It is a sign of growing maturity that the New Zealander is beginning to ask who he is and what is his destiny. The older categories are no longer sufficient to describe the emerging multi-racial society. Many streams have been flowing together, Polynesian, European, Eastern and Western to produce a society that is rich and exciting in its diversity. This is a heritage of infinite value and promise. Its full development involves a choice, not assimilation but interrelationship, not absorption but recognition of the identity of cultural and ethnic groups within the community, not the domination of the one by the other, but the fellowship of all.

The Maori, in New Zealand society, is the elder brother giving to the rest of us a sense of history. The Maori people is a caring people. Without the unique Maori response to the Gospel awakening us to a way of life and to corporate values so much needed in the individualism of the Western world, as a Church and as a country, we should be greatly impoverished.

This is a time for research, for interpretation, aid for listening to one another. No one is better equipped to speak for the Maori response than Mr Rakena. He is making an important contribution to mutual understanding. I warmly commend this book.

J. J. Lewis Principal, 
Trinity Methodist Theological College 
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INTRODUCTION.

It was with reluctance that I agreed to give the lecture which forms the main substance of the following pages. In the first place, I did not consider that I had adequate resources for the purpose. Secondly, an interest in the subject is not historical, but practical. It springs from a concern for the Methodist Maori Mission in the present and in the immediate future, rather than in the past. But I was reassured, and the lecture was prepared and delivered.

Several influences have combined to direct my interest into the areas concerned. One in particular comes readily to mind.

In gathering material for the East Asia Christian Conference Hymnal, published in 1964, the BCT. Dr. D. T. Niles requested, through the National Council of Churches in New Zealand, a selection of what could properly be called "Maori" hymns for inclusion in the hymnal, as a contribution from New Zealand. It was disquieting to discover only two hymns in the Methodist Maori Hymnal which appeared suitable. I was even more perturbed when, having forwarded the two hymns, I discovered that they were the only two actually to appear in the E.A.C.C. Hymnal, (Nos. 106 and 107). Moreover, only one of the two had a tune of truly Maori origin. Why, after almost a century and a half of Christian nurture and experience, had there been little if any direct expression of the Faith on the part of the Maori in hynnology? Similar questions arose with respect to other areas where one would expect to find "Maori" expressions of the Christian faith.

The lecture indicates the area in which I feel that the basic questions and answers lie. I have done little more than scratch the surface, but if the following pages stimulate others with more adept and disciplined minds to probe deeper and more widely, this effort will be justified.
ENCOUNTER AND RESPONSE IN THE MID 20th CENTURY.

In the field of race relations New Zealand enjoys a reputation which is acknowledged and acclaimed in many parts of the world. As one publication affirms: 'for many years New Zealand has been recognised as one of the nations in the vanguard of those that are building multi-racial societies.' In a world of inter-racial conflict and tension, New Zealand may well feel proud and with some confidence proclaim that 'we are a homogeneous people united in the common purpose of individual welfare and national stability. This unity has its roots in the respect and admiration each has for the other; it is fostered by friendships formed at school, at work, and on the playing fields against a background of social and economic equality.' To those less fortunate in other countries, we appear to be achieving in practice what for many is only a hope.

The mid 20th century, however, is witnessing rapid and revolutionary change. Race relations in New Zealand have been affected, and may no longer be viewed in isolation. The focus of attention on racial discrimination in sport, for example, makes that untenable. The growing influx of Polynesians from neighbouring islands requires a shift from a bi-racial preoccupation to a multi-racial one. At the same time, areas of conflict between Maori and Pakeha are brought into relief. With the ‘demythologizing’ of our history now in process, and especially with the effects of Maori urbanization, we must recognize that Maori-Pakeha relations are most vulnerable. The stocktaking Hunn Report of 1960, the Report of the Department of Industries and Commerce entitled ‘The Maori in the New Zealand Economy,’ the Report of the New Zealand Educational Institute on Maori Education, the brief furore over the anglicized pronunciation of Maori place names, and the widespread objections to the hasty passing of the 1967 Maori Affairs Amendment Act, indicate something of the nature and extent of the problem.

Most Maori and Pakeha would readily agree that the goal is integration, and we are assured that 'the integrated state, when properly conceived and implemented, can be an enduring and healthy state for a society.' But it seems to many Maoris that just here a radical change of policy is demanded. For the better part of one hundred years a policy of assimilation has been followed, and in practice there is little to convince the Maori that the Pakeha has grasped what integration involves. Hartley and Thompson describe assimilation as 'the state in which the other group makes the decision as to what shall be accepted and what shall survive. Shall the Maori define the values essential to his sense of identity and reflective of his traditions' they ask, or 'shall he be identified with those elements the Pakeha find useful, interesting and acceptable?' As some recent decisions have shown, in this supposedly post-assimilation era of Maori-
Maori-relations-the-Maori-is-still-very-much-subject-to-the-decisions-which-the-Pakeha-make-even-when-his-own-values-and-traditions-as-a-Maori-are-at-stake-Is-it-any-wonder-that-doubts-are-expressed-on-the-tribal-marae-when-competent-Pakeha-observers-are-moved-to-comments-such-as-the-following-


Note the following:

1. A contemporary catch-phrase, the "Three-H Culture." This suggests that Maori culture consists in little more than the haka, the hangi and the hongi. This both devaluates Maori culture as such, and identifies the Maori with elements which 'the Pakeha find useful, interesting and acceptable.'

2. A persistent denial of a more significant place for the Maori language, particularly within the schools - the very place from which it was removed by deliberate policy over a century ago - reflects the above view. To talk about a language is to talk about a people, their traditions, thoughts and aspirations, their whole way of life. To deny a people their language is to maim them, and consequently to impoverish their encounter with others.

3. A great deal has been said and written about the Treaty of Waitangi. To this day a Maori understanding of the Treaty has survived, which varies considerably from that held by most Pakeha. But in this matter, including the extent to which the day should be observed, Maori opinion has counted for little.

4. Finally, in an article entitled "The Latest Maori Migration," Dr Sydney Meads draws attention to the number of Maori people migrating overseas. The number has increased each year in the 1960's, and departures exceeded arrivals by over 1,000. One reason suggested for this trend is a psychological factor arising out of certain assumptions and attitudes among the Pakeha which discourage the development of a positive Maori self-view.

This situation is of course reflected in Methodism. Unfortunately there is not much research material available, of the kind indicated for example in Dr J. J. Mol's sociological study "Religion and Race in New Zealand," from which correlations might be drawn. Also there is no full and readily accessible account of our Methodist Maori Mission from the beginning. But something of the current Maori-Pakeha encounter in Methodism is suggested in a survey conducted by the Home and Maori Mission Department in 1964.

Among a series of questions, local Circuits were asked to state

(a) how many Maori families were on their pastoral rolls,
(b) how many individual Maoris were recorded as members
(c) how many attended Sunday worship, once a month at least.

 Replies showed that Circuits were in contact with 1,255 Maori families, 151 of which were located in areas outside existing Methodist Maori Mission boundaries. In all, 598
Maori persons worshipped with Pakeha members, and of these, 127 lived outside the Mission area. The survey indicates a comparative failure to communicate, especially when we remember that in those Districts beyond the traditional boundaries of the Maori Mission, local ministers and circuits have for many years been required to assume direct pastoral responsibility for Methodist Maori families, or Maori families without any obvious church affiliation, in their locality. Conversely, participation of Pakeha within established Maori Circuits is negligible.

The Mission could also have done much more to encourage the use of the Maori language. It has tried to keep in circulation all-Maori or substantially Maori magazines, such as "Te Kotuku Kai-whakaata" and the more recent "Maataapuna" but it has more than once appointed men to positions of leadership requiring a firm grasp of the Maori language, and then proceeded to ignore its own recommendations by denying them the opportunity to learn the language during the initial period of their appointment. Had the Conference adopted a firmer attitude in this respect, Maori-Pakeha relations within Methodism would have been considerably advanced.

Response.

It must be recognized that after a century and a quarter of contact with and exposure to western ideals, values and skills, and especially in view of the increasing rate of inter-marriage between the races, it is no longer possible to generalize about the Maori. Nevertheless a substantial body of Maori opinion does exist. Maori responsibility for shaping a distinctive response to the Gospel is not deliberately excluded; but the unconscious assumption of European patterns of life and worship has inhibited the Maori from the beginning.

Very little in our Maori Mission may pass as an authentic "Maori" response to the Gospel. In theology, in worship patterns, in the form and expression of the church's ministries, in Christian education, in matters of finance and administration, of structure and law, we have taken over from the Pakeha. The Mission was paternalistic, the Maori was dependent. One of the most damning aspects of the western-based inheritance was denominationalism. Even more damaging perhaps is the false assumption, conscious or unconscious, that a response to the Gospel can only be valid if it is expressed in forms consistent with those of the Pakeha. Hence the Maori membership has for the most part felt incapable of responding on its own account. There has been a weak caricature of the response expected by the Pakeha, or no response at all. The Pakeha has responded again and again on behalf of the Maori, so
reinforcing the elements of dependency and paternalism which continue to feed his impotence.

Down through the years much has been sown and reaped to the benefit of the Maori Membership. But it remains true that too little was and is done actively to encourage and equip the Maori membership to do more, both for itself and for others, within the context of the Christian faith. The full potential of the Maori is unlikely to be realized so long as he feels that he must draw his inspiration from and have his charter for Christian life and action drawn up by his Pakeha counterpart. To open the way for the Maori to respond to the Gospel on his own account and to give it concrete expression in terms that are relevant and meaningful to his particular life-situation, is a fundamental concern throughout these pages.

---

1 Department of Maori Affairs Bulletin: Integration of Maori and Pakeha. 1962.
2 Department of Maori Affairs Bulletin: The Maori Today, 1962
4 ibid.
BELONGING AND SELF-HOOD

There is an all-important correlation between the above two terms and the two primary concerns of Maori-Pakeha encounter or relations, and the Maori response to the Gospel. The term belonging is preferred to 'identity,' which if given its dictionary definition of 'absolute sameness' does not accurately describe the relationship envisaged.

In describing this relationship the appropriate terms that come to mind are 'koinonia' from the New Testament, with its basic idea of fellowship, and 'whanaungatanga' which is now popularly used to refer to a sense of brotherhood and has its origins in the cognitive system of relationship operating in traditional Maori society. Both terms indicate a strong extended family solidarity; on the one hand, a Christian family; on the other a Maori family in which every member is valuable and is drawn into that family's total life by a powerful sense of belonging. When the popular Maori phrase 'tatou tatou' (we are one people) arises from such a sense of belonging we will have reached our goal.

But in most areas the relationship of the two races is still one of encounter only. We continue a 'contiguity without real fellowship.' Areas of discontent and disparity which are seen to exist require, of course, the undivided attention of both Maori and Pakeha. There is, however, a vital prerequisite which is summed up in the second term of the subheading: selfhood.

The relationship with which we are concerned is a relationship between persons. This cannot be stressed too much. We must discover each other first as people, people who have been shaped and moulded by distinctive cultural ideals, values and skills. In Africa there are reputed over 2000 modern indigenous Christian or sub-Christian movements. An African minister who defected to such a sect was asked, "Why is it that you have left the Mission and gone over to this separatist movement?" The reply was, "The trouble is that I was never treated as a human being." 

In our contacts this personal content is often lacking. Both sides are too ready to stereotype. We label our fellows as 'problems.' When we do meet as persons, the product of quite distinct cultures, the Maori today finds himself in an unenviable position. He has to come to terms with the question, "Who am I?"

A great deal has been said about the disintegration of the political, social, economic and religious institutions of the Maori over the past one hundred years or more. But
even more serious is the disastrous effect of this cultural erosion upon the Maori himself as a person, i.e. as someone of significance, who possesses an inherent value in himself, and is valued sufficiently by others to evoke in him a due sense of being wanted and of belonging. Too many are resigned to a sense of 'anonymity' and 'alienation,' in a country to which they have a prior claim to belong. There is a lingering sense of inferiority and not a little bitterness.

In his study of a small Maori community, Dr. James Kitchie gives prominence to this sense of inferiority as 'whakama' (shame). He concludes that 'in terms of the future whakama is a more significant potential difficulty than Pakeha prejudice against the Maori and it is certainly less easy to eliminate or reduce. It stems primarily from the divided Maori identity and from disruption and disturbance in the development of that identity.'

The hopelessness and frustration experienced by the Maori for several generations have prevented the development of a positive Maori self-view. But this self-view is an essential part of the process of meeting as persons, and establishing a relationship out of which a deep sense of belonging is realized. Writing particularly of the community to which he gave the fictitious name of "Rakau", Ritchie says: 'They will be required to commit themselves more fully to a future built on their own efforts. They must find ways of stating their own demands, first to themselves, and then to others. They must resist the luxury of being coerced and the indulgence of righteous grievance. They must abjure and cauterize the desire to be dominated and to have decisions made for them. … they must examine their faith in things Maori. If this is spurious, weak and failing, then conserving or preserving it can have no useful end.'

The term selfhood has special reference to the Maori response to the Gospel. The nature of our relationship within the church and the exercise of our mission in and to the world depends upon the Maori discovering himself in terms of what God has achieved for him in Jesus Christ. God became man. More significantly for our purpose. He did not become man in general, but man in particular, i.e. a man of His times, subject to and moulded by a culture - all the social, political, economic and religious influences of Jewish Palestine.

When the Gospel came to the Maori in the early 19th century, it came unavoidably with all the trappings of western civilization, and enmeshed with colonialism. In recent years the consequences of this have become apparent in Asia, Africa and in the Pacific.

With enthusiasm we acknowledge in Christ a universal Gospel, one that is ecumenical in scope and intention, a Gospel of relevance for all individuals and
peoples everywhere. Less readily, however, do we acknowledge the equally important fact to which D. T. Niles draws attention, namely, 'That this universalism of the Gospel finds its initial historical expression in the particular, in the specific word it offers to each person and each people.' The word can be effectively communicated only when the Gospel is presented to each 'in his own tongue,' and the response in turn, offered by each 'in his own tongue.'

With respect to the Maori, this "particularizing" of the Gospel is the fundamental issue with which New Zealand Method-ism must come to grips. Many of the questions which confront us in the Maori Mission today spring from a culmination of circumstances, events and "missionological" mishaps which have virtually denied the Maori this more direct experience of the Gospel. The matter will be considered further later on, but a major contributing factor is underlined at this point. In discussing the missionary's technique and approach, Douglas Webster expounds an all-important principle which is embodied in Paul's letter to the congregation at Corinth. It is summed up in the word subordination. The relevant passage reads as follows:

I have made myself every man's servant, to win over as many as possible. To Jews I became like a Jew, to win Jews; as they are subject to the law of Moses, I put myself under that law to win them although I am not myself subject to it.
To win Gentiles who are outside the law I made myself like one of them, although I am not in truth outside God's law, being under the law of Christ. To the weak I became weak, to win the weak. Indeed, I have become everything in turn to men of every sort, so that, in one way or another, I may save some. All this I do for the sake of the Gospel, to bear any part in proclaiming it.

Further study may qualify the judgment, but on knowledge so far gained it seems that this principle was completely lacking in the proclamation of the Gospel to the Maori by the early Wesleyan missionaries. This failure to identify with the Maori on the part of the missionaries is the main reason why the Maori response has been little more than a caricature of the Pakeha response.

If the Maori is to realize selfhood in respect to the Gospel he must have sufficient freedom to meet Christ as a Maori and to respond in his own way. Hence quite fundamental changes in the attitude of both Maori and Pakeha, and in the relationship of the Mission to the wider church, are inevitable. Webster stresses the fact that prior to any comprehensive integration there is a period of preliminary disintegration. '... the unifying powers are themselves divisive before they move towards union,' he writes. 'Possibly one reason for this is that the potency of any force for unity will depend ...'
enriched and strengthened by diversity, but it may be weakened by too great a diffuseness.\textsuperscript{15} We have recently seen such a principle work itself out among the churches negotiating for union. The parallel is not complete, but it does point to a process which is not only essential to selfhood but also to the whole concept of belonging.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{11} James E. Ritchie: The Making of a Maori. 1965, p. 179.
  \item \textsuperscript{12} ibid., pp. 191f.
  \item \textsuperscript{13} D. T. Niles: "A Church and its Selfhood," in A Decisive Hour for the Christian Mission, 1960, W.C.C.
  \item \textsuperscript{14} I Corinthians 9:19-25.
  \item \textsuperscript{15} D. Webster; Yes to Mission. 1966, p. 70, R.B.C.
\end{itemize}
HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES; THE EARLY MISSIONARIES

When the Rev, Charles Creed arrived at Waikouaiti he was greeted by his predecessor with the words, "Welcome to purgatory!" This is how the early Wesleyan missionaries viewed their sphere of labour. The 1850 report of the Wesleyan Missionary Society states: 'The perverse levity and awful depravity of these savages appear to be unequalled in the history of man.' These are typical reactions to the raw and primitive conditions prevailing. The missionaries were not lacking in courage and resolution, but inevitably they saw the Maori from a vastly different cultural vantage point. They were not qualified by education or background to appreciate the finer qualities of these "savages" or to recognise that the Maori had a way of life in some respects superior to the European. At least it was his own. (It is worth noting also that Maori life had already been corrupted to some extent by Pakeha contacts, as for example in Waikouaiti).

This cultural gulf was a major obstacle preventing a truly indigenous Christianity among the Maori people.

The Social Element.

It is important to notice that Australia, New Zealand and other Islands of the Pacific became the focal point of interest for Britain and other western countries at a time when the rise of humanism, the French Revolution and the Methodist Movement were stirring the social systems of the day, and that the missionaries were themselves moulded by these forces. The movement which led British missionaries to New Zealand was, in part, an expression of a far wider development which Max Warren refers to as 'the social emancipation of the under-privileged classes... Warne underlines three facts about the missionaries who left the shores of Britain in the first half of last century. In the first instance 'they belonged in very large measure to a distinctive and emerging class in society, that of the skilled mechanic, well described by Dr. Kitson dark as the 'aristocracy of labour.' He goes on to quote Dr. W. N. Gunson who writes: 'Most of the missionaries, however, whatever their experience or training, took with them into the field the New Mechanic's consciousness of his social position, his desire to better himself, and his dependence on, and obligations to, the less fortunate;' and makes the comment: 'There we may discern at least one of the roots of that missionary paternalism which, surviving too long, has produced such violent reactions in our own day...
Secondly, Warren notes that they were "inner-directed" men. Released from anonymity within the masses by the opportunities of the day, many were consciously able to realise a certain individuality and to rise in the social scale. Being moved by this inner force - believed implicitly to be the Holy Spirit - the education they required to reach this status, they acquired "the hard way." Finally it appears that the ordained too were virtually of the same social and economic background as the skilled mechanics. Therefore, 'being slenderly equipped themselves with what the world calls learning' Warren remarks, 'they the more readily expected that Pacific Islanders ... would be able to rise to the same responsibilities.' Warren adds that when the second half of the century brought a more formally educated ministry, there was a 'slowing up of the process by which a responsible indigenous ministry was created.'

In this era there was every inducement for the more enterprising of the classes indicated to make a break from it all. It is not without significance that Warren included missionary service, with its prospects of ordination and social advancement, as one form of escape.

The Theological Element.

The Evangelical Revival brought a new sense of missionary obligation to English-speaking Protestants. It emphasized the need of every man for salvation and the Gospel message that Christ had died, thereby offering God's gift of life to all who would receive it. This universal note was powerfully reinforced by Wesley's Arminian theology. While the evangelical impulse ushered in a new age of missionary concern, it also tended to set 'sin' rather than God at the centre of the theological spectrum. Some of the missionaries were inclined to conceive their task solely as a rescue-from-sin operation.

The Ecclesiastical Element.

Denominationalism contributed to the confusion which affected the relationship of the missionary to the Maori. The Gospel was initially presented to the Maori clothed in the respective habits of the Anglicans, the Wesleyans and the Roman Catholics. Confusion and conflict were inevitable. One chief was prompted to say: "I have come to the cross roads and I see three ways: the English, the Wesleyan and the Roman. Each teacher says his own way is best. I am sitting down and doubting which guide I shall follow." Having expressed his mind in this way he firmly refused to become a Christian.

The differences between the Church of England and the Wesleyans were barely discernible by the Maori people, but very marked differences existed between these and the Roman Catholic missionaries, and the points of friction were amplified as the
latter's influence and following increased. Further reference to this point will be made later. Here it is sufficient to note that denominational rivalry was inherent in the situation, and therefore part of the total impact of the missionary on the Maori way of life.

It is clear that no matter how sincerely a "foreign" missionary tries to ensure that the Gospel he proclaims is unadulterated in any shape or form, the fact is that "we have this treasure in earthen vessels." His presence alone is a factor which complicates the issue. "It has always been the aim of the missionary" writes Bishop Stephen Neill, "to present to the non-Christian the pure doctrine of Jesus Christ.... But this has, in fact, proved impracticable. We are all conditioned by our background and tradition, by our forms of speech, by inherited values which have little relationship to the Christian Gospel. … It was natural for the representatives of each western nation to regard their own culture as superior to that of the countries in which they carried on their missionary work, and to regard as Christian many things which are only remotely, if at all, related to the Gospel." ²³

In his study of the growth of indigenous churches in Indonesia, Dr. Hendrik Kraemar refers to this characteristic of the western missionary as "narrow-mindedness." "I mean here," he writes, "that, through lack of self-criticism, we present our own convictions in the form and content of the Christianity we preach." ²⁴ "There was too little genuine interest in indigenous people as they really are, too little interest in them for their own sake. As such they were not taken seriously, but were primarily seen as objects of evangelism and loving care … The missionaries did not see that the Gospel can neither be heard nor felt by taking the focal points of the Gospel as they are formulated to European ears and minds, and expressing then in a tolerable fashion in an indigenous language. They did not see that the true appeal of the Gospel may be heard and responded to only by starting out from a formulation of spiritual problems as living in the indigenous soul, thus touching existing chords." ²⁵

We now turn to consider some of the methods adopted by the missionaries as they set about their task in terms of the charge given to Samuel Leigh in 1821, "proposing the glorious Gospel in its simplest and most explicit truths, as an undoubted revelation from God. to dwell upon the wretched and guilty state of man, and to invite and persuade them to be reconciled to God."

By the time Wesleyan activities began among the Maori, there had been considerable infiltration of Christian teaching, as well as western cultural values and skills. The agents of both Anglican and Wesleyan Societies mixed freely and had many opportunities to discuss, compare and evaluate their respective techniques. There is little to suggest, however, that any clearly defined pattern of "proposing the glorious Gospel" existed. Efforts were based on trial and error. In the circumstances this is not
to be decried, nor seen as detracting in any way from what was achieved. It does, however, throw some light on the main issue.

Except for the change of language, the technique adopted differed little from that used in any unevangelised rural village in England. Regular acts of worship, incorporating the singing of hymns, prayers, the reading of Scripture and preaching, were the pivot round which all other activities gathered. Inevitably worship implied the erection of a special building which, in later years, was to take the exact shape and form, and include almost all the interior paraphernalia of church buildings in 19th century England. The missionaries communicated their own western understanding and interpretation of what it means to be a Christian.

Inevitably, however, the Maori language was the primary tool of communication, and they set about to master it. Soon after his arrival Leigh was translating his own prayers and hymns, and in just on six months he delivered his first sermon in Maori. When James Stack arrived to assist Leigh, he said, "I suppose my first business will be to learn the Maori language." The road was not always easy. Writing from Kawhia in 1840, the Rev. Hanson Turton complains that mundane matters such as buildings and general labouring activities hamper his learning the language and getting to know the people. In the far south Watkin laments that lack of time and suitable aids prevent him from acquiring facility in the local dialect. Nevertheless, progress was sure and steady all round. But it is doubtful if the Maori acquired by the missionaries really reached the depths and subtleties of Maori thought forms so as to ensure that at all times speaker and hearer were on an identical wave-length.

For as Kraemer says: "Studying a language, mastering its grammar, acquiring a large vocabulary, all this is excellent and indispensable. Nevertheless, the gates of Indigenous life re-main shut, unless this knowledge is placed in its true perspect-ive: that it is a vehicle for the unravelling and inner under-standing of the psychological and cultural reality in which the speakers of the language stand. Hence the main emphasis in studying the language ... should not be a good speaking command of the language, however indispensable. It should be on the language as a means of penetrating into an alien world, and of assimilating its literature, either written or unwritten, with its underlying philosophy of life."26

Once they had a sufficient command of the language, the missionaries naturally began to provide written and printed material. Something of the impact of the written word is graphically portrayed in the classic story of "Tarore and her Gospel." The need for printed material was already apparent in the Anglican mission when Leigh arrived. For a time both Missions had to be content with supplies printed in New South Wales,
but in 1834 and 1836 respectively, the Anglican and Wesleyan Missions began operations on the spot. "A new era opened in the 1830s" writes Parr, "when the Maoris for the first time actively sought to read and write Maori."27 "Between 1835 and 1839 almost everybody, young and old, wanted to read and write their own language ... for a time their enthusiasm seemed limitless."28 The reading material provided was limited to translated portions of the Old and New Testaments and other works of a specifically religious nature, which reinforced the appeal of the Mission. But in the next decade this interest waned, not so much because the novelty had worn off, but, as Parr believes, "the real reasons lay deeper. The Maoris had lost interest in more than reading and writing ... they had lost interest in the Missions' teaching as a whole. The Missions' precepts no longer made the same impact ... the arrival at this time of several thousand European settlers and speculators, many of whom did only lip service to Christian ethics, further lessened the Missions' standing ..."

A less spectacular but equally effective aid was the training class. Associated with each station, these ranged in activity from a women's sewing meeting to the more "soul-directed" class-meeting. As time went on these settled into clearly defined age and activity patterns. Instruction of children was seen as more than Christian nurture for its own sake. As Leigh early realized, "the instruction to the children was the best way of reaching the parents." The value of these classes is seen in the way simple Christian ideals and observances were introduced and sustained up and down both islands independently of direct action by mission personnel. Scant though their instruction had been, the members of these classes were to serve the missionary cause beyond anything realized at the time. Here in the training classes was the nucleus of a truly indigenous Maori leadership and ministry, and the way to an indigenous New Zealand Methodist Church.

Having looked at the methods followed, we now turn to consider the results, drawing attention only to those aspects relevant to Maori-Pakeha encounter and Maori response to the Gospel.

Cultural-religious Voids.

This term is used by Dr. Alan R. Tippett in his study "Solomon Islands Christianity." As was stated at the beginning of this chapter, from the standpoint of the missionaries the Maori was in a state of utter degradation. "Their religion" reported the Rev. John Bumby, "contained nothing of charity, goodness, and love and hope... no such high conception as that of the all infinite wise, just and good Jehovah."29
It was natural, therefore, that they should see their missionary task basically in terms of "saving souls" by destroying all that had, as Leigh puts it, "given rise to the foul usages of cannibalism, polygamy, infanticide and obscene and hideous war songs and war dances." As the process of destruction advanced far more rapidly and with a greater sense of finality than the process of soul-saving, the result was a cultural-religious void, "The Polynesians deserted their gods and sold them for a mess of pottage."

Keesing says with regard to Pacific Island Missions in general:

The mission bodies varied in the extent to which they condemned or discouraged elements of the traditional systems of life and in the requirements they set regarding behaviour for their adherents. In general the regime established by the early missionaries was by present-day standards exceedingly puritanical ... much of native custom that would now appear harmless or even socially useful was tabooed: native dancing, games, wearing of ornaments and flowers, and the like. Instead, a family and community life modelled on that of Christian gentlefolk was presented for emulation.

A quaint description of a Sunday observance in the Hokianga reads: "On the other side was the pleasant sound of the church-going bell; the natives assembling for divine worship, clean, orderly, and decently dressed, most of them in European clothing ... Their conduct and the general appearance of the whole settlement reminded me of a well-regulated English country pariah." Exactly! To quote Keesing again:

The most serious criticism launched against missions has been that they have contributed unnecessarily to the destruction of the indigenous systems of life. Discounting here irresponsible criticisms based on prejudice, it is undoubtedly true that by modern values much of traditional custom was banned unnecessarily, and much of Western custom was forced upon converts with little justification. Christian principles were presented to native peoples encased in a matrix of unessential Euro-American usages, instead of being fused into the body of familiar native practice and tenet. The dangerous and disorganizing step was taken in making people ashamed of practically everything of importance in their traditional inheritance.

As Tippett points out, failure to achieve this fusing will lead to the condition described in St. Luke's Gospel: "When an unclean spirit comes out of a man it wanders over the deserts seeking a resting-place; and finding none it says 'I will go back to the home I left.' So it returns and finds the house swept clean and tidy. Off it goes and collects seven other spirits more wicked than itself, and they all come in and settle down; and in the end the man's plight is worse than before." The cultural-religious void leaves the
field wide open, to be filled by such as "Etolem" in the Solomons, and Papahurihia and the like for the Maori. The destruction of anything of value in the old way must be followed by a replacement by something equally functional in the new, to ensure cultural continuity in change. As Maori religious beliefs permeated the whole of life - from planting the kumara at the economic level to the social ramifications of birth and death - it is not difficult to realise the psychological and cultural effects resulting from a failure in this respect.

**Sodality Conversions.**

Closely related is the type of response Tippett has labelled "sodality" conversions. He writes:

> They were not based on the structure of society itself, or kin groups or craft segments. They were loosely held groups on a basis of age and sex - youths or young women who were thrown together on a station, usually (but not always) detribalised persons, slaves and orphans in particular ... A person who decided for Christ within this pattern found his life within the fellowship of the church, but he isolated himself from any normal social unit to which he belonged. This was fraught with social and physical dangers and therefore tended to make the converts cling together. This new cohesion of the Christian fellowship became strong but tended to make the convert look to the Mission station for his strength and support. It made the mission so indispensable that the emergence of a really indigenous Church was delayed thereby. 35

The matter of Maori conversion is complex, and needs further study and research in its own right. "Ten years of hard toil... and much money expended by the Wesleyan Missionary Society ... and yet, up to the middle of the year 1830, there seemed to be nothing of a visible kind, either to repay the exertions of the past, or excite hope for the future."36 And then, as if spontaneously, it happened and, as one writer puts it, there are 'wholesale conversions.'” Dr Morley says that the first Wesleyan convert was a young man called Hika from Whangaroa. Hika, like many more who followed him, was received into the missionary's household and there received the instruction and nurture which was to lead to his conversion and subsequently to his baptism on February 16th, 1831. After similar success with other young men, the missionaries concluded that "if their work was to be effective they must train the young. They soon had forced upon them the necessity of removing their pupils, for a time at least, from the demoralizing influence of the native kaingas."38 While this hastened the spread of Christianity to both islands, its contribution was also negative, in that many such teachers and catechists were the result of sodality conversions.
This meant that their expression of the Gospel was in every respect except language identical with that of the missionaries. Having dismissed most if not all elements in Maori society as of Satan's own creation and design, the disassociation which ensued was only to be expected.

A further word concerning the missionaries themselves. There is little to suggest that they realized the servant nature of the Church in their ministry among the Maori. Their failure can be readily understood. They represented in themselves all that was considered superior and of greater power and prestige. The simultaneous colonizing of New Zealand was no help in this respect. But the results were serious.

Although he is regarded as the outcast of all early missionaries, it is Thomas Kendall of the Church Missionary Society who most nearly realised this relationship of subordination. Whatever else he did, he effected such a sense of belonging within Maori society, that some members of it reported to Leigh: "Mr Kendall no more missionary, he is now one of us, a New Zealand tangata!" Unfortunately this led to his downfall. Believing that "the missionaries could only gain the confidence of the Maoris by conforming to their habits … he therefore learned Maori thoroughly, helped Hongi with his schemes, traded in muskets, and lived with the Maoris until they accepted him as one of themselves and he finally achieved the influence he thought necessary … But the difficulty was that Kendall became so completely 'Maorified' in the process that eventually he lost sight of his ends." The issues are complex and involved, illustrating a problem which may plague any sensitive missionary. But we can see that in some respects Kendall, more than any other in his day, embodied hopes for a truly indigenous ministry among the Maori.
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HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES; CULTURAL IMPOSITIONS.

Harrison Wright distinguishes three phases of Maori-Pakeha encounter in the early half of the 19th century. Though these cannot be regarded as established or precise, they serve to introduce the theme of this chapter.

The first phase is one of initial contact, beginning with Abel Tasman's visit in 1642. Contact was intermittent, being confined to occasional visits by ships of trader-sealers and whalers. On the whole and particularly following the "Boyd" incident in 1809, ships tended to avoid the New Zealand coast-line.

From the latter part of the 1820's contact increased. The Maori began to appreciate the benefit derived from guns, knives, axes, gardening implements, clothing and the like, but these were acquired, not so much for their original purpose as to fulfil traditional Maori goals, especially success in war. "When the Maori did accept Western articles, they altered them in form and function to fit Maori purposes." They remained the dominant group, exercised control over the situation, and not infrequently showed considerable self-confidence and aggressiveness in doing so. "To the Maoris the European was nothing more than a vehicle for the acquisition of certain European goods, and his habits and suggestions were largely left alone."

The third phase, beginning in the next decade, saw a steady erosion of Maori assertiveness and self-confidence. The Pakeha population was increasing and the missionary impact was having its effect. These pressures led to a breakdown in the Maori philosophy of life, with resulting confusion and be-wilderment, while the Pakeha was securing his position by proving to be masters of the very things that were upsetting the Maoris. This third phase showed considerable strain and tension in Maori-Pakeha relations, and led to a general state of disorder and lawlessness - both between tribes and between Maori and Pakeha. This set the stage for the Treaty of Waitangi and the eventual colonizing of New Zealand.

The Treaty of Waitangi.

As Professor Keith Sinclair writes: "The Treaty of Waitangi was intended to lay a basis for a just society in which two races, far apart in civilization, could live together in amity... At the time, however,..., it pleased no one entirely." Doubts which were early entertained by many Maori concerning the Treaty's real meaning and implication, beyond merely allaying the immediate state of inter-racial strife and lawlessness, were to prove justified. "It seems to be pretty certain" writes Norman
Smith, "that the early effects that followed from it were not fully comprehended by those who subscribed their names to the Treaty, or by those who, by tacit acquiescence, subsequently agreed to its terms. It is equally certain that it was from this point in our intercourse with the Maori, commenced their mistrust of the Government and its administration of negotiations for the acquisition of land." To this day, for a significant number of Maori, the Treaty remains a bone of contention, described on the one hand as a sacred pact - the Magna Charta of New Zealand - and on the other, as not worth the paper it is written on.

For the Pakeha generally, the Courts and successive Governments it is already resolved, as Koro Dewes points out, in terms of Sir Richard Wild's decision, "that it does not lay down or proclaim rights or impose obligations today." This conclusion is not shared by the Maori generally, particularly by the Kotahitanga Movement which has its roots in and derives its basic charter from a movement similarly named which came into being prior to the signing of the Treaty. This raises the question of its legality. In a major address recently Dr. Douglas Sinclair is reported to have said:

It is strange that the Maoris became British subjects by a Treaty which has conveniently become illegal... successive legislators of this country and the judges too have never exercised any doubts as to the illegality of the Treaty, and from Hobson down the entrenched clauses of the Treaty have been subject to ridicule, evasion, erosion, dereliction, everything in fact short of nullification by direct statute... The Government refuses to consider the ratification of the Treaty because of the enormous debt they would incur because of the numerous laws made in defiance of the Treaty. Some of these would be the Fisheries Act, the claiming of the land below the high water mark. Rating Act, various Maori Affairs Acts and Amendments, Town and Country Planning Act, the unfair decisions of the Maori Land Court and that of Mr Commissioner Spain, which awarded the Crown most of the land claimed by the New Zealand Company. If the Treaty was now subject to a decision that validated it, the Government would have to hand back Taranaki, Waikato and the Bay of Plenty... The basic defects in the New Zealand situation stem from the early failure to ratify the Maori version of the Treaty, to adopt a moral standard of interpretation, to have given the Maori leaders due responsibility in the early government, to have granted Maoris a just share of the national revenue for development according to their needs in competition with the vigorous European settlers, to have allowed the Maoris full scope to develop their own culture...

At the time of the Treaty's centennial celebrations in 1940, the Methodist Conference noted with regret that the Waikato, King Country and Taranaki tribes were not officially represented, and urged the Government to initiate a full enquiry why this
was so. They also asked "that a suitable summary of the principles and provisions of
the Treaty of Waitangi be placed upon the statute books." There was no response.
Two years later the matter was raised again, when the Conference pointed out that
unless the question was properly clarified it would remain a perennial source of
concern to the Maori people. The Maori has every right to feel tricked if, as Ian Wards
asserts, "... the Treaty was never intended to be more than an internationally
acceptable step of no lasting significance."48

Colonial Administration.

The story of the Treaty reflects early policies and administration, and the dominant
attitudes that lay behind them. The assumed policy of government by "moral suasion"
was in fact a myth. Force would have been used if troops had been available, but they
were not, and Britain was not at all favourably disposed to supplying them at the
time.

The central personality of the period was, of course, Governor George Grey, "...a
strange mixture of man and super-man to whom "the shape of New Zealand life in the
nineteenth century owed more... than to any other individual." Grey was instructed
"... to foster the education of the Maoris, and to consider their feelings and prejudices
- but only where these were not inconsistent with the peace and welfare of colonists of
European descent.. to require implicit subjection to the law, and... enforce that
submission by the use of all the powers, civil and military, at his command." Grey
was to do a great deal to improve the Maori-Pakeha encounter (e.g. training the Maori
in agriculture and extending educational facilities generally), but at the same time he
virtually gave the European settler a free hand in acquiring Maori land, with
consequences that are still with us.

There were some humanitarian motives at work, but on the whole colonial
administration settled in favour of the colonist.

Although Maoris had, somewhat carelessly, been promised the status of subjects,
Lord Stanley, after five years of Colonial Office circumlocution, ruled that the
degree of consideration to these Maori subjects was to be modified whenever it
came into conflict with the peace and welfare of colonists of European descent.
There was discrimination in both cases, deliberate and as a matter of policy, but
where there was no settlement, the policy was that the natives were to be upheld
in their own land; where there was settlement, not too much was to stand in the
way of the welfare of the settlers.

This, and no more, was what British acquisition of New Zealand was to mean to
the new Maori subjects in terms of policy.51
This was inevitable for, as Ward points out, it stemmed from "an inherent attitude that Divine Providence had created the races of mankind, as indeed the grades of society within these races, in an immutable order of precedence with Anglo-Saxons firmly entrenched at the head of it." \(^{52}\) It is fairly well established that despite some disillusionment over the Treaty of Waitangi, the Maori was ready to respond to overtures that promised a better life for his people no less than the Pakeha. Unfortunately, "The collective attitude of the European settlers, in its simplest form, was one of disregard... The exceptional European who saw the Maori as an individual possessing identical rights with himself was judged to be misguided." \(^{53}\) This attitude was not uncommon among missionaries of the three churches concerned. Ward considers that "a just system of land sales, enunciated and adhered to, could have supplied the initial needs of the settlers." But the settlers "wanted unrestricted use of land, without obligation of sharing with, or frictions of competition from the Maori." \(^{53}\) Hence deteriorating relationships which culminated in the wars of the 1860's.

This period was a major tragedy for the Missions as well as for the development of a truly bi-racial society in New Zealand.

Until recently, historians spoke of "The Maori Wars." They now realize that this name is unfortunate, since the European was equally the aggressor if not more so. One writer suggests "Land Wars" but Alan D. Ward in his reconsideration of the matter suggests that such motives as fear of the Maori, some settlers' inherent racialism and contempt for the Maori, and Grey's "anti-kingite" attitude and personal ambition to realize an amalgamation between the races, were also factors determining the nature and extent of European aggression. It was not land hunger alone that led to the wars.

**Assimilation.**

In reviewing the race relations literature of New Zealand, Dr. Richard Thompson notes that "The idea that the Maoris should be converted into Europeans as rapidly as possible has been a fundamental aspect of European Maori policy since 1840." \(^{56}\) The term assimilation was formally used following its inclusion in the 1844 Native Trust Ordinance, the latter part of the preamble reading:

"...And whereas great disasters have fallen upon un-civilized nations on being brought into contact with colonists from the nations of Europe, and in undertaking the colonization of New Zealand Her Majesty's Government have recognized the duty of endeavouring by all practical means to avert the like disasters from the native people of these Islands, which object may best be attained by assimilating as speedily as possible the habits and usages of the native to those of the European population." \(^{57}\)
There were humanitarian motives at work, but in their application these were largely supplanted by self-interest and regard for the integrity of European culture. "Righteous idealism had become self-righteous arrogance." This was openly expressed in the 1860's. "With the Australian example before them humanitarians had come to believe that the Maoris must either co-operate with settlement or be exterminated. Given that it was not then practical politics to control the driving progress of settlement, the remedy was to guide the Maori into rapid 'amalgamation' with the intruders." 58

But the greatest havoc wrought by this policy is in its rigid application to the education system. The process began under Governor Fitzroy who, in rendering practical assistance to the Mission schools, also tried to modify their aims by including as a primary objective the assimilation of the Maori. This was formalized in the 1867 Native Schools Act, and its Amendment Act of 1871, which Acts, as Biggs points out, "marked the overthrow of the bilingual system... (and) the beginning of the policy of prohibiting the use of Maori in the school, with the aim of replacing Maori by English as the language not only of the school but of all situations. Maori language became the 'enemy'..." 59 Since then there have been a few changes, but the system as a whole is the same. This system reflects the prevailing attitude of the community at large.

Nowhere is this failure to break completely with the older attitude more vividly demonstrated than in the long drawn out campaigns to obtain wider recognition for the Maori language within all schools and at all levels. One Maori educationalist speaks of 'linguistic imperialism.' 60 "I am sick and tired of hearing my people blamed for their educational and social shortcomings, their limitations highlighted and their obvious strengths of being privileged New Zealanders in being bi-lilingual and bicultural, ignored."

This outburst reveals more than frustration and annoyance. In the first place it reflects a general Maori aspiration towards a nation that expresses its unity in at least two languages and which is enriched by cultural diversity. Secondly, it emphatically reaffirms Maori rejection of assimilation as a policy for Maori-Pakeha relations - a rejection tellingly expressed in the following poem by the part Australian aboriginal, Kath. Walker:

**Assimilation - No!**

Pour your pitcher of wine into the wide river
and where is your wine? There is only the river.
Must the genius of an old race die
That the race might live?
We would be one with you, one people,
We must surrender now much that we love,
The old freedoms for the new musts,
Your world for ours,
But a core is left that we must keep.
Change and compel, slash us into shape,
But not our roots deep in the soil of old.
We are different hearts and minds in a different body.
Do not ask of us to be deserters, to disown our mother,
To change the unchangeable.
The gum cannot be changed into an oak,
Something is gone, something surrendered, still
We will go forward and learn.
Not swamped and lost, watered away,
but keeping our own identity, our pride of race.
Pour your pitcher of wine into the wide river
and where is your wine? There is only the river.\(^{61}\)

---
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BELONGING AND SELFHOOD IN EMBRYO.

Exhausting itself physically in the wars of the 1860's, Maori reaction to the whole complex of cultural impositions sought expression in more peaceful ways. Tension and conflict remained an inherent element in Maori-Pakeha relations, but within it the Maori sought ways of expressing his \textit{mana motuhake} (ethnocentrism). Viewed in relation to the concepts of Belonging and Selfhood, this surge from the inner springs of his being found expression in at least two ways.

\textbf{Self-government.}

The first is represented in the widely known King Movement, the origin of which is traced back to 1845. Though said to have been formed primarily for the specific purpose of resisting pressures to land acquisition in the Waikato, it had other objectives, mainly focussed on retaining the cultural integrity of the Maori and uniting the tribes so that all matters affecting the welfare of the race might be discussed and acted on with greater unanimity.

Closely allied is the \textit{Kotahitanga} Movement, which derives its ethos from gatherings held in the 1850's and which later, in 1892 and for eleven years following, became 'an extra-legal Maori Parliament.' But the idea of uniting the Maori for self-government goes back to Hongi in the 1820's,\textsuperscript{63} had been taken up by the missionaries in 1855, and came to an end in 1840. The missionaries would have liked to see New Zealand become a Christian Maori state. It seemed at first that this end had been secured through the Treaty. When this proved an illusion, the Maori sought to realize his \textit{mana motuhake} in terms comparable to those of the Pakeha. In 1884 and again in 1892, petitions were presented to the Queen, asking for a separate government for the Maori. These were dismissed on the grounds that they were the views of a small minority only. Accordingly a 'Maori parliament' was convened in 1892, and a 'Federated Maori Assembly Empowering Bill'\textsuperscript{94} promoted. The bill proposed that 'the power to govern the natives be delegated to the Federated Maori Assembly of New Zealand, which would be identical to the existing Maori parliament. The upper house would be composed of 'the chiefs by birth' and the lower house of Maoris 'elected by the different tribes.' All the response the Maori received was an acknowledgement; there was no debate. Another bill, the 'Native Rights' bill, was introduced to the House by Hone Heke and supported by a committee led by Te Heuheu. The debate was adjourned for lack of a quorum. In 1895 the bill was formally rejected.
Since 1867 the Maori were represented by four members in Parliament, but their effect on decision-making was negligible. Although the passing of the Maori Lands Administration and Maori Council Acts did not have all the effect that was hoped for, the tendency has been towards co-operation. Today Maori representation in Parliament and the King Movement have been joined by the Dominion Maori Council, the Maori Women's Welfare League and other organizations, which are in effect modern expressions of the mana motuhake.

An Indigenous Church.

The second expression was through the messianic movements which followed the orthodox missionary teaching. In general these received little but condemnation until recently; but the climate has changed or is changing, as evidence accumulates with regard to these cults in different lands. It is far from being an exclusively Maori problem. Such cults are the product of colonialism and are due to the striving of suppressed peoples to emancipate themselves and recover their identity. Instead of condemning, the western world should be listening to these people to learn what they are thinking, in order better to co-operate with them.

When the subject of indigenous Maori religious movements arises, immediately the Hauhau, the Pai Marire, Whiti and Tohu and Ringatu movements come to mind. There were others; but of them all the Ringatu was to develop and sustain its inherent links with the Old and New Testaments and finally assume official recognition as a Christian Church in 1958. All these movements 'arose out of the turmoil of feeling, the bitterness and the sense of frustration which characterized the Maori people in this (early) period. Their origins may be traced either directly or indirectly to the destruction of Maori land rights and the repercussions on Maori society.... The divine was brought in to intervene on behalf of the weakened Maori people.... The resort to the Bible is understandable since this was the main book in the Maori language, and it provided parallels between the children of Israel and the Maori people in similar historical circumstances. It provided a basis both for religion and for political science.'

There has been a tendency to associate such movements solely with land disputes, and to overlook their essentially religious quality, with its lessons for the ongoing work of the church. It is difficult to dissociate the two, for the Maori mind.

In this regard Binney's work on the Papahurihia movement is most significant. The movement began about 1853, i.e. before any real conflict over land. The reason for it must therefore be found in the missionaries themselves and their methods. The movement broke out simultaneously with the period in which con-versions occurred in
significant numbers. There was now a negative as well as a positive reaction to the influence of the missions, and for this the missionaries were themselves directly responsible. Had it been possible to isolate the religious elements in these cults and to encourage their more positive aspects, the foundation for a truly indigenous New Zealand Church might have been laid. But the Victorian missionary was as much a creature of his own age as the Maori, and he could see nothing but the hand of Satan at work.

The Ratana Church.

This movement is of particular interest because it emerged as late as the first quarter of the twentieth century, yet reveals in a modified form similar elements to those which gave rise to the messianic out-breaks of the previous century. Following the Great War of 1914-1918 and the influenza epidemic immediately afterwards, there was a great deal of Maori unrest and dissatisfaction, providing the conditions for the rise of another messianic leader - someone who would meet the specific needs of the Maori in terms both of a spiritual and a material salvation. Wiremu Tahupotiki Ratana was the man of the moment. His name is now legend; and in 1966 his followers numbered 25,855 and the Ratana Church was the third largest of those with Maori members. It is not necessary to enter into a comprehensive discussion of the movement here, but simply to make some observations on its relations with Methodism.

Except for a small number of Maori ministers and the Rev. T. G. Hammond, Methodist relations with the early Ratana movement were confined to the Rev. A. J. Seamer. There was soon complete rejection and withdrawal by leaders of other churches. But Seamer had established friendship with Ratana and other leaders of the movement, and was able to maintain the role of friend and counsellor for many years, in spite of differences in matters of theology and practice. It was mainly Methodist influence that kept the Ratana Church within the Christian orbit.

But in the long run, the exclusive and personal nature of this relationship worked against any continuing relationship at depth. There has been no significant relationship between the Ratana Church and Methodism generally. Certain patterns of Christian belief and expression have been taken over from Methodism, but it is very doubtful if these would have formed any part of a truly indigenous Maori Christianity. Initially the Ratana movement, more than any previous movement, had a certain freshness and initiative which might have led to a broader basis both of belonging and of selfhood. Why it realized this in a limited way only, must be due to the same pressures that operated on earlier movements, and particularly to missionary attitudes and methods. It is generally acknowledged, however, that with a more intensive programme of
Biblical and theological instruction, especially in its early years, some if not all of its limitations might have been avoided. In this respect the Methodists occupied a strategic position, and they must take the major share of the blame.
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MAORI AND PAKEHA IN THE METHODIST CHURCH TOMORROW.

Our assessment of the present and the immediate future must of necessity take account of the world scene - and for New Zealand in particular, the Asian and South Pacific scene - as well as current national trends. Rapid social and revolutionary changes are all about us. Close at hand new nations strive to be born or to consolidate a new nationhood. New churches too, recently emerging out of their 'mission' status, try to become equal and effective partners in God's mission to the world. On the home front, and specifically in terms of Maori-Pakeha relations, we note the increasing dispersion of the Maori population, its predominant youth-and its concentration in urban centres; also the increase in Maori-Pakeha marriages, the slow but steady rise in educational standards, and the influx of Pacific Islanders. There is also the prospect of an early union of all but one of the major churches working among the Maori. The field is too vast and too complicated to allow of dogmatism. But some things are plain. In the first place, there must be an openness to radical change, in both Maori and Pakeha, and the Methodist Church as a whole. Professor Harvey Cox reminds us that 'The church is first of all a responding community..., it must allow itself to be broken and reshaped continuously by God's continuous action.' The area under consideration requires nothing less than structural re-thinking from the bottom up, if the Maori is to realize his selfhood and make the response of which he is capable. As in recent years the church has seen a growing responsiveness within the Maori Mission, and the members have found themselves involved in matters which previously were the prerogative of mainly Pakeha courts, the Maori membership he's become conscious of its dependency, and the paternalism which has engulfed it, so rendering it impotent in giving a truly Maori response to the Gospel.

Secondly, we must implement without delay the policy of promoting a 'self-governing, self-supporting and self-propagating' church among the Maori people. Through the years the Conference has flirted with the possibility of a Maori synod. In the late 1890's such a proposal was tabled. The idea hovered till 1913, when it was turned down. There was a reference to 'engendering a spirit of independence in the Maori Church,' but this was too evidently correlated with financial support to be convincing. With the rise of the Ratana movement and similar stirrings among the Maori at that time, there came a deeper understanding:

The marvellous re-awakening of racial consciousness and the desire of the people to organise and control their own religious activities is, rightly understood and guided, a real asset to our work. .... The Board is still emphatically in favour of our Maori
people having the fullest possible freedom of action in their church organisation, but the people themselves are only now beginning to realise that if they are to exercise authority they must also shoulder corresponding responsibilities. The various attempts made to organise independent Maori churches all have a real educative value. The Board years ago unanimously and very emphatically decided that the interests of the Kingdom of God and the development of the Maori race must ever be put before purely denominational considerations.66

Nevertheless the General Superintendent, the Rev. G. I. Laurenson, writing in 1946, had to conclude his survey of the field with the comment; "The Maori work is still a mission."67 In 1964 the Conference asked the Maori Mission whether or not it thought the time had come to drop the term 'mission' from its title. It replied that it saw no reason why it should not be retained, because the term .... 'now carried another meaning, that they themselves were engaged in mission. ....There is no problem provided that the title is interpreted to describe the Maori people as engaged in mission, and not as the Pakeha people engaged in mission to the Maori."68 But there is a certain paradox in this situation, and fundamentally the Maori church has to realize its selfhood by growing out of mission into full maturity, before it is really ready to speak to men at large.

Thirdly, the Mission must work at the variety of forms in which its response to the Gospel should take shape, in order to have meaning and be effective within the situations confronting its people. These areas of concern may not be very different from those around which the Pakeha has shaped his work, but at least they will be those which the Maori himself discerns as relevant, and whatever forms evolve will be Maori-oriented.

It would be presumptuous to define these areas of concern too closely at this stage. What follows is merely an attempt to set out a programme. There first arises the question of a Maori theology, a Maori understanding of God. This needs to be articulated as the dynamic which shapes all other forms. Then follows the area of worship with its corollaries of hymns, orders of worship, the leading of worship and the place of worship. This must be related to and emerge from the daily life-situations of the people. There is the nurture of the community of faith, and its total life in relationship to the community of no-faith. The training and deployment of the leadership which the community will require to exercise specific tasks for varying lengths of time. The inevitable questions of finance, of properties and administration generally. A further complication would arise from the need to consider all the issues in an ecumenical setting. Essentially all this would be a move towards indigenising the Gospel among the Maori. What would emerge we do not know. To quote D.T. Niles,
'The seed that is sown grows by itself.... The task of the sower is to sow and then in the words of the parable "to sleep."'

Any programme to encourage and develop such an indigenous Maori Christianity would demand a great deal of the Pakeha church by way of acceptance, some forbearance, and for some members a complete reversal of attitude. Integration, or 'belonging' will not be achieved by conformity or uniformity, which have been agents of assimilation, nor by any effort to eliminate the differences in the cultures we have inherited. We must view and react to each other's cultural differences, not in terms of extirpation or even derision but in terms of mutual accommodation.

This accommodation has not been achieved in the local congregation merely because a number of Maori members appear regularly in the pews on Sunday morning to sit out an English structured service, or because a committee has Maori members, or because a Sunday School is 30% Maori. This is accommodation from one side only. Consider the contrasts offered in a report to Synod by the Rev. Harold Darvill:

**Pakeha**: Church life is gathered round the buildings which are the symbols of the Church in the community.

**Maori**: Church life is gathered round the people who comprise the staff of the Maori Mission.

**Pakeha**: People withdraw from home and community to participate in the life of the Church. They go to Church.

**Maori**: The Church goes to the people and works within the context of Maori social and cultural life.

**Pakeha**: A constant temptation is to become introspective and more concerned with the maintaining of its own life than with witnessing to the community.

**Maori**: The Church moves more freely in Maori life and is present at every significant occasion.

**Pakeha**: Being independent within the community and a close-knit organisation, the Church can pursue an intensive programme of teaching and nurture.

**Maori**: Being more subject to disruption and working amongst a scattered membership, the Church is seriously weak in its ability to give adequate teaching and nurture.

**Pakeha**: People go to Church for the express purpose of worship.

**Maori**: People expect the Church to be present to lead worship when they gather for almost any occasion.

These differences imply a meeting in which either one party or the other is denied complete satisfaction when required to meet on the other's ground. To date it is mainly
The Maori who remains unsatisfied. If a true integration is to be realized more Pakeha members must make serious attempts to meet Maori members at greater depth. It means more than a handshake at the Church door; the brief sharing of an occasional haangi; an eight-hour working partnership at a factory, an office or a class-room; an hour or so on a sports field, or several hours once a month at a committee or board meeting. Belonging demands a meeting between persons - in the home, on the marae, in the meeting-house - there the nature and extent of the relationship is something felt; where the subtler qualities of personal intercourse realize their potential. Initially what is sought is a change of attitude, for some a quite revolutionary change. In action, the effort to plan, to travel, to stay overnight, perhaps two or even three nights; to understand and speak Maori, at least to pronounce Maori names correctly; generally to support and participate in specifically Maori-oriented activity, these things will reflect the extent to which such a change has occurred.

It would be wrong to conceal or to minimize the magnitude of this task which confronts both Maori and Pakeha. We are both called to a more onerous sharing in the mission of God, not merely by word or action, but as we are seen to be the first-fruits of the new creation which God continues to establish on earth, in and through those who respond in kind to the New Man Himself, Jesus Christ, in whom all things were created in heaven and on earth, and in whom all things reach complete fulfilment, meaning and purpose.

66 Minutes of Methodist Conference, 1927, p. 150.

The Maori Response to the Gospel by Ruawai D. Rakena
ADDENDUM: Worship; Liturgy and Building.

A church gathered together in worship, speaking to its Lord and being spoken to by Him; that is the basis of a church's selfhood. Increasingly each worshipping group must learn to offer its worship in forms most natural to itself. Out of the stuff of common life must be fashioned the instruments of worship - whether music or architecture, whether themes of prayer or modes of instruction. Worship must be Christian. Worship must be indigenous. Worship must be catholic. Worship must be missionary. In such worship each church must find and be itself.

- D.T. Niles in Upon the Earth

In the context of the Maori response to the Gospel, worship - its forms and the place of worship - presents a special area of concern. Firstly, the form of worship offered within the Mission at the present time does not spring from the Maori membership, but has its origin in the Wesleyan version of the Book of Common Prayer. Secondly, this concern goes far beyond any current tinkering with existing orders. Fundamentally, we need to relate worship to Maori life in such a way that the one becomes inconceivable and meaningless without the other. There was such a relationship in the old life in pre-Christian Maori society. Why this vital relationship in the old life was not realized in the new, may offer some helpful clues to our present problem.

While it is probable that the pre-Christian Maori was mono-theistically inclined, for practical purposes and for the ordinary man in the pa the relationship between worship and life was essentially rooted in, and derived from, his belief in several orders of gods. Each god was acknowledged and invoked according to the needs of the moment, e.g. Rongo (of agriculture) was appealed to during the season of planting; Tu (of war) was invoked when preparing for and engaging in war; Tangaroa (of the oceans) was approached when sailing or fishing. A belief in these and other gods more intimately associated with a hapu or whanau, ensured that this relationship permeated the entire social structure.

With the advent of the missionary this relationship and the forms through which it was expressed was destroyed outright, so that a life-centred system of belief was replaced by one setting church or mission compound at the centre instead. This basic dislocation with repercussions extending to the present day resulted directly from the failure of the missionaries to make provision for the transfer from the old to the new in terms of 'functional substitutes.' This will be grasped better by reference to the illustration used by Dr. Alan Tippett in his study of Solomon Islands Christianity. The illustration is adapted for this context. (See Figure 1.)
A is self-explanatory. Whatever need presented itself in daily life was covered by reference to an appropriate god through a particular incantation, symbol or ritual charm.

B reveals the religious void created where there is failure to provide functional substitutes and worship centres on God and the church, rather than on God and the world.

C shows how God and worship is related to a life situation by the provision of a liturgical form serving as a functional substitute. As Tippett points out, this both satisfies a felt need and brings about a deeper participation by the people.

The existing official orders of worship in the Maori Mission have been in use over many years, and most members are conditioned to their use primarily because they belong to the ongoing life of the Methodist Church. However, they fail to serve felt needs, except in illness and death. This is shown both by reluctance to attend planned acts of worship, and especially by the fact that there are areas of Maori life in which present orders are irrelevant; such as mate Maori, where various forms of exorcism are
required; the tomokanga (entering), whakanoa or taia te kawa (lifting of tapu) and takahi (tramping) of a family or tribal house. All these life-oriented areas are completely outside the range of the Service Book. In spite of contemporary trends towards the novel and the up-to-date, a complete disregard of older forms such as the waiata song types, traditional karakia forms, the use of water, and even certain dance forms (the poi, for instance, which is used so effectively in the Te Whiti and Tohu movement) is unlikely to bridge the gap that exists between worship and life.

The same issue is of equal importance with regard to the place or building used for worship. Where these have been provided there is little to suggest that they were fashioned out of the stuff of common Maori life, at least in their basic con-concept and architecture. Urbanization and the movement towards church union are forcing attention to this matter.

The direction of thought suggested here is illustrated in Figure 2. Here an attempt is made to fashion from the stuff of our common Maori-Pakeha life, a multi-purpose building complex in which specifically Maori architectural or art features are incorporated, not solely for their ornamental value, but because they have value for the basic concept and structure itself, and at the same time bring the place of worship into the centre of the community's total round of daily activities.
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