

PUBLIC CHRISTIANITY AND TE TIRITI O WAITANGI – HOW THE CLAPHAM SECT REACHED DOWN UNDER

In the highly secular New Zealand of 170 years later it is hard to imagine the dominant part that Christians and their faith had in our story as a nation and in shaping what has variously been described as its Magna Carta or foundation stone – the Treaty of Waitangi. Any event in history is formed from a complex interweaving of many strands but I would like to isolate just one of the significant threads and examine its contribution to what took place in 1840.

It may seem surprising that a relatively small group of Christian activists who were determined to give public expression to their faith, could have had such a large impact on our national history. This paper attempts to briefly develop this story.

The Clapham Sect

The Clapham sect was not a sect. It had no distinctively separate beliefs from the current of evangelical Christianity that had come out of the impact of the 18th century and Methodist revivals. These had stirred the Puritan heritage of the established Church of England and had challenged the formalism and corruption of 18th century Christianity. The “sect” was never more than 25 persons but they were people of influence many of them choosing to live close to each other in the village of Clapham near London. Many were MP’s . and they included prominent members of the board of the East India Company which then controlled the British ruled provinces of India.¹

What was distinctive about this group was their commitment to living out their Christian faith in public life and their determination to provide a vital Christian presence not only in Parliament (where they were known as “the saints”) but through their promotion and support of numerous “societies” providing an active Christian front on almost every issue of the day. They are best known for the way William Wilberforce led the campaign in Parliament against slavery and succeeded over the course of 20 years in awakening the conscience of the nation, taking on the powerful West Indian slaving lobby and winning. The film “Amazing Grace” gives a popular and for the most part, historical, account of this campaign.

The story impacts on New Zealand history in the next generation of evangelicals following Wilberforce. It does so in three respects which can all be called the legacy of the Clapham sect

- a) The missionary movement and the CMS
- b) The Aborigines Protection Society
- c) The dominant presence of the second generation in the colonial office.

The Missionary movement and the CMS

¹ Keith Newman, *Bible and Treaty*, Penguin, Auckland, 2010 outlines the connection of the Clapham sect with New Zealand at 119 -124.

To gauge the impact of the missionary movement on the colonising of New Zealand one needs only to look at those colonies that preceded the missionary movement. The American colonies were settled more than 150 years before New Zealand. Australia was first selected as a penal colony 50 years before. The first encounters with “native peoples” in those colonies took place before the missionary movement. In the American colonies the evangelizing of the Indians was of little interest. Heroic missionary efforts were made by a few individuals such as David Brainerd and John Eliot but attracted little support or interest from either the Puritan colonies or Virginia. The often brutal encounters with the indigenous peoples in both countries were regarded later in England as deplorable.

By the time New Zealand was first colonized attitudes to native peoples had significantly changed and to a large extent the rise of the missionary movement was responsible. The Clapham Sect played a major part in this. The first missionary societies, The Baptist Society and the London Missionary Society owe their origin to William Carey. The Clapham Sect was not slow in following Carey’s initiative and in 1799 the society which later became the CMS was founded with strong support from the Clapham sect and, given the Anglican affiliation of members of the Clapham sect, the CMS became the evangelical missionary arm of that church. Samuel Marsden who pioneered missionary endeavour in New Zealand was a CMS missionary and the first missions in New Zealand were from the CMS.

The Clapham Sect, influenced by this early movement, used its influence on the board of the East India Company and in Parliament to pass legislation in 1813 to give Christian missionaries access to India. It took a campaign as long as that pursued to end the slave trade – 20 years. It was hugely significant for New Zealand 30 years later.² The hostility to evangelism in British ruled colonies was broken down and from that point British expansion and missionary enterprise walked hand in hand albeit uneasily at times. (For an illustration of the change this brought in India Wm Dalrymple’s *White Mughals*³ is instructive). It is surprising that in his major recent study on the rise and growth of the “Anglo-World”, *Replenishing the Earth*, James Belich omits any mention of the missionary movement as part of the story of British expansion in the 19th century.⁴

This illustrates how much ground Christianity has to make up in the public square today

The Aborigines Protection Society

The abolition of the slave trade in 1807 did not end the work of the Committee on the Abolition of the Slave Trade but few active steps were immediately taken to renew the battle to abolish slavery itself. Energy initially went into enforcing the abolition of the trade by keeping pressure on the British government to use the Royal Navy to suppress the trade and by gaining international support for the banning of the trade.. In 1821 Wilberforce’s declining health led him to pass on the chairing of the committee to a young MP Thomas Fowell Buxton an evangelical Anglican, who was related to Elizabeth

² Robin Furneaux, *William Wilberforce*, Regent College, Vancouver, 1974, 322-331.

³ William Dalrymple, *White Mughals*, Flamingo, London 2003.

⁴ James Belich, *Replenishing the Earth*, Oxford, 2009.

Fry and was a supporter of various humanitarian causes particularly the abolition of the death penalty except for murder.⁵

Younger anti slavers pressed for a new society to be formed dedicated to opposing slavery and this was formed in 1822 and Buxton was appointed chairman. With the energetic support of Macaulay and Stephen the campaign was renewed. It was not until 1833 that abolition was achieved and then only with compensation by way of the huge sum of 20 million pounds to the slave owners. Wilberforce received the news just before he died that the bill would be passed.

With slavery abolished in 1833 the evangelicals who had supported this measure turned their energy to what they perceived to be the next pressing abuse that cried out for attention. They found this in the plight of "native" or aboriginal peoples who had been the victims of exploitation with the expansion of the European powers into the new world. The evangelicals regarded the contact between British colonists and the North American Indians and the Australian Aborigines as having been disastrous for these native races and opposed settlement in any new colonies. A new society called the Aborigines Protection Society was formed in 1837.

In its first report the Committee of the Society in giving the reasons for its establishment stated:

"The abhorred and nefarious slave traffic, which has engaged for so long a period the indefatigable labours of a noble band of British philanthropists for its suppression and annihilation, can scarcely be regarded as less atrocious in its character, or destructive in its consequences, than the system of modern colonization as hitherto pursued.

The two questions are indeed intimately blended with one another; and the energetic spirit that would universally suppress the slave traffic, cannot rest without a corresponding effort to rescue and elevate the coloured races at large".⁶

Those involved in establishing the Society, including Buxton and a leading Quaker, Dr Thomas Hodgkin, had already in 1836 lobbied Parliament to carry out an investigation and report on the treatment of "aborigines" in the British colonies and areas of British expansion. The Parliamentary Select Committee on Aborigines (of which Buxton was a member) produced a report highly critical of the way native peoples had been treated in

⁵ The often repeated assertion that the Clapham sect was concerned about the plight of slaves on the other side of the world but neglected the plight of the nearby English working classes is a calumny put about at the time by the West Indian slaving lobby and taken up by Richard Cobbett, noted for his extravagant attacks on opponents. In fact, although their leading efforts went into the abolition of slavery, moral reformation and the opening up of India to missionaries, they were active in numerous causes to improve the position of the English poor, factory, and prison reform and the treatment of convicts which gave the impetus to Lord Shaftesbury's reforms in the next generation. Sadly Keith Sinclair repeats this quite unfounded accusation in *The Origins of the Maori Wars*, NZUP, 1957 at 23—"in the early nineteenth century the humanitarian movement with little exception, provides the ignoble spectacle of solicitude for the savage but not the industrial poor". Better founded is the accusation that they opposed trade unions and supported Pitt's measures to suppress dissent but it must be recognized that this was the period of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars.

⁶ *First Annual Report of the Aborigines Protection Society* 1838, Cornell, University Reprint,

the course of colonization and urged that steps be taken to either prohibit further British colonization or introduce safeguards to protect exploitation of native peoples from the expropriation of their land and the destruction of their way of life.⁷ It was to build on the impact made by this report that Buxton and other evangelicals established the Aborigines Protection Society.

The second generation of evangelicals in the Colonial Office

In the 1830's the Colonial Office was dominated by evangelicals who were the second generation of the Clapham sect. Lord Glenelg Secretary of State for the Colonies 1835 - 1839 was the son of Charles Grant, a prominent member of the Clapham Sect and Sir James Stephen the significantly more able Under-Secretary (1836 -1847 nicknamed Mr Mother Country and Mr Over-Secretary by EG Wakefield and other opponents) was the son of Wilberforce's close confidant, James Stephen. Both had close links with those involved in the Aborigines Protection Society and had been Vice Presidents of the CMS and Stephen had been on the board of the CMS for nine years. Dandeson Coates, Lay Secretary of the CMS was a powerful influence on the Colonial Office.

There was considerable tension between this alignment of interests which have often been referred to by historians as the "humanitarians" who were opposed to colonizing New Zealand (all deeply influenced by the evangelical movement), and the commercial interests led by Edward Gibbon Wakefield and those involved in the New Zealand Co who were lobbying strongly to establish a colonial settlement in New Zealand.⁸

Initially Lord Glenelg under the influence of Dandeson was hostile to any proposals for British settlement of New Zealand and opposed Wakefield's plans for colonization but by 1837 he had changed his mind. This was in part due to a report on New Zealand issued by the Aborigines Protection Society which accepted that the growing number of Europeans now living in New Zealand and the lawless activities of some members of this community meant that the best prospect for New Zealand was to permit settlement by hard working skilled settlers as advocated by Wakefield and the newly formed New Zealand Association and through a merger of the two races advance religion and the fruits of civilization. Stephen, who viewed Wakefield very negatively, was persuaded that left unchecked the lawless element among existing settlers would exterminate the Maori and Britain should therefore seek to take control of the situation, enforce law and order and introduce a strict policy to regulate the sale of native land. This view found strong support in a petition taken up by missionaries in New Zealand in early 1837 urging British government intervention to control the growing disorder created by unruly ex-convicts and other violent elements. James Busby, the British Government Resident in New Zealand also reported on the lawless activities of runaway convicts and other British subjects and that without intervention from the British government there was serious risk that the Maori race would become extinct. Glenelg was persuaded to grant a charter of government to settle New Zealand to Wakefield's New Zealand Association⁹ believing

⁷ Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines 1836, reprinted 1966 by C Sruick, Capetown.

⁸ Keith Sinclair, *The Origins of the Maori Wars*, supra., 24-26.; Claudia Orange, supra, 23-31.

⁹ Peter Adams, *Fatal Necessity*, Auckland UP, Oxford UP, 1976, 108.

that under Wakefield's enlightened principles of colonization a better class of settler would be attracted to New Zealand.

Lord Glenelg, who was not a decisive person, appears to have soon had second thoughts about the wisdom of permitting a private company to have responsibility for a new colony and negotiations broke down. The critical point came with a report from Captain Hobson in early 1838. He had returned after a visit to New Zealand. Hobson reported that with 2000 British residents already in New Zealand, the number of settlers was bound to increase and the British government could not avoid taking responsibility for establishing law and order in the areas where settlement had taken place. This he recommended should be achieved by sending a Government representative to New Zealand to negotiate the cession from Maori chiefs of sovereignty of such parts of the country as might be best adapted for a colony and that future land purchases should be forbidden except through the Crown.¹⁰

It was in this proposal that the Treaty of Waitangi was born. It immediately appealed to Coates of the CMS who with support from missionaries in New Zealand was lobbying the Colonial Office strongly against private enterprise being put in control of settlement. Glenelg, who had become increasingly less enamoured of the New Zealand Company accepted Hobson's plan and with support from Coates, Captain Hobson was offered the position of consul to New Zealand (later increased in status to Governor) and the Colonial Office began to prepare his instructions.¹¹ Hobson was known as an evangelical who had previously visited New Zealand and established good relationships with the missionaries.

It is clear from Adams' detailed account of the complex series of events at this time that the humanitarian influence on Colonial Office policy was in the end decisive in the decision to enter into a Treaty with Maori and not entrust the founding of the colony to a private company dominated by settler and commercial interests. As Adams puts it:

'The reason for this change of mind [by the Colonial Office in deciding not to proceed with the New Zealand Association charter] lay in the basic sympathy which Glenelg had always had for the evangelical humanitarian argument that European colonization debilitates, demoralizes, and destroys indigenous peoples and their societies, an argument which had constantly been urged by the Church Missionary Society against the New Zealand Association.'¹²

In this way the Clapham sect in the next generation reached down-under and ensured that in however fractured a way European settlement of New Zealand would respect the indigenous people of this country and in its early years would partner with those of a "humanitarian" outlook in New Zealand, the missionaries. New Zealanders today can rightly feel relief that at the time of the Treaty this "humanitarian" outlook won the day against the alternative prospect that Wakefield would have become the first governor and

¹⁰ Adams, *ibid.*, 128-129 and Keith Newman, *supra*, 142-145.

¹¹ Adams, *ibid.*, 119, 124-129.

¹² Adams, *ibid.*, 132.

the New Zealand Company under its charter would have had responsibility for land purchase and relationship with Maori.

Before Lord Glenelg could implement this proposal he was forced to resign over difficulties in Canada and it was left to his successor Lord Normanby to carry through the plan. It was under Lord Normanby, that the British Government was prepared to consider taking over the whole of New Zealand and treat with Maori on that basis. In this respect its hand was forced by Wakefield's action in attempting to pre-empt Hobson's arrival in New Zealand to enter into a treaty with Maori, by sending the *Tory* and other ships to Wellington in 1839.¹³ Lord Glenelg had been opposed to further colonization of New Zealand and Hobson's plan, adopted by him and taken over by his successor Lord Normanby, provided only for cession of sovereignty in those districts in which there was existing settlement.

Hobson worked closely with the missionaries who were seen as an essential part of the British Government policy in relation to New Zealand. The Colonial Office (and Hobson) distrusted the NZ Company and that distrust was increased by the company's action in sending out the *Tory* and acquiring large tracts of land before the treaty could be entered into. Hobson received little co-operation from the NZ Company or other settlers. Missionaries were used to translate the Treaty and explain it to the Maori. Without their backing and support it would have been very difficult for Hobson to have achieved the outcomes the Colonial Office sought.

Hobson's early death made it important that the governor to succeed him would be able to work closely with the missionaries. Dandeson Coates of the CMS lobbied for an evangelical, Captain Fitzroy to be appointed. It is likely that the Aborigines Protection Society also had a close interest in this critical appointment. Fitzroy had a tense period of office plagued by the aftermath of the Wairau massacre, Hone Heke's insurrection in the north, an empty exchequer and few resources including only a handful of soldiers. British policy was to make the colony self sufficient by obtaining its revenue from land sales. When Maori refused to sell more land he had no revenue. He resorted to dubious methods of land sale by trying to circumvent the Crown's right of pre-emption and was recalled.

This was a major setback for the missionaries. The Evangelicals had already lost their ascendancy in the Colonial Office and the Colonial Secretary was now Earl Grey who was deeply influenced by the ideas of Vattel and Locke and took a very different view of the rights of indigenous peoples. Stephen had health problems and resigned soon afterwards in 1847. The CMS and the Aborigines Protection Society were no longer in a position to influence the appointment the new governor. The next governor, George Grey, who assumed office in late 1845 demanded troops and money if he was to take office and began without the handicaps that Fitzroy had suffered. He resented missionary influence and manipulated the newly appointed bishop, George Selwyn, (an appointment itself resented by the missionaries) into ousting the leading missionary, Henry Williams.

¹³ Patricia Burns, *Fatal Success*, Heineman Reed, Auckland, 1989, 96 -97.

By 1847 –

- both the Colonial Office and the direction of government policy in New Zealand were out of evangelical hands.
- the Colonial Office had passed to Earl Grey and the Whig Party (party of great land and property owners) The Whigs (and settlers in NZ) were influenced by Vattel's approach to sovereignty of the nation state and lack of rights on part of indigenous peoples and by Locke's views on property rights and use of "wastelands"
- The absence of missionary influence on the policy of the Colonial Office and successive governors led to a corresponding increase in settler influence and demands aided by the growth in settler numbers.

The "wastelands" philosophy led to significant changes in the way that land rights and the issue of sovereignty came to be understood in the period following 1840.¹⁴ Adams succinctly puts the critical issue in this way:

'...the Maoris saw the protection of their lands as the crux of the matter. They had no doubt that all their lands, cultivated or otherwise, were confirmed to them by the Treaty. Neither had William Hobson, who acted on that basis during the brief course of his administration till his death in September 1842. [A different view was put forward by Governor Gipps in Australia and others] based on ...North American experience where European powers, international jurists and the Supreme Court of the United States had all agreed that indigenous peoples, "uncivilized tribes", of any country had merely "a qualified dominium over it, or a right of occupancy only". Therefore the Maoris did not own the waste land in New Zealand but only the land they "occupied" in the sense of cultivated or lived upon. The Crown owned the waste land.

On this issue a successful campaign to hold the Colonial Office and the Governor to the Treaty, was fought by the missionaries backed up strongly in London by the Aborigines Protection Society and the CMS and this again had lasting implications for Maori/Pakeha relations in New Zealand. In 1846 Earl Grey, now Colonial Secretary, issued instructions to Governor Grey to undertake a review and registration of land titles on the basis that Maori were only entitled to occupied and cultivated land. Governor Grey and many settlers realized that such a move would inflame Maori and be seen as contrary to the promises in the Treaty but Governor Grey was not prepared to resist the instruction. This provoked a strong reaction, and active campaign on the part of all those interests who had supported the Treaty, including the Chief Justice William Martin and the missionary and church leaders such as Bishop Selwyn, all with the complicit support of Governor Grey. Earl Grey backed down and stated that he had no intention of overturning the Treaty.¹⁵ The imperial Wastelands Act 1842 (of the UK Parliament) was stated not to apply to New Zealand by the Wastelands Amendment Act 1846.

¹⁴ A significant treatment of this whole issue is given by Dr Duncan Roper in a study nearing completion and expected to be published next year.

¹⁵ Claudia Orange, *The Treaty of Waitangi*, Allen and Unwin, Wellington 1977 pp 126-131.

The significance of this action is put, again by Adams, in this way:

Undoubtedly, the most significant outcome of the debate between the Colonial office and the New Zealand Company about the meaning of the land guarantee was the recognition by the British Government that the Treaty of Waitangi would have to be interpreted according to the way in which the Maori signatories understood it, rather than according to European theories about the land rights of aboriginal peoples.. This recognition prevented the outbreak of a major war or series of wars such as occurred in the 1860's...".¹⁶

But although this battle was won by the humanitarian lobby, the war was lost. The "European theories" had taken a strong hold on settler opinion and when self-government came to New Zealand under the Constitution Act 1852, the colonial parliament which was in reality a settler parliament introduced measures to facilitate land sales that led to the sale and, after the land wars, the confiscation, within the next 40 years of most of the "wastelands".¹⁷

One of the bitter ironies of this story is that notwithstanding the strenuous efforts of the missionaries and the "humanitarian" lobby in Britain to make the encounter with aboriginal people in New Zealand an exception to the harsh experiences of the past and preserve Maori from the depredations of those the missionaries saw as destructive of the Maori people, and the mana of their chiefs, the missionaries have been accused with varying degrees of animus, by most of the present generation of New Zealand historians, of mistranslating the treaty and thereby deceiving those who trusted them and of manipulating Maori into signing the treaty.¹⁸ Henry Williams, in particular, is said to have either deliberately or negligently softened the Maori translation by avoiding the use of the word *mana* to describe "sovereignty" whereas it had been used in Busby's earlier Declaration of Independence of 1835. Instead Williams used the word *kawanatanga* derived from the English word "governor".

Is this where the high ideals of the Clapham sect and their successors have ended ?

There are a number of difficulties with the mistranslation theory apart from the unlikelihood that Henry Williams himself acted in the way alleged.

- The principal debate during the first decade following the Treaty was over the meaning of the second article, not the first. It was maintaining the guarantee to Maori of their right to retain their land and dispose of it as they chose, and in that respect the nature of the Crown's right of pre-emption, that was the principal concern of Maori at this time, not the first article. As described earlier, it was the missionaries' concern (at that time

¹⁶ Adams, *Ibid.*, 207.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 209.

¹⁸ This mistranslation theory was first put forward by Ruth Ross in *Te Tiriti o Waitangi: texts and translations* NZJH VI 2 (1972) 129 -157. It was recently advanced by Anne Salmond at the Waitangi Tribunal in the Nga Puhi and Muriwhenua sovereignty claim.

shared by some leading settlers) that the Treaty should be understood in the way Maori understood it.

- Thirty nine chiefs signed the English version of the Treaty. There does not appear to have been at that time or later any suggestion that they questioned the translation of were misled by it.
- The mistranslation theory is inconsistent with the affirmation of the Treaty, (by then clearly understood as involving the cession of significant authority to the Crown) at the Kohimarama conference in 1860.¹⁹ When translating Governor Browne's explanation of the cession of sovereignty Donald McLean used the words *nga tikanga nga mana Kawanatanga katoa* to describe "sovereignty."²⁰ There is no suggestion in any report of the proceedings that objection was raised that these words went beyond what was stated in the Maori version of the Treaty.
- The question that needs to be addressed in order to reach a view on whether the word "sovereignty" in the Treaty was adequately translated is what did the framers of the Treaty mean by that word in the **English** version of the Treaty? None of the historians apart from Adams appears to have addressed that question. This is the question to which Duncan Roper has devoted his forthcoming book mentioned earlier. Duncan Roper points out that there was a significant shift in understanding of the meaning of "sovereignty" under the influence of Vattel, and other jurists.
- Chief Justice Martin, a strong humanitarian who was close to the missionaries and shared their concerns, clearly understood the word "kawanatanga" to refer to sovereignty in terms of only "those rights which were necessary for the government of the country". The whole of his comment on the meaning of the words "kawanatanga" and "rangatiratanga" deserves restatement in view of the serious criticisms now being made about Henry Williams' translation

The rights which the Natives recognised as belonging thenceforward to the Crown were such rights as were necessary for the Government of the Country, and for the establishment of the new system. We called them "Sovereignty"; the Natives called them "*Kawanatanga*," "Governorship."

This unknown thing, the "Governorship," was in some degree defined by a reference to its object. The object was expressed to be "to avert the evil consequences which must result from the absence of Law." To the new and unknown Office they conceded such powers, to them unknown, as might be necessary for its due exercise. To themselves they retained what they understood full well, the "*tino Rangatiratanga*," "full Chiefship," in respect of all their lands.

These rights of the Tribes collectively, and of the Chiefs have been since that time solemnly and repeatedly recognised by successive Governors, not merely by words but by acts. For, through the Tribes and through the exercise of the

¹⁹ Claudia Orange, *ibid.*, 145- 154 discusses the Kohimarama conference in some detail. Orange states that "the most important idea that Maori took away from the Conference was that their mana was guaranteed".

²⁰ R M Ross , *supra*, 139.

Chiefs' power and influence over the Tribes, all the cessions of land, hitherto made by the Natives to the Crown, have been procured.²¹

Sir William Martin arrived in New Zealand as Chief Justice 18 months after the Treaty and was Chief Justice during the formative years that followed until 1857. He was a noted philologist and familiar with the Maori language (he published a text in Maori educating Maori about their legal rights) and as a trained lawyer and holder of judicial office²² his views on the meaning of the words used in the Treaty deserve great respect. It is clear that he regarded *kawanatanga* as an entirely appropriate word to translate what the framers of the Treaty understood by "sovereignty".²³ In this respect the framers of the Treaty appear to have had a very different view of sovereignty to that espoused later by Governor Grey and the settlers under the influence of Vattel and the wastelands theory.

By 1860 the current had turned strongly in a counter-direction to those who had been architects of the Treaty. As earlier mentioned the "humanitarian" lobby had ceased, well before then, to have influence in the Colonial Office. In New Zealand power was in the hands of a Governor and a settler controlled parliament that was openly hostile to the missionaries and the Aborigines Protection Society. The 1846 protest over the meaning of the second article succeeded because it had the support of many influential settlers but later actions taken by the Aborigines Protection Society were largely unheeded. The 1852 Constitution Act was challenged as providing insufficient participation for Maori and the changes made in the Constitution when it was enacted in 1854 did little to address those concerns.²⁴ The very serious injustices in the confiscation legislation following the Land Wars drew strong protests from the Society which was pilloried by settlers for the position it and former Chief Justice Martin took.²⁵ It was not until nearly 150 years later that the extent of those injustices was recognized.. Had the Society been listened to much bitterness could have been avoided.²⁶

The Land Wars were an almost inevitable consequence. The voices of those who opposed settler policy and advocated a policy of preserving the integrity and mana of Maori society were closely allied to the missionaries, and figures such as the former Chief Justice Martin who had worked closely with the missionaries, were ignored.

²¹ Sir Wm Martin, *The Taranaki Question*, 1860 available at www.NZETC.org.nz/scholarly/tei-martara-ti-body-d1-d1-.html

²² "William Martin", entry by G P Barton QC in *Dictionary of NZ Biography* Vol 1 277-279.

²³ Ruth Ross refers to this statement by Martin at p140 of her article but dismisses it as being "missionary Maori" but that is not the issue. The question rather is whether, missionary Maori or not, the word was understood by Maori. Ross acknowledges that Maori were familiar with use of the term *kawana* to describe the Australian governors, and were aware of its use in scripture and the liturgy. Ross could have added that Maori were certainly using the word to refer to the mana and deference given to Hobson.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp 138 -139.

²⁵ William Fox, *The War in New Zealand* ch 10 and Orange (*supra*) p 164. Fox unfairly blames the Society for resisting the initial confiscation proposals which would have led to smaller areas being confiscated.

²⁶ The protest by Octavius Hadfield and some missionaries over the Waikato war was not a united action as the missionaries were divided on this issue and lost much mana over this. See John Stenhouse, in "Religion, Politics and the New Zealand Wars 1860-1872" in Stenhouse and Adhar *God and Government*, Univ of Otago Press, 2000.