would have had the power or authority, or the *mana* to negotiate with the sellers, nor adequate financial resources, Henry Williams stood effectively as an agent acting on their behalf.

Initially, the land was not surveyed – accurate surveys were years away. Rather, the boundaries were described according to Maori custom using geographical or natural features. The following, relating to part of the Pakaraka purchase, is an example: "This is the Boundary. Pokapu, a piece of land covered with fern, and near an old sacred place called the Umutakiura, Tomotomokia, and along the boundary marked on trees as far as the Kuta: the Horu, and above the Horu, Kauri, Kopu and Puketotara, up to the old boundary". [13] In some deeds reference was made to the exclusion of sacred sites from the sale. The deeds were written in Maori, signed or marked with a cross by the vendors, and witnessed by fellow missionaries and Maori.[14] They make the land over to "Williams and his children for ever" (or similar wording) and may include "for them to reside on, to work on, to sell, or do what they like with it".

From time to time Henry Williams advised the Church Missionary Society when he was purchasing land and what was being given in exchange, but he was sometimes short on detail. He did, however, inform the Society as to the extent of his purchases in 1841, which the Society vindicated in 1845.[15] For reasons given above it would have been difficult to give accurate land measurements, although he could have made approximations. What the Society would have made of such estimates it is difficult to say, as they would have to be qualified by an assessment of land quality and potential productivity to make sense. Such estimates would invariably exceed the acreage of mature and productive English farms with which the Society could make comparisons. They would not easily comprehend the stocking rates of New Zealand scrubland, and the time, effort and cost to bring land into full productive capacity - a matter of some years.

Nevertheless, this would come back to haunt Henry Williams once the Society became aware of the total area he and other missionaries had purchased. Not all Maori-Missionary exchanges were trouble-free, but in those days Maori held the upper hand, and deceitful practices carried great risk. Maori chiefs who were among the vendors later swore that they disposed of the land willingly and had no wish to have it returned.[16] Tamati Waka Nene, a chief who was friendly towards the missionaries, wrote to Henry Williams in similar terms.[17] At the Treaty signing Maori voices were raised over missionary land holdings, which have continued to be referred to in claims and evidence heard by the Waitangi Tribunal.

All the above suggests that things were cut and dried: negotiations were held, agreements reached, deeds signed, and money and goods handed over. But given the times and the circumstances, it was not that simple. Initially, there was no legal structure to which the deeds could belong – land was bought and held under Maori sufferance. Over the period of purchase, and after New Zealand became a Crown Colony, the social, economic and political ground shifted substantially. The ways in which Maori land was acquired changed – not always for the better. Any Williams vision of a future New Zealand must have been constantly revised. After the Treaty was signed the missionary holdings were scrutinised by the Land Commissioners and the sizes in some cases amended - a process Henry Williams was comfortable with. The relationships between the Williams family and Maori were inevitably complex – not able to be fully revealed by quoted snapshots in letters and journal entries- and in particular we know little about what was in the minds of those who sold the land to Henry Williams. Were they merely seduced by the value of the goods and money on offer, or was there something else they hoped to gain from the exchange? If they thought that the land was alienated forever, what did they think might be their future relationship with it and the new owners? The contexts were much more than just a willing buyer and a willing seller and an exchange of value.

It has been said that in the 1830s Maori ideas of title and rights to land predominated, and negotiations over land were closely dependent on individual relationships forged between Maori and Europeans, the latter being incorporated into a Maori world. As long-standing mediators between this world and the European one, the missionaries were in a notably different position to other purchasers.[18] Most missionaries had close connections with particular iwi, and individuals within them.

How much was too much?

This is a difficult question to answer, and there are widely differing views. His biographers, Hugh Carleton and L.M. Rogers, and others strongly supported his case, as did some of his fellow missionaries including his brother William, Robert Maunsell, and Archdeacon Brown. Some, nursing faith-based objections, opposed the idea of missionaries owning land at all – Octavius Hadfield and William Colenso among them.[19] Bishop Selwyn was far from enthusiastic and later sided with those who challenged the purchases. Settlers and the New Zealand Company saw the missionaries as competitors, or obstructing their own negotiations – although E.G. Wakefield initially supported missionary purchases.[20] The missionaries Richard Taylor and Fairburn had purchased four to five times Henry Williams' acreage, although they claimed it was being held to protect Maori interests, for the most part. Although the Church Missionary Society was hard to pin down on quantity, it did urge restraint, and found reports of higher figures alarming.

At this distance from the 1830s it is difficult to estimate the amount of unimproved Northland land that would serve the needs of eleven progeny, all but one of whom would marry and start families of their own. In April 1833, the missionaries recommended to the Church Missionary Society that 200 acres of land be given to each child on reaching the age of fifteen. However, the Society hedged its acquiescence with conditions that were unacceptable. This was as well, as there was a growing recognition that "land in New Zealand was not like land in England" and a holding of 200 acres of unimproved land would lead to the starvation of people and animals.[21] A farm of this size might be a viable unit if fully developed and intensively farmed using modern farming practices. But that was not achievable at the time.

Frequent references were made to the quality of land, including that it was poor and fern-covered. Much of it was in Northland clay soils, and Northland soils in general need fertiliser for pasture growth.[22]

Making rough, but useful comparisons: in 2007 the average size for a sheep and beef cattle farm in New Zealand was 678.7 hectares or 1677 acres.[23] On the basis of a final grant to Henry Williams of 9000 acres, each of the Williams children might be allotted 331 hectares or 818 acres, assuming that it was evenly distributed.[24] This is approximately half the area of the average sheep and beef cattle farm in 2007, noted above, although we can assume that there will be viable units below the figure quoted. Also, we are comparing unimproved with today's improved acres, including modern, intensive farming practices. On this basis the area that was bought by Henry Williams and available for distribution among his family does not seem unreasonable.

As we are still, in the present century, evaluating the impacts of European-style farming on the country's environment, it is easy to imagine the difficulties of making judgements on land quality, management, sustainability and productivity all those years ago. Anyone having read Guthrie-Smith's *Tutira* might be less quick to judge those who began farming in the 1830s, with limited farming knowledge and little understanding of altered landscapes and New Zealand ecosystems.[25] How, under such circumstances would you know how much land would serve your purpose? What would be the outcomes? This is a context entirely left out of the debate.

Another figure to gain currency was that of 2560 acres, ultimately used by the Society as its bottom line for an individual missionary holding. Although this was for the relevant parent, not for the individual children for whom the land was destined. The figure had its origins with the New Zealand Legislative Council, which in 1841 had deemed it to be the maximum that the Land Commissioners examining pre-1840 claims, could grant. The figure faded from view, but periodically re-surfaced in the convoluted processes that followed.

The total figure is tied back to a single individual, in this instance Henry Williams, as if he were planning to farm it himself, for his own benefit. This was never the case. Other than keeping a watch on progress, giving encouragement and occasionally lending a hand, he was not greatly involved, and denied receiving any financial gain.[26] If he made a mistake, it was in not taking the legal steps to put the land in trust for each of the beneficiaries sooner than he did, even though that would have been difficult at the time. However, he would have been aware that circumstances might change cases in that volatile environment. Had the eleven Williams children each been able to buy 1000 acres of land as adults, fewer questions would have been raised. But they lacked the *mana* and financial resources of their parent, and Maori owners would not have negotiated with them. Under English Law the children could not act in an independent legal capacity until they were twenty-one - none of them had reached that point by the time the land was purchased.

The issue is complex and deserves a better analysis than simply exclaiming over the size of the purchase. In the end, Henry Williams was debating the issue from two perspectives: the first the need to provide adequate areas of farming land for his progeny, the second, to modify those amounts if Governor Grey apologised for slandering the missionaries over responsibility for the wars in the North. These were in conflict with each other - there needed to be a balance. The question remains - could they have done with less? Possibly, but not a great deal less, and by how much is so far unresolved.[27]

Apportionment

Henry and Marianne Williams had six sons and five daughters. In his Journal, Henry states that the land was purchased for "his boys" or "my children". Although distribution was likely to favour sons, there was reference to a division of the Pakaraka holding amongst his sons, with an allowance made to "unmarried ladies".[28] What form this allowance took is not clear, although it may not have been large. The women faced the prospect of marrying men in a similar situation to their brothers regarding employment. In an 1861 deed, putting land in trust for the church, reference is made to a land holding of Caroline Williams, one of Henry and Marianne's daughters, who by then had married into a family that is still farming in the area.

The land was made over to the children by deed by 1849.[29] Thomas Bartley, who became Henry Williams' solicitor, arrived in the Bay of Islands in 1839 and set up a practice in Auckland in 1841. Instructions to him from Henry Williams in 1851, regarding his will, stated that land grants made to the children were in the charge of trustees who would apportion the land according to need. Also, a tenth was to be set aside for schools and churches, again under a trusteeship.[30]

Attitudes to land purchases – the CMS and others.

From beginning to end, the Church Missionary Society's instructions and admonitions on land purchases were nebulous, ambiguous, and contradictory.[31] They were aware of "secular temptations" that would cause their missionaries to "stray from the path of righteousness". But they did not object to the purchase of land in order to make "adequate provision for families". In 1840, while disapproving such purchases in general, they did not wish to "lay down prohibitory rules". They were then upset to learn the extent of the purchases, but in 1845 excused the missionaries from censure, saying that they were warranted in making suitable arrangements for their children, especially given their long and devoted service to the country and the mission. By 1847 they were threatening disconnection of those missionaries whose grants were not approved by the Governor and the Bishop. Matters between Williams, Governor Grey and Bishop Selwyn - the source of great tension - were not resolved and on 30 November, 1849 the Society carried out its threat and Henry Williams was no longer in its service.[32] Four years later the Society rescinded its decision and, later still, apologised.

How could the Society be precise about purchases of land, condition and utility unknown, in a country that they had never seen, when the fundamentals of their thinking were at such odds? Their policies, never coherent or consistent, changed as they became subject to agendas pursued, and pressures applied, by individuals and organisations in England and New Zealand. Matters were made worse by the months separating relevant communications between the parties.[33] Appearances in person to argue cases were almost impossible given the distances involved.

How did this state of affairs evolve? The following summarizes the main points:[34]

In 1838 a Select Committee of the House of Lords heard from John Flatt, a former Church Missionary Society catechist who, among other things, referred to missionary land purchases. While his testimony contained inaccuracies, it was not particularly damning, nor was a subsequent publication, by Edward Gibbon Wakefield, complaining about the Church Missionary Society's attitude to colonisation by the New Zealand Association.[35] Nevertheless, these observations had the effect of alerting the Church Missionary Society to the issue, which was raised again in a vitriolic attack on the New Zealand missionaries by the colourful and abrasive J.D. Lang, a Presbyterian Minister from Australia who briefly visited New Zealand. [36] Thus, missionary problems with land were given significant impetus through Parliamentary inquiries into colonisation and the lobbying of the New Zealand Company in England, eventually coming to public notice through pamphleteering and the newspapers.[37]

In 1839-40 Henry and William Williams took alarm at the dubious land-buying practices of the New Zealand Company and New South Wales speculators, and as a countermeasure bought up land to be placed in reserve for Maori. They encouraged other missionaries to do the same, thus earning the lasting enmity of the New Zealand Company. By 1841, attacks on Henry Williams by the Wakefields and supporters of the New Zealand Company in England, were increasing.

In 1840 the Treaty of Waitangi was signed, translated into Maori by Henry Williams. Several missionaries took part in gathering Maori signatures around the country. In spite of their reluctance to accept colonisation, they recognised it as inevitable given the encroachment of what they saw as malign forces, damaging to Maori. With the Treaty came the development of Government institutions and regulation. Pre-1840 land claims, including those of the missionaries would be scrutinized and reviewed by the Land Commissioners and approved by Governor Fitzroy. Henry and William Williams came through relatively unscathed.

Next, two key figures arrived in New Zealand: Bishop Selwyn in 1842, and in 1845 Governor Grey, who replaced FitzRoy. Meanwhile, in 1844 an act of rebellion by Maori against the Government commenced. Called the "War in the North" it did not end until early 1846. This event would play a central role in forthcoming arguments over missionary land.

Grey made a number of attempts to discredit the missionaries – taking aim at Henry Williams in particular. Beginning with an accusation of his disloyalty during the rebellion he then attributed the cause of the war to the large land holdings of the missionaries. He developed his theme in dispatches, culminating in one to Gladstone, then Secretary of Colonial Affairs, in 1846. This last, the so-called "blood and treasure" dispatch", argued that a large expenditure of British blood and money and the use of naval and military force would be required to secure the missionaries in their land claims. [38] For the most part, Grey's claims were manifestly untrue – he later admitted as much to William Williams.[39] But an admission in New Zealand was not as good as a retraction in England, and pressure on the Church Missionary Society continued to mount.

In September 1847, Bishop Selwyn entered the fray, siding with Governor Grey, an act later deemed injudicious, and one that he would later regret when he lobbied for Henry Williams' reinstatement.[40] Grey then sought to prove that Governor FitzRoy's land grants were illegal, losing in the Supreme Court in 1848. A favourable appeal granted by the Privy Council was overtaken by Grey's own "Quieting Title" legislation in 1849. But, by having gained Selwyn's ear, Grey was able to allow additional pressure to be applied to the Church Missionary Society.

The major sticking point in negotiations was the refusal of Grey to withdraw his accusations against the missionaries, and Henry Williams' refusal to back down unless he did so.[41] In spite of continuing protests by Williams, on 21 May 1850 he received notice of his disconnection from the Church Missionary Society, and he moved with his family from Paihia to Pakaraka, where his sons were farming. The severance would last for four years.

In December 1850 William Williams left for England. He would appear before the Parent Committee of the Church Missionary Society to repudiate Grey's accusations, and restore his brother's reputation and membership of the Society. The Society acknowledged the former but would not reverse its decision.

Then in 1854, with pressure growing within the Society itself, both Grey and Selwyn sought Henry Williams' reinstatement by the Church Missionary Society, and on July 18, 1854, the Parent Committee of the Church Missionary Society passed a resolution, noting their regret at the disconnection and restoring Archdeacon Henry Williams as a missionary of the Society.

In New Zealand, by 1856 (Selwyn) and 1862 (Grey) the parties were reconciled. It was almost as if the events of the past few years had never happened. The saga was allowed to drag on for nearly two decades, and nobody emerges with a great deal of credit. The obduracy of Henry Williams, ineptitude of the Church Missionary Society, the deviousness of Grey, the misjudgements of Selwyn, all played their part. The dogged persistence and political influence of the New Zealand Company in England, were underestimated. The difficulties of trying to address complex problems in two jurisdictions, separated by half a world, cannot easily be dismissed.

In a sense Henry Williams had won, but not without cost. The land was in the hands of his family, he was still an Archdeacon and a member of the Mission, and relations with the Bishop and Governor Grey had been restored. But the affair had consumed the last two decades of his life. In a belated footnote, on 17 September 1939, just prior to the centenary of the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, the Church Missionary Society resolved to acknowledge the valuable

service given by Henry Williams, and made a formal apology for the way in which it had treated him, saying that their earlier judgements had been based on misinformation, the matter amplified by distance and poor communication.

William Williams and land

William Williams provides an interesting contrast to Henry Williams in the context of land. His holdings were smaller and more scattered. He was a more mobile missionary, and his purchases, both in location and quantity, reflect that. William and Jane also had a large family and the arguments made by Henry for sizeable land purchases could easily have been made by them had they been pressing. However, William and Jane had only three sons with two destined for the Church. Also, their family was much younger. At the time the Treaty was signed, only two children (both daughters) had reached fifteen years of age.

It is also the case that at the time he was making provision for his family, reaction against missionary land-buying was mounting in New Zealand and England. Also they were growing up in a New Zealand that was rapidly changing as it became a Crown Colony, with a growing settler population, infrastructure and economy, that would increasingly support employment. With the growth of mainstream Anglican congregations, a life in the church was becoming more feasible.

Accordingly, William purchased land in Northland and Hawkes Bay in several parcels totalling 1488 acres.[42] These were not amended by the Land Commissioners. The only son to take up farming (James Nelson Williams) did not purchase land until 1857 (Kereru station) and later bought Frimley in 1867, where the family has remained ever since.

Current perceptions

Missionary land-buying was never very popular among the colonists and contemporary newspapers. Not always the most impartial sources, they were full of accusations, and equally vociferous rebuttals. Two biographies of Henry Williams, written almost 100 years apart, were favourably disposed towards their subject and his land purchases, basing their claims on a large body of original source material.[43] Nevertheless, this diversity of opinion continues.

The fate of missionaries and religion in post-war historical writing is discussed elsewhere on this website under the "Williams and the Treaty" tab. This unfavourable environment retriggered the land issue. Once again Henry Williams and the missionaries were accused of the "sin of greed".[44] Some of this was to seep into popular writing where there are fewer constraints on accurate reporting, and there has always been an appetite for stories about errant clergy.[45]

Modern scholarship has to an extent restored some of Henry Williams' reputation, much being owed to advances in Treaty research and academic writing. However, time has not entirely stalled the flow of accusations.

He remained the Archdeacon of Waimate, a position to which he was appointed in 1844. According to Auckland Diocesan records he retained the position until his death.[46] Carleton's biography suggests that in the absence of any form of church government Bishop Selwyn could not remove him from the post, although clearly there was an impression at the time that he had done so.[47] There is a failure in many discussions of this topic to recognise the difference between the Church Missionary Society and the Anglican Church.

The Society, the Church, and disconnection

Much has been made of Henry Williams' 'disconnection' from the Church Missionary Society as a direct consequence of his land purchases. The term is used advisedly as it is the one the Society itself employed when advising him of the severance of their relationship. It is more than just a euphemism and, to understand why, we need some understanding of the nature of the Church Missionary Society, and its relationship to the establishment Church.

He was not strictly speaking an employee, in the sense of a master-servant relationship. The Society was a voluntary one made up of clergy and laymen, backed by philanthropists and reformers. It was funded through donations, bequests and collections, and had a President, committees and secretaries. It functioned as a lay organisation, and although it had links with the Anglican Church and worked with it, they were separate entities. To be a missionary, one had to be both a member of the Society and an ordained minister in the Anglican Church, unless appointed a catechist or lay missionary. The Society could, and did, dissolve the connection between itself and a missionary either for cause or simply because they no longer required the missionary's services. In many cases, the appointment was for a lifetime of service in the country to which they were sent, the full implications of which were unforeseen by the Society.

This brings us to the position of the Church. Recent cases before the House of Lords and English Court of Appeal have determined that a clergyman is not an employee, but a "Servant of God" and even his Bishop does not have sole powers of dismissal. Henry Williams' Bishop, Bishop Selwyn, could have removed him from the Archdeaconry of Waimate, an administrative appointment of Selwyn's making, but he did not. He could not easily dismiss an ordained minister, and there was no indication that this ever crossed his mind. Dismissal of a clergyman for gross moral turpitude might be possible, but buying land does not appear to meet the threshold.

Henry Williams' departure from the Society (it turned out to be temporary) had no effect on his vocation as a minister. He retained, uninterrupted, the position of Archdeacon, and continued to act as a minister and missionary, more or less as before. The Society even offered him a year's stipend to help him through the transition. Their obvious reluctance, in taking the step, was of a piece with the ambivalence with which they treated the entire issue.

Most importantly he retained the loyalty and support of his Maori friends and congregation. At some cost, local iwi raised a memorial to him, still to be seen in the grounds of St Paul's Church Paihia. The image of Henry Williams has been carved into the central pou in the whare waananga at Te Tii marae, at Waitangi, a rare honour for a pakeha.

In his last decade he lived a relatively normal life, at least with as much normality as his environment could allow, surrounded by a loving and loyal family. Socially, he retained friends and supporters amongst the settler community, fellow missionaries, and Maori, but the stigma of the 'disconnection' was something that never entirely left him. His family, now settled on the land over which there had been much dispute, were making their own mark in the expanding settler community.

- [1] Letter, Henry Williams to Edward Marsh, 8.12.1830, p.141, Fitzgerald, C. (Ed.) 2011. *Te Wiremu, Henry Williams, Early Years in the North*. Huia Press, Wellington.
- [2] Letter, Henry Williams to Edward Marsh, 14.2.1834, p.230, Fitzgerald, C. 2011, *loc.cit.* This was on what was then known as the Talamai plains, an area adjacent to and south of Te Waimate, which would include areas known today as Ohaeawai, Pouerua and Pakaraka. It is often difficult to relate names to specific purchases, as some of the deeds refer to several names in the one purchase, and some names do not appear to be in current use.
- [3] Turton, H.H., 1879. *Maori Deeds of Old Private Land Purchases in New Zealand, from the year 1815 to 1840, with Preemptive and Other Claims*. <http://nzetc.victoria.ac.nz/etexts/TurOldPP0185.gif>
- [4] p. 230, Fitzgerald, C. 2011. *loc.cit.* Although the deed of sale does not explicitly include this.
- [5] Pp. 106-107. Belgrave, M., 2005. *Historical Frictions, Maori Claims and Reinvented Histories*. Auckland University Press, Auckland, 388pp.
- [6] pp. 39, 41. 1838. Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords Appointed to Inquire into the Present State of the Islands of New Zealand. Minute of Evidence of Mr. J Flatt. They claimed that they would not be able to otherwise obtain a return given the state of the economy and the market at the time. They were apparently able to plant for themselves on the bought land.
- [7] By then British coins were circulating in New South Wales, which outlawed Spanish dollars. However the Spanish dollars were still legal tender in the United States, the source of many visiting ships.
- [8] pp. 265-267, Chamerovzow, L.A. 1848. *The New Zealand Question and the Rights of Aborigines*. T.C. Newby, London, 418pp. Chamerovzow was the Assistant Secretary of the Aborigines Protection Society in London which was defensive of the rights of Indigenous people.
- [9] p. 220, Rogers, L.M. 1973. *Te Wiremu, A Biography of Henry Williams*. Pegasus Press, Christchurch, 335 pp.
- [10] In his report on the claim, the Land Commissioner Robert Fitzgerald stated that Henry Williams had paid enough to entitle him to 22131 acres under the ordinance scale. Land Office June 10, 1844. Appendix III, p.486, Rogers, L.M. (Ed.), 1961, *The Early Journals of Henry Williams*. Pegasus Press, Christchurch. However he never bought or claimed this amount.
- [11] p.223, Rogers, L.M. 1973. *Te Wiremu, A Biography of Henry Williams*. Pegasus Press, Christchurch, 335 pp.
- [12] At an earlier point 2560 acres was mooted. Pp. 226-228, Rogers, L.M., 1973. *Te Wiremu, A Biography of Henry Williams*. Pegasus Press, Christchurch, 335 pp.
- [13] Translation from Maori, Deed 172, p.170, Turton, H.H., 1879. *Maori Deeds of Old Private Land Purchases in New Zealand, from the year 1815 to 1840, with Preemptive and Other Claims*. <http://nzetc.victoria.ac.nz/etexts/TurOldPP0185.gif>
- [14] Among the witnesses was William Colenso who later claimed to be opposed to the sales.
- [15] pp.220, 222, 223, 278 Rogers, L.M., 1973. *Te Wiremu, A Biography of Henry Williams*. Pegasus Press, Christchurch, 335 pp. Although he did communicate, to the CMS, in 1841, progress that was being made on the farms.
- [16] p.38, Moore, D, Rigby, B, and Russel, M., 1997. *Old Land Claims*. Waitangi Tribunal, Rangahaoua whanui series, 364 pp.
- [17] p.200, 201. Carleton, H. 1877. *The Life of Henry Williams, Archdeacon of Waimate*. v. II, Wilson and Horton, Auckland, 364 pp. It was not always plain sailing. A chief, Hake, involved in purchase of land for the CMS re-occupied the land to underline a separate dispute, not connected with the land in question. This was resolved. (p. 255 Journal). Broad objections by some Maori were raised to missionary land purchases during the Treaty signing.
- [18] pp. 29, 58, 59, 86-93. Belgrave, M., 2005. *Historical Frictions, Maori Claims and Reinvented Histories*. Auckland University Press, Auckland, 388pp.
- [19] Hadfield (Henry's future son in law) then a new arrival, was some years away from having children, and needing to think about their future. Colenso, whose self-righteousness and highly developed sense of sin prompted his own downfall, was not an ally of Henry Williams, although he witnessed the deeds of some of the purchases.
- [20] In his letter to Dandeson Coates, Secretary of the CMS, who opposed colonization, Wakefield used the missionaries as examples of land-owning settlers.
- [21] pp. 143,147. Porter, F. (ed.) 1974. *The Turanga Journals, 1840-1850*. Price Milburn and Victoria University Press, Wellington, 659 pp.
- [22] Allan Gillingham, 'Soils and regional land use - Northland', *Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand*, <http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/soils-and-regional-land-use/page-2> (accessed 12 October 2017)
- [23] Land Information New Zealand, *Average New Zealand Farm Sizes*. www.lin.govt.nz. Given current intensive farming practices and the use of fertilizers it is currently possible to have a productive sheep/cattle unit at around 100 ha or less. But two-thirds of small-holdings are deemed unproductive. Pp.11-12, 14, Mulet-Marquis, S. and Fairweather, J. R. 2008. *New Zealand Farm Structure Change and Intensification*. Research Report No. 301. Lincoln University, Christchurch.
- [24] It probably was not even the men getting more than the women. Even so the figures would still bear comparison to the size of a farm in 2007.
- [25] Guthrie-Smith commenced farming fifty years later and his struggles with the environment are described in *Tutira*, published in 1921 – a New Zealand classic.
- [26] p. 273. Rogers, L.M. 1973. *Te Wiremu, A Biography of Henry Williams*. Pegasus Press, Christchurch, 335 pp.
- [27] It should be noted that by the time the issues with Grey were surfacing – the mid to late 1840s – the employment environment for the Williams family was changing as the colony grew. Perhaps he could see future employment opportunities beyond farming, and could be more relaxed about the amount of land needed for their support.
- [28] Letter, Henry Williams to Thomas Bartley, 27.5.1851, Folder 89, Box 3, MS 91/75, AML.
- [29] p.227, Carleton, H., 1877, *loc.cit.* Once the legal status of disputed Crown grants had been established.
- [30] Letter, Henry Williams to Thomas Bartley, 5.3.1851, Folder 89, MS 91/75, box 3, Auckland Museum Library
- [31] Partly the result of applying the strictures and ethics of faith to secular and earthly realities.
- [32] pp. 270, 272, 279, Rogers, L.M. 1973. *Te Wiremu, A Biography of Henry Williams*. Pegasus Press, Christchurch, 335 pp.
- [33] The Reverend E.G. Marsh, Henry's brother-in law and mentor, who had close connections with the Society, counselled him to "forego the prospect of worldly advantage" but then advised him to bring the land under cultivation and stock it "with the most useful productions". Letter, E.G. Marsh to Henry Williams, 11.7.1835. Folder 19, Box 1, MS 91/75, AML.
- [34] For greater detail consult Chapters 5 & 6, Rogers, L.M., 1973. *loc.cit.*
- [35] 1837. Mr. Dandeson Coates, and the New Zealand Association; in a Letter to the Right Hon. Lord Glenelg, by E.G. Wakefield Esq. Henry Hooper, London, 26pp. Coates was the Secretary of the Church Missionary Society, Lord Glenelg the Colonial Secretary. While it contained several inaccuracies, it stated in reference to missionary land-buying (p.20) that "it is perfectly natural and proper that they should do so". It listed several missionaries and the amount of land bought by them. The information came from "the lips of John Flatt".
- [36] Lang, J.D. 1839. *New Zealand in 1839 In Four Letters to Lord Durham*. Smith and Elder, London. Durham was chairman of the New Zealand Company.
- [37] E.g. *The Times*, of London, 7.10.1840.
- [38] pp. 243-251, Rogers, L.M. 1973. *Te Wiremu, A Biography of Henry Williams*. Pegasus Press, Christchurch, 335 pp.
- [39] p. 251, Rogers, L.M., *loc.cit.*
- [40] p. 388. Limbrick, W.E. 1990. Selwyn, George Augustus 1809-1878. *The Dictionary of New Zealand Biography*, v. 1, Allen and Unwin, Wellington.
- [41] p. 262, Rogers, L.M., *loc.cit.*
- [42] Appendix A, Rigby, B., 2014. Validated review of the Crown's tabulated data on land titling and alienation for the Te Paparahi o Te Raki Inquiry region: Old land claims, surplus land and scrip. Waitangi Tribunal Paper (Wal 1040). Although the totals are similar the breakdown of location and acreage does not match that cited on p. 148 (n16), Porter F., 1974, *The Turanga Journals, 1840-1850*. Price Milburn and Victoria University Press, 659pp.
- [43] Carleton, H. 1877. *The Life of Henry Williams, Archdeacon of Waimate*. v. II, Wilson and Horton, Auckland, 364 pp; Rogers, L.M. 1973. *Te Wiremu, A Biography of Henry Williams*. Pegasus Press, Christchurch, 335 pp.
- [44] p. 161. Sinclair, K. 1990. Grey, George 1812-1898. *The Dictionary of New Zealand Biography*. V.I, Allen and Unwin & Department of Internal Affairs, Wellington.
- [45] An example can be found in the *Listener* of 22 May 2010, in an article titled 'Land sakes' by C.K. Stead, a novelist, also a descendant of John Flatt whose testimony is mentioned above. Stead's article contains several errors, not least of which is that Williams bought 22 000 acres (it was 11 000) and he "recently received a late posthumous reinstatement by the Anglican Church to his archdeacon-hood [sic]...". "Again not true – he never lost it (see above).
- [46] p.353, Davidson, A.K.(ed.) 2011. *Living Legacy. A history of the Anglican Diocese of Auckland*. Diocese of Auckland.
- [47] p. 254, Carleton, H. 1877. *The Life of Henry Williams, Archdeacon of Waimate*. v. II, Wilson and Horton, Auckland, 364 pp.

[Back to Top](#)

© 2013 H & W Williams Memorial Museum Trust. All rights reserved.



designer: karl reynolds of waspfactory.net. contributors: history and writing, John andrews; photos and editing; camilla hope-slimcock; collections , priscilla williams

[more information?](#)
[contact us via e-mail](#)

Henry and Marianne Williams, William and Jane Williams, Williams Memorial Museum Trust, The Retreat Pakaraka, New Zealand missionary families, Henry and William Williams Museum website, Church Missionary Society, Holy Trinity Church Pakaraka, Henry Williams, William Williams, Marianne Williams, Jane Williams, Coldham family Nottingham, Williams family Nottingham, Missionaries and Maori, mission ship the Herald, 1800's missionaries, c19th missionaries, Maori and Missionaries, Northland museums