The Cruel Pattern: Early Child Care and Protection and the Imposition of Settler-Colonial Capitalism in Aotearoa

Kendra Cox

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Social Work in the School of Counselling, Human Services, and Social Work, the University of Auckland, 2021.

II. Abstract

The mechanisms of the settler-colonial capitalist project took many forms in early New Zealand in the quest to transform Māori society and economy. One such aspect was the early care and protection system with its unrelenting drive to assimilate and proletarianise tamariki and rangatahi Māori. The whakapapa of the early care and protection system runs through the first meetings of Reverend Samuel Marsden and Ngāpuhi rangatira, continues through the spread of the mission, Native, and Māori church boarding schools, and into the formation of our child welfare institutions. Archival texts, Māori and English language newspapers, school records, legislation, and secondary research were analysed through a synthesised Kaupapa Māori and historical materialist lens to explore this broad topic. In weaving together the apparently disparate threads of the early care and protection system, its function in transforming the relations of production on this whenua becomes clear. This system and its focus on Māori children as a primary site of social and economic change was critical for the implementation of settler-colonial capitalism.

keywords: Māori, capitalism, colonisation, Native schools, mission schools, care and protection

III. Acknowledgements

Finishing this thesis is like closing the final loops and threads of a pattern, one that could not have been drawn together without the hundreds of hands that have shaped it and shaped me. To my wāhine toa supervisors Liz Beddoe and Melinda Webber, your guidance and feedback has been invaluable. Thank you both so much for keeping me on track despite how much I wanted to get into the weeds and for making sure I actually wrote this thing in words that make sense. The lecturers and tutors in the School of Counselling, Human Services and Social Work at the University of Auckland, particularly Ian Hyslop and the merry band of critical and radical social workers, you all truly helped shape my thinking around child care and protection, capitalism, and social work. To the generations of Māori women, whānau, and tūpuna before me and around me that have done everything within their power to fight back and survive and dream in the face of two hundred years of settler-colonialism, I would not be writing this without you. More personally, I would certainly not be writing this without my beloved mum and dad, Donna Mear and Jim Cox. You two and Brian, Tracy, ngā irāmutu kātoa, and all the whānau and whanaunga helped make me curious about the world and frustrated with the injustice of the world and keep me that way. The nannies on my shoulders that set me on the path to social work, Te Ata Ihaia who gave me more fry bread and jam than any six year old should eat, and Te Raumawhitu whose legacy has so shaped our whānau and whakapapa, I'm proud to be your mokopuna. My beautiful and fierce friends and comrades who kept me grounded during the last five years attempting to balance late night study and having a social life and frantic political organising, bless you guys. To my incredible partner in life and definitely not in crime, Emilie Rākete, thank you most of all. Your whakaaro and your heart and spirit has helped shape this work more than you know, and your aroha has shaped my future. Finally, to our taonga that has yet to enter te ao Mārama, that has caused so many sleepless nights and who has been kicking the absolute hell out of me as I finish this work, you are part of this whakapapa too. This is for you, babe.

IV. Table of Contents

I. Title Page

II. Abstract ii

III. Acknowledgements iii

IV. Table of Contents iv

1. Introduction 1

2. Whakapapa, Tūrangawaewae, Whakautu 4

3. Methodology 6

Social Work and Historical Analysis 6

Research Aims 7

Kaupapa Māori 7

Marxism as a Science 9

Synthesising Kaupapa Māori and Historical Materialism 11

Method 12

Data Selection 12

Data Analysis 14

4. He Māhere Hei Whakamārama Ai Tātou 15

Child Care and Protection in the Modern Era 15

Centralising Child Care and Protection 1945-1990 16

The Neoliberal Era 1984-Today 17

Understanding Precolonial Whānau and Hapū Māori 20

Precolonial Māori Social and Political Economic Organisation 22

Understanding the Conditions of Capitalist Britain 17th-19th Century 25

The Coming of the Pākehā 27

5. The Early Missionary Period 1805-1867 30

Ko te Taenga Mai o te Mihingare 30

Te Mātene 31

The First Mission Schools for Māori 33

Analysing Marsden's Role in Settler-Colonial Capitalism 35

Early Mission Schools in Aotearoa 36

John Morgan and the Ōtawhao Mission School 40

Morgan on Race 41

Morgan on Political Economy 42

Analysing Morgan's Role in Settler-Colonial Capitalism 44

The Broader Role of Māori Child Removal in the Early Missionary Period 47

6. Native Schools and Māori Church Boarding Schools 49

The Native Schools System 50
The Māori Church Boarding Schools 54
Native Schools, Māori Church Boarding Schools, and Gender 57
Transforming Māori Society and Economy Through the Native and Māori Church Boarding Schools 62
The Diverging Functions of the Native and Māori Church Boarding Schools 64
The Formal and Real Subsumption of Māori Labour 65
7. Early Child Welfare 1867-1939 ..... **69**
Whāngai, Atawhai, Fostering, and Adoption 70
Industrial Schools and Reformatories 72
Child Welfare Legislation 1893-1925 75
Māori and Early Child Welfare 77
8. Weaving These Many Threads **79**
Ideology and Hegemony 81
The Economic Base of Early Colonial New Zealand 83
Weaving History into Today 86
Remembering and Acting in Social Work 87
Kia Whakatōmuri te Haere Whakamua 88
9. References **92**

1. Introduction

> All the way to school I'd talk to her, tell her what to say and what to do. And she did know, she did learn. She was very brave and tried to do everything I told her. She remembered to speak in English, except that the teacher didn't know it was English she was speaking because Riripeti was too afraid to make the words come out loudly. "Do I have to shake that language out of you, do I do I?" the teacher would say, shaking and shaking her. Then Riripeti would be smacked and sent to stand in the bad place. She did mimi there sometimes. Sometimes she sicked there, then cleaned it all up with a cloth and bucket. I would've helped her if I'd thought I'd be allowed. After a while it was only Riripeti who went to the bad corner. It became her corner. She smelled like an animal and spoke like an animal, had to go to the corner until she stopped being an animal. (Grace, 1998, p.34)

The work of historic remembering is difficult for Indigenous peoples still living in a colonised world. The poking and prodding and tearing open of wounds that have never healed across generations is traumatic and painful. The mamae of our tūpuna bears down upon us while society tells us we must forget to move forward. Patricia Grace (Ngāti Toa, Ngāti Raukawa & Te Ati Awa, 1998) wrote about the struggle against the weight of settler-colonial violence by weaving together the experiences of tūpuna, tamariki, and mokopuna in her book *Baby No-Eyes*. In *Baby No-Eyes*, Grace (1998) retells the experiences of our kaumātua who were subjected to the Native schools system through the story of Kura and her teina Riripeti. Grace's (1998) remembering is technically a fictional story, and yet it holds the historic truth of our parents, grandparents, and ancestors that shapes our contemporary and future world. The work of remembering falls to us as uri Māori to do so in whatever ways we know how: as storytellers, scientists, nurturers, artists, or scholars. Ani Mikaere (Ngāti Raukawa & Ngāti Porou, 2011) said that "[t]o forget history is to allow myths to spring up in its place, myths that serve to ease the conscience of those upon history does not reflect well" (p.105). This thesis is a work of historic and present remembering, of drawing together the disparate threads that make up the early whakapapa of our child care and protection system and the destruction it wrought in the interests of settler-colonial capitalism.

Across the settler-colonial world, Indigenous children have been targeted as a site for the economic, cultural, and social transformation of their societies (May et al., 2014). The damage of the multi-faceted early child protection system in the colonised world cascades through our families, our communities, and through the state institutions that reproduce this whakapapa of violence. Yellowknives Dene scholar Glen Coulthard (2014) argued that conceptualising the damage of the Canadian residential schools system that removed hundreds of thousands of Indigenous children from their families and communities as being limited to a distant colonial past absolves the state of the responsibility to address ongoing

settler-colonial brutality in the present. Coulthard (2014) said that by seeing the violence of the colonial past as separate from the violence of the colonial present means that the state "need not undertake the actions required to transform the institutional and social relationships that have been shown to produce the suffering we currently see reverberating at pandemic levels within and across Indigenous communities today" (p.121). Through the residential schools and "sixties scoop" of Turtle Island (Coulthard, 2014; Glenn, 2011), the missionary schools of India (May et al., 2014), and Australia's stolen generation (Jacobs, 2006), imperial powers have seen the potential in attempting to reshape the future of Indigenous societies through their tamariki. Though the reasons behind the removal and attempted white supremacist reshaping of Indigenous children have changed somewhat throughout the settler-colonial world, the whakapapa remains to pattern the society left behind.

Within te ao Māori, tamariki are taonga (Mikaere, 2017). The wellbeing of tamariki and their whānau cannot be separated, and to attempt to extinguish the links between tamariki and their whānau is a direct assault on their whakapapa (Moyle [Ngāti Porou], 2014). The whakapapa of tamariki Māori stretch back through our tūpuna to our whenua, back to Hawaiki, and further still to Papatūānuku and the red clay of Kurawaka from where the first wahine Māori was born (Mikaere, 2017). Tamariki Māori carry within them a whakapapa that links them to their "their history, citizenship, cultural identity and sovereignty" (Moyle, 2014, p.61). Despite this, the modern care and protection system remains structurally unable to hold the responsibility to maintain or unearth the whakapapa of tamariki Māori (Moyle, 2014; Māori Inquiry into Oranga Tamariki, 2020). The tamariki and whānau Māori of today are subjected to colonial surveillance and intervention in their lives, just as their tūpuna were. And just like in the days of our tūpuna, the inherent racism in these systems is supposedly justified by the very economic and social systems that create and recreate Māori suffering in our unjust settler-colonial world (Hyslop & Keddell, 2018).

The purpose of this research is to uncover the threads of the early New Zealand care and protection system and how it aided the settler-colonial capitalist project across this whenua. The removal of Māori children from their whānau, hapū, iwi, and communities is one unifying aspect across this research, however, it is not the *only* aspect. Before the urbanisation of Māori caused by desperate economic and social circumstances in the post-World War II era, Māori were not the focus of what we conceptualise as state care and protection today (Dalley, 1998; Stanley, 2016). Despite this, the assimilation of tamariki Māori *was* a focus of early colonial New Zealand, and this assimilative project was done through diverse mechanisms that make up what I have called the early child care and protection system. On the surface, this system consists of disparate interests, organisations, and institutions that do not appear to be clearly connected. What connects them is their

purpose: to entrench the capitalist social relations of production on this whenua and the people upon it through the assimilation of Māori children. The many aspects of the early child care and protection system worked in varied ways to achieve these ends.

This thesis is made up of several main parts. The first part is the methodological outline in chapter three, where I describe the thinking and practice behind this kaupapa. Next is chapter four, which contains a high-level historic overview and review of the literature that contextualises the research findings. This section covers the contemporary child care and protection system in New Zealand, as well as a brief description of pre-colonial Māori social and economic formations and a concise history of capitalism in Britain. Chapter five examines the early missionary era of early child care and protection from the establishment of the first mission school for Māori in Parramatta, Australia, to the near total demise of the mission school system during the height of the New Zealand Wars in the 1860s. In chapter six, I explore the purposes and processes of the Native and Māori church boarding schools spanning from 1867 to 1939. The history of these schools occupy a contradictory space in the remembering of many whānau Māori, as they were places of both pride and deep mamae. Chapter seven considers the early state and private child welfare system with a focus on the industrial schools and reformatories in the six decades preceeding World War II. The final main aspect of this thesis held in chapter eight is my attempt to weave together these several research threads to create a clear understanding of this whakapapa and its function in early settler-colonial capitalism.

2. Whakapapa, Tūrangawaewae, Whakautu

I carry within me the lineage of Te Ure o Uenukukōpako, Whakatōhea, Ngāi Tūhoe, and Ngāti Porou. The marae I am closest to, Ruamata, overlooks Te Rotorua-nui-a-Kahumatamomoe and Mokoia, where the kōiwi of my tūpuna remain in hidden places. Through the Uenukukōpako heritage of my ancestors I whakapapa to the captain of the Te Arawa waka, Tamatekapua, who led the Arawa people to our landing place at Maketū. Through him, I am connected to Ohomairangi of Rangiātea, and through this tūpuna, to the originators of the Arawa people, Te Kuraimonoa of our physical realm and the atua Pūhaorangi. This whakapapa, and my entire whakapapa, has shaped my tūpuna, my whānau, and me. It will shape my tamariki and mokopuna, and their mokopuna. Whakapapa is not only genealogy, it is identity, culture, history, and future. Whakapapa is our connection to our ancestors and to each other, to our waters, mountains, and land. My own whakapapa Māori is varied, through my mother and father, and reaches out across Te Ika a Māui and back to Hawaiki and Rangiātea, and back further still to Papatūānuku herself. Through my whakapapa I also carry the colonial and settler heritage of women and men from the United Kingdom (UK) and Ireland and from Germany, and likely from other fading imperial powers of the European sub-continent.

My whakapapa gives me a place of standing from which to examine the world and to speak from. Like all genealogies and histories, it contains struggle, love, greatness, and defeat. The iwi I hail from have varied histories as aggressors and survivors. Some openly collaborated with missionaries and later the Crown during the New Zealand Wars of the early colonial era in a quest to attain what they saw as the only future for their uri. Others resisted over generations and were punished greatly for it. All have been subjected to the brutal weight of settler-colonial capitalism, and all now are survivors of it. The tension between these histories was part of the whakapapa of this research. The birthplace of my mother, Rotorua, was an early mission stronghold at Mokoia and Ōhinemutu. The birthplace of my paternal grandmother, Tūranga, was equally so. These places are intimately linked with our settler-colonial history through influential missionaries who shaped our early care and protection system.

During the early stages of this research, I was seized with the drive to explore my father's whakapapa Māori. This history had been kept from me not through shame, but through forgetting. As I was reading about the damage of religious boarding schools in Aotearoa, I unearthed this in my own history. My whānau, my siblings, my father and his brother and sisters, did not know this whakapapa. The work had been done by our whanaunga of Ngāti Porou uri to remember the mamae, the death of a kōtiro, the sister of my great-great-grandfather, in a Catholic boarding school for Māori girls. The wound of this death, caused by the neglectful care of nuns and poor conditions of the school, was so deep

that the entire whānau subsequently converted to Anglicanism. Though this history was a tohu for me, it is by no means a whakapapa unique to my whānau. Thousands of tamariki Māori were touched by the early child care and protection system. These tamariki were the project of settler-colonial capitalism, the agents of which attempted to reshape them into faithful workers and citizens of Empire. The blanket of time, aided by the social forces that tell us we need to leave the past behind to move on, has settled across the shoulders of many mokopuna and obscured this history from us.

My political whakapapa is equally important to this research. It was also shaped by my whānau and my ancestors, by my mother and aunties and uncles talking about the confiscation of our whenua under the *Public Works Act 1928*, by whānau discussions about racial profiling of Police, by learning about my father and other men in my family going to prison for crimes of youthful indiscretion, and by simply observing the social and economic position of my whanaunga. As an adult, my political education became more robust through reading the words of generations of aunties, nannies, koroua, and tūpuna Māori who fought fearlessly against the many guises of settler-colonial capitalism. This eventually lead to my joining People Against Prisons Aotearoa and being exposed to a global whakapapa of communist and socialist theorists and organisers. In the same year, I started a Bachelor of Social Work as a mature student unsure of how my explicitly anti-imperialist political perspective would fit with a profession apparently hell-bent on aiding modern imperialism. It was during this study that I learned about the child care and protection system of today and about the role of social work in some of the cruellest and darkest parts of modern history. This thesis is the culmination of my place in these whakapapa, and a response to them.

3. Methodology

Social Work and Historical Analysis

> History as an arena of study, and more importantly, history as a modality of inquiry to illuminate the social problems of the present, suffers a marginal existence in the discipline. Despite social work's avowed identity as a profession and a discipline dedicated to the amelioration of social ills, the study of its public past—the articulation of the forces that have constituted and continue to shape the society and the profession in which we live and work—has failed to become a concern of major standing. (Park, 2006, p.170)

Social work research has a wide range of aims and values. It should add to theory and knowledge (Alston & Bowles, 2018; Shaw & Holland, 2014; Steinberg, 2015); provide evidence about the efficacy and impact of practice and policy (Alston & Bowles, 2018; Shaw & Holland, 2014; Steinberg, 2015); improve social work practice (Alston & Bowles, 2018; Shaw & Holland, 2014); give voice to the people impacted by social work and social welfare (Humphries, 2008; Shaw & Holland, 2014); and promote social justice (Alston & Bowles, 2018; Humphries, 2008; Shaw & Holland, 2014; Steinberg, 2015). Contemporary research in this field is largely tied to projects that can be used to directly inform social work practice, social work programmes, and social policy at an organisational or government level. According to Alston and Brown (2018) one of the defining aspects of social work research that differentiates it from other forms of social research is its clear link to social work practice.

On the surface, historical analysis does not sit comfortably within the parameters of social work research described above. In many of the heavy instructional tomes aimed at social work researchers, an overview of historical and other conceptual analysis is markedly absent (Alston & Bowles, 2018; Curtis & Curtis, 2012; Engel & Schutt, 2013; Humphries, 2008; Rubin & Babbie, 2014; Steinberg, 2015). Historical research cannot evaluate the outcomes of a current social work intervention, nor can it collect and analyse the experiences of current or recent clients of social work organisations. However, for a profession and academic discipline that has yet to truly reckon with the entirety of its whakapapa both here and globally, historical analysis is vitally important (Graham & Al-Krenawi, 2010; Park, 2006; Margolin, 1997; Shaw & Holland, 2014). Historical research in social work not only contributes to the professional knowledge base, it also provides context to and understanding of present conditions (Graham & Al-Krenawi, 2010). Historical research can also be a tool in the kete for social justice as it encourages critical reflection on the complicity of the profession with historical and modern oppressive regimes, and encourages us "not to repeat past mistakes" (Graham & Al-Krenawi, 2010, p.500). Knowing the genealogy of social work is particularly important when we consider this in the context of

the evidenced gulf between the emancipatory values and aims of the profession and our collaboration in ongoing structural and systemic injustice (Humphries, 2008).

Historical research has fallen out of favour since the early days of social work research (Fisher & Dybicz, 1999; Graham & Al-Krenawi, 2010). Graham and Al-Krenawi (2010) stated that in the first half of the 20th century, knowledge and analysis of the history of social work, social welfare, and social conditions was a common facet of social work research. In their analysis of social work doctorates completed at universities in the United States of America (USA), Fisher and Dybicz (1999) found that the number of theses searchable in online databases ProQuest Social Services Review that focused on history had dropped from 12.9% in 1952 to 1.4% in 1999. The ascendency of behavioural sciences, as well as a focus on quantification and statistics in both social work research and the social sciences more broadly, are partly behind the dramatic decline in the quantity of historical social work research (Fisher & Dybicz, 1999; Schutt, 2015). Fisher and Dybicz (1999) also note that the majority of social work and social welfare history has been written by authors outside of the social work field, and the same is true in Aotearoa. Of the few social welfare history books that exist in this country—for example, historian Bronwyn Dalley's *Family matters: Social welfare policy in New Zealand* (1998), or criminologist Elizabeth Stanley's groundbreaking *Road to Hell: State violence against children in postwar New Zealand* (2016)—none have been written by social workers, despite being intimately tied to social work policy, organisations, and practice.

Research Aims

The overall aim of this research is to understand the social and political economic functions and consequences of the early care and protection system in the entrenchment of settler-colonial capitalism in Aotearoa. This is a broad time period, and spans from the beginning of the relationship between Reverend Samuel Marsden and Ngāpuhi hapū in their aspirations to create the first mission school in Aotearoa in the early 19th century, until the years immediately preceeding the outbreak of World War II in 1939. This time period is largely absent in the written social welfare histories of Aotearoa, and both academic and primary sources on this subject are sparse. These goals align with what Schutt (2015) stated makes for good historical research: taking a wide view of the period of interest and asking broad questions that regard the whole environment, rather than looking at discrete events or actors in isolation. Beyond this, I want this research to become part of the whakapapa of knowledge about both the early formation of care and protection and settler-colonisation in Aotearoa. Most important, however, is the potential of this research to contribute to the long struggle against historic and ongoing racist and unjust child care and protection.

Kaupapa Māori

This research is grounded in Kaupapa Māori, an approach that has grown from and been nurtured in the fertile soil of these islands. Kaupapa Māori research is a contested paradigm, with many different interpretations of its methodological and analytical approaches (Mikahere-Hall, 2017; Smith, 2012). The earliest conceptual definitions of Kaupapa Māori research were summarised by Graham Hingangaroa Smith (1992), a descendant of Ngāti Apa, Ngāti Kahungunu, Te Aitanga a Hauiti and Kāti Māmoe. According to Smith (1992), Kaupapa Māori research and theory is linked to being Māori; grows from mātauranga and tikanga Māori; understands the legitimacy of Māori language, culture and history; and is inextricably tied to the struggles for decolonisation and tino rangatiratanga. In her seminal work on research, decolonisation, and Indigenous peoples, Linda Tuhiwai Smith (Ngāti Awa & Ngāti Porou, 2012) drew a further line in the sand when she argued this approach rejects the imperialist construction of Western research paradigms as the judge of what constitutes real or valued knowledge. Alayne Mikahere-Hall (2017), a Ngāti Whātua, Te Rarawa, and Tainui uri, stated it is important to note that the mātauranga Māori that is taken for granted as part of Kaupapa Māori research is not static, and weaves together the ancient influence and information of te ao kōhatu with the new knowledges of te ao hurihuri.

Though this research approach has been well-theorised and hotly debated for three decades, some scholars state the focus has always been on the values and requirements of doing Kaupapa Māori research, rather than prescribing how to do it (Walker et al., 2006). Because Kaupapa Māori does not have a prescribed method, it is defined and applied in many different ways according to the kaupapa of the work itself (Walker et al., 2006). Kaupapa Māori research is used across many different fields, including education, health, sociology, psychology, environmental sciences, and history (Smith, 2012). This research lens also has a small but growing foothold in social work research, where it has been used to analyse culturally specific fostering programs (Walker [Kāi Tahu, Ngāti Kahungungu], 2002), to evaluate the efficacy of drink-driving prevention among hāpori Māori (Eketone [Waikato & Ngāti Maniapoto], 2005), to understand Māori social workers experiences of care and protection (Moyle, 2014), and more. The flexibility of this approach and its grounding in Māori ways of being and knowing does not preclude it from being scientific and rigorous (Smith, 2012; Walker et al., 2006). Smith (2012) pointed out that anti-Māori research, or research done by an anti-Māori researcher, could not possibly be Kaupapa Māori. Similarly, Pihama (2005) stated that by positioning ourselves as Kaupapa Māori researchers we clearly identify ourselves as pro-Māori.

One of the most debated aspects of Kaupapa Māori research and practice is the inclusion of critical theory as part of the core concept (Smith, 2012). Eketone (2008) argued that the critical theory approaches espoused in early literature about Kaupapa Māori are unbalanced, and that the constructivist pou is more coherent with Indigenous approaches to

knowledge. Eketone (2008) suggested that the inclusion of critical theory and its obsession with power and conflict in Kaupapa Māori is popular because it is a comfortable lens within the academy, rather than in Māori communities and organisations which instead use concepts of “tapu, mana, utu, aroha and manaakitanga” (p.6). Eketone (2008) insists that the focus on conflict makes Kaupapa Māori about oppression, about “ourselves in relation to them” (p.7). From his perspective, the centrality of conflict somehow presupposes the eventual end of Kaupapa Māori as a theory and practice when our strugges for tino rangatiratanga are realised. In contrast, Leonie Pihama (2005), who has ancestral connections to Te Ātiawa, Ngāti Mahanga, and Ngā Māhanga ā Tairi, argued for the inclusion of liberatory and critical approaches within Kaupapa Māori. According to Pihama (2005), Kaupapa Māori is not only linked to decolonial struggles, but grows from them. She argued that the resistance of her tūpuna to raupatu, cultural genocide, imprisonment, and death are examples of Kaupapa Māori theory.

Pihama (2005) also noted that both Kaupapa Māori theory and mātauranga Māori more generally are always both transforming and transformative. This is clearly evidenced in what is considered the root of Māori knowledge and analysis, the concept of whakapapa (Pihama, 2005). Marsden (Ngāi Takoto, Ngāti Warara) and Royal (Ngāti Raukawa, Ngāti Tamaterā & Ngā Puhi, 2003) described whakapapa as stages of time in which the new era is grown within the old before bursting forth in a revolutionary transformation. This applies, of course, to our own genealogical links from our parents, our grandparents, and our ancestors, but also to natural phenomena, to the metaphysical realm, to socio-cultural practices, and to history. When we take this knowledge for granted, we can understand that the presumption of an end to Kaupapa Māori following the eventual re-implementation of tino rangatiratanga and mana motuhake is not an end at all, but part of the whakapapa of transformational change that is the heart of mātauranga Māori. This conception of whakapapa as transformational historic change and the repositioning of Māori knowledge as central to our understanding of the history of this whenua are both critical elements in this research.

Marxism as a Science

> [A]ll nature, from the smallest thing to the biggest, from grains of sand to suns, from protista to man, has its existence in eternal coming into being and going out of being, in a ceaseless flux, in unresting motion and change. (Engels, 2005, p.35)

Dialectical materialism is the overarching scientific framework of the Marxist tradition. Dialectical materialism has four key principles of the development of phenomena: that they are interrelated and primarily determined by the conditions of their environment and history; that the world is in a constant process of change; that development of phenomena is not a simple linear progression but a transformation of one form to another; and that this development arises from internal contradictions (Engels, 2005). Historical materialism is the

application of these scientific principles to society and social history. The central relationship of historical materialism is the social relationship between a person and how they obtain the necessities of life (eg., food, shelter, and clothing), called the "mode of production" (Marx, 1990). The mode of production consists of not only the natural materials and instruments needed to maintain survival (the "forces of production"), but also the relationships between people that are required to produce these necessities (the "relations of production"). Whether these relationships are of mutual co-operation or exploitation, it is only within these relationships that production can take place (Marx, 1990).

In a Marxist analysis, it is the mode of production that acts as the economic base upon which the institutions of society (the "superstructure") are built on. This superstructure consists of two interrelated floors; the first is the politico-legal level (laws and systems of government), the second is the ideological level (religion, education, media) (Althusser, 1977). The levels of this superstructure "could not 'stay up' (in the air) alone, if they did not rest precisely on their base" (Althusser, 1977, p.129). Though the social superstructure is largely determined by the economic base, this is of course a *dialectical* relationship. The economic base and social superstructure shape and reinforce each other, locked in a spiral of constant motion that is patterned with contradiction and struggle—until the next transformation to a new form of society breaks free. This scientific method is not politically neutral, and has never feigned such an appearance. Marxism is transparently and proudly concerned with human liberation from exploitive and unjust social structures (Lenin, 1977).

As a scientific framework, Marxism has expanded over time and has many different traditions which are also sometimes contradictory to each other. It has been applied theoretically to many different but interrelated struggles, including patriarchy and the subordination of women (Ghodsee, 2018; Vogel, 2014), and colonisation and imperialism (Barber, 2019; Coulthard, 2014; Fanon, 1991; Lenin, 1977). The theories of Marx and Engels and the generations of people who have broadened and deepened them, have been fundamental in dozens of socialist, anti-colonial and liberation struggles across Africa, Asia, the Middle East, the Americas, the Caribbean, the Pacific, and Europe (Prashad, 2017). The influence of Marxism and critical or radical approaches more broadly in Western social work have changed dramatically. On the whole, social work has been and continues to be a profession that is deeply tied to the maintenance of capitalism, however, a fiercely critical strand remains (Ferguson, 2008; Pease & Nipperess, 2016). In some of the earliest years of social work, ideas about the role of the profession as an agent for social change and easing human suffering were common, particularly in the settlement house movement in the USA (Andrews & Reisch, 1997) and among the Fabian social reformers of the UK (Ferguson, 2008). However, the virulent anti-communism of this era saw many of the social workers who supported these ideas imprisoned, investigated, pressured, and fired, and funding

withdrawn from programs that reflected Marxist and broadly liberatory ideals (Andrews & Reisch, 1997).

The next time the influence of Marxism held sway in Western social work was during the civil rights era in the 1960s-70s, following the social movements of Black liberation, Indigenous sovereignty struggles, the anti-war movement, feminism, and queer rights (Andrews & Reisch, 1997; Ferguson, 2008; Pease & Nipperess, 2016). Once again, this radical strand of social work was subsumed, this time following the decay of social democracy and the introduction of neoliberal capitalism (Ferguson, 2008). The effects of neoliberalism on social work have been many and varied, from the continuing austerity of public services, to the heavy handed instrumentalism imposed on social workers by organisations desperate to meet their key performance indicators and secure funding, to the collusion of social work in framing social problems as individual responsibilities (Ferguson, 2008). Despite this, that fibre of radical and critical theory and practice continues to pattern contemporary social work (Pease & Nipperess, 2016). Like many critical social work practitioners and scholars before me, I utilise a Marxist analytical lens to help interpret the world. Throughout this thesis I use scientific Marxism to explain the role of the early care and protection system in the implementation of settler-colonial capitalism in Aotearoa.

Synthesising Kaupapa Māori and Historical Materialism

> [R]endering Marx's theoretical frame relevant to a comprehensive understanding of settler-colonialism and Indigenous resistance requires that it be transformed *in conversation* (original emphasis) with the critical thought and practices of Indigenous peoples themselves. (Coulthard, 2014, p.8)

There are, of course, tensions and contradictions between certain strands of Marxist knowledge and both Indigenous realities of colonisation and imperialism, and with Indigenous communities as a whole. Coulthard (2014) summarised these in his book *Red skin, white masks: Rejecting the colonial politics of recognition.* First, that the foundations laid down by Marx (1990) in his idea of primitive accumulation—the violent disposession and carving up of common land and resources for private ownership—are erroneously portrayed as being rooted in a discrete time in history. Coulthard (2014), drawing on generations of Marxist theorists, noted that this is an ongoing process that has very serious ramifications on Indigenous people in both settler-colonies and in the extractive colonies that are ruthlessly exploited by wealthy imperialist countries. His second critique regards Marx's earlier understanding of each stage of social organisation and production (eg., early communism, feudalism, capitalism, socialism) being necessary and advantageous to human liberation. This conception of history takes colonisation as a violent but essential step in human development, and is clearly racist and Eurocentric. Both Coulthard (2014) and Barber (Kāi Tahu & Kāti Huirapa, 2019) noted that Marx changed his position on this in the later stages

of his life, however, his interest in colonisation remained peripheral, and this has in turn influenced the Marxist tradition as a whole. The final critique laid out by Coulthard (2014) is that colonial disposession, both historic and ongoing, is not *purely* through brute violence and coercion, but also through assimilating Indigenous peoples into the mechanisms of capitalist state power by limited degrees.

In synthesising an Indigenous focus on settler-colonisation and Marxist political economy, Coulthard (2014) argued the necessity of shifting the Eurocentric framing of the main social relationship from that between a male worker and the means of production, to one between the colonised person(s) and the effects of colonial disposession. He argued that when we consider *this* relationship the primary focus of the introduction and maintenance of capitalism in a settler-colony, it then becomes difficult to justify racist assumptions of the developmental necessity of capitalism to “the supposedly ‘backward’ world of the colonized” (p.11). For Coulthard (2014), this framework is easily applied by Indigenous people, who hold the land and our relationship to her as both essential for our continued survival both materially and culturally, and as a model of systems of reciprocal obligations that deeply inform Indigenous ways of life.

From within our own islands, Barber (2019) drew on the similarities between historical materialism and whakapapa as scientific ways of understanding historical processes. Barber used the curling form of the koru as a visual representation of these similarities, both of which use “a relational thinking of process, cycle, and development” (p.62). He builds on the stageist conception of whakapapa described by Marsden and Royal (2003) above when he asserted that the splitting apart of Papatūānuku and Ranginui by their children, the violent end of Te Pō and the ushering in of the new world of Te Ao Mārama, is an astonishingly clear example of dialectical materialism. Expanding on Coulthard (2014), Barber (2019) said that building a Māori Marxist analysis means rejecting the taken for granted focus on the “lifeless materialism” (p.65) of te ao Pākehā, and welcoming in the interconnectedness between the material, the social, and our obligations to each other and to Papatūānuku herself.

Method

The relative sparsity of both primary and secondary sources that cover these subjects and time period in our history requires a pluralist approach. This research is conceptual, rather than empirical, and synthesises information from various appropriate sources through the carefully woven analytical lenses of Kaupapa Māori and historical materialism in order to create a broad picture of the role of child removal in settler-colonial capitalism in Aotearoa.

Data selection

Primary sources used in this research include archival data, such as the letters of John Morgan, the missionary in charge of the Ōtawhao Mission School, as well as letters and diaries of other missionaries in Aotearoa. It also includes records from Native and Māori church boarding schools, excerpts from both English and Māori language newspapers, the Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives (AJHR) and Hansard, and legislation. Secondary sources include books, theses and articles on a broad range of topics, such as the historic and ongoing colonisation of Aotearoa, child care and protection, Native and missionary schools, and political economy. Drilling down into the actual process of examining historical texts, researchers should "not assume that documents are simply neutral artefacts from the past" (May, 2011, p.215). May (2011) cautioned that when analysing documents, researchers must consider the purposes of the document, the intended reader, and the social, political, and economic context within which they were created. Like weaving a tāniko, these strands (historical texts) are carefully selected, prepared, joined, and looped to create the final pattern.

There were significant challenges to obtaining primary sources for the three main aspects of this research. The missionary journals and letters to the Church Missionary Society (CMS) were the easiest to source from the Hocken Collections research library at the University of Otago. None of the materials needed for my examination of the early missionary era were restricted in the Hocken Collections, with free access to all members of the public. However, primary sources regarding the Native and Māori church boarding schools and the early child welfare system were much more difficult to review. Many of the archival texts of the Native schools systems were not held centrally at the main Archives New Zealand branch in Wellington, but were scattered throughout regional branches. Furthermore, most of these texts were restricted to the public as they were bound into collections covering several decades. As the most recent date of the majority of these collections was within the last one hundred years, access to the public is typically denied to protect the privacy of any named individuals (Archives New Zealand, 2020).

Archival texts from the early state child welfare era was also restricted, though much of this was erroneously marked open to public. On application to view records of industrial schools and reformatories at Archives New Zealand, I was denied on the grounds of these records having been recently transferred between the Ministry of Education and Oranga Tamariki. Consequently, decisions on public access were still undecided. Information on the Māori church boarding schools and private child welfare institutions of the late 19th century onwards was also restricted, but for different reasons: these records are restricted by the individual religious institutions and require an application for access on each set of records. The pursuit of so much scattered history was outside of the scope of this thesis. For these reasons, certain aspects of this research lack the richness and depth that would follow public

access to restricted historical texts. In particular, in the future the early child welfare system would benefit from a further exploration of the private childrens homes of this era. Unfortunately, secondary sources that critically examine these institutions simply do not exist at this time, and would represent a huge undertaking on the part of any researcher. The section on Native and Māori church boarding schools in chapter six also relies heavily on secondary sources of information.

Data Analysis

In this thesis, I attempted to utilise the Māori Marxism alluded to by Barber (2019) by combining an explicitly Māori kaupapa and orientation to history and knowledge with a Marxist focus on the attempted transformation of social relations of production among hāpori Māori. The use of whakapapa as a scientific explanatory force for historical change is central to this thesis, as is the privileging of Māori knowledge and history. I do not attempt to present a neutral view of the historic processes of settler-colonial capitalism—this research is proudly pro-Māori and deliberately critical of the global imperialist project. Coulthard's (2014) reframing of the coloniser-colonised relationship as the primary antagonism in settler-colonial capitalism is used throughout this thesis. Chapters five to eight contain a clear focus on how each aspect of early child care and protection examined in this research was characterised by this social relation. The primary and secondary data I gathered was analysed through this synthesised lens in an effort to contribute to the remembering of Māori history, of colonial history, and of social work history.

4. He Māhere Hei Whakamārama Ai Tātou

To understand the impact of Māori child removal in the colonial and early nation period, there are three disparate aspects of our history we must examine.

1. The formation and continual reforms of the child care and protection system in the post-World War II period. In this section I describe the ways the current system carries the threads of the past. Modern care and protection and has a direct whakapapa to the ideological and economic realities of the colonial and even precolonial era.
2. The basic social and political economic structure of Māori societies. In this section, I examine the precolonial whānau and hapū units, along with the relationships between whānau and hapū members, the environment, and labour.
3. The development of British capitalism prior to the colonisation of these islands and the early exploration and exploitation of this whenua before the arrival of missionaries. The social and political economic forces behind the eventual colonisation of Aotearoa are analysed here to help us understand why the expropriation of Māori from their land and traditional ways of life was so deeply important to the implementation of capitalism.

Child Care and Protection in the Modern Era

The child care and protection system in Aotearoa is in a chronic and cyclical crisis, and is deeply rooted in the historical and modern consequences of settler colonial capitalism (Hyslop, 2020; Hyslop & Keddell, 2018). At September 30 2020, 5750 children and young people were in the care of the Chief Executive of Oranga Tamariki, our state care and protection institution (Oranga Tamariki, 2020a). Approximately 68% of these children were tamariki and rangatahi Māori. Though the number of children entering care has dropped over the last five years, Māori children remain subjected to huge overrepresentation in this system. In the year July 1 2019 to June 30 2020, 58% of the children who entered care were Māori (Oranga Tamariki, 2020b). In addition, around 75% of the young people being held in youth justice facilities whakapapa Māori (Oranga Tamariki, 2020a). These figures are both alarming and damning, particularly when we recognise that tāngata Māori are only 16.7% of the total population (Stats NZ, 2020a). However grim these figures are, they are far from a historical aberration, nor are they unusual when compared to the broader social position of Māori in the settler-colony. Māori are also 52.9% of the total prison population (Department of Corrections, 2020); have higher rates of severe housing deprivation than Pākehā (Amore et al., 2020); and rate both their own and their family's health, wellbeing, housing quality, and income sufficiency lower than Pākehā (Stats NZ, 2020b). In the months July to September of 2020, Māori were four times more likely than Pākehā to access a foodbank (Stats NZ, 2020b). Since the earliest days of this colony, racist violence and poverty have been

imposed upon Māori people, and this continues today. It should be hardly surprising, then, that our child care and protection system reflects and reinforces the wider injustices and inequities of our racist society.

Centralising Child Care and Protection 1945-1990

It was during the post-World War II social democratic period that the modern form of our centralised, largely state run care and protection system was created (Stanley, 2016). The post-war social contract was essentially a concession to working class power and the spectre of communism in the wake of the October Revolution, the Great Depression and two devastating global wars. Leaving behind the liberal austerity of the earlier 20th century, this new era of care and protection saw a large state investment in public services and institutions. With this influx of public funding came a renewed focus on child abuse, neglect, and youth delinquency (Stanley, 2016). During this era, as many whānau left their tūrangawaewae and papakāinga in search of work and some relief from grinding rural poverty, Māori became hyper-visible to both Pākehā neighbours in towns and cities as well as the state (Dalley, 1998; Walker, 2004). Many of these now conspicuous families were targeted for intervention and child removal simply because they were seen as poor or lived in poor quality housing (Stanley, 2016). Others were constructed as young delinquents and vandals, victims of a conservative post-war moral panic that took aim at working class, Māori, and Pacific young people as the cause of social disorder (Dalley, 1998; Stanley, 2016). By the 1960s, Police, the Department of Social Welfare, the Department of Education, politicians and the media were whipping Pākehā New Zealand into a frenzy with the idea of youth crime and immorality. This was a familiar pattern in the history of child care and protection, and was a return to the political rhetoric used to justify the early child welfare institutions of the preceeding century, as I explore in chapter seven. Both official surveillance by child welfare officers and Police, and unofficial surveillance by community members, became a difficult reality for many Māori, Pacific, and poor Pākehā families. Between 1950 and 1990, some 100,000 children were taken into state care, most of them Māori (Stanley, 2016). Stanley (2016) noted that the antagonism and targeting of rangatahi, tamariki, and whānau Māori at this time was “the starting point for the over-representation of Māori in institutions” (p. 31).

The new language of psychology became an influential explanatory force in the care and protection system, and this was combined with the continuation of individualised explanations for both child behaviour and the destitute conditions of families targeted for state intervention (Stanley, 2016). Stanley (2016) said that “[w]hile officers saw Māori families suffering from deprived home conditions, limited employment opportunities and socio-cultural dislocation, they readily attributed these problems to personal deficits of laziness, drunkenness or cultural instability” (p.32). Child protection again became

increasingly punitive, and the number of large institutions for delinquent children flourished, much as they had in the previous century, as examined in chapter seven. In the mid-1970s to the mid-1980s, between 12,000 and 14,000 children were subjected to children's court processes every year (Stanley, 2016). By 1982, around 10% of these children lived in institutions—boys' and girls' homes, church homes, borstal, and psychiatric institutions—with the other 90% living in foster homes, usually outside of their own family. The intention was to give them a good, Pākehā, middle-class upbringing (Stanley, 2016). Much like today, Māori and Pacific children were more likely to be removed from their families, and were subjected to institutionalisation at much higher rates than Pākehā children (Stanley, 2016). Some of these tamariki certainly came from homes where they were subjected to abuse and neglect. We now know that many of these children suffered further neglect and violence, in some cases horrific and sustained violence, in the institutions and foster homes they were placed in (Stanley, 2016).

The Neoliberal Era 1984-Today

The mid-to-late 1980s saw drastic reform of all public service policy and practice, including child protection services. Following the shifting orientation of modern capitalism away from social democracy, the fourth Labour government (1984-1990) ushered in a new era of neoliberal corporatisation that fundamentally changed the connection between the state and the public. The change towards a neoliberal "opening up" of the country and the removal of protections for domestic production meant major changes for primary industry (Kelsey, 1995). The closing down or downsizing of dozens of major mills and other firms that employed thousands of people, and the commitment to maintain low unemployment through public works disappeared almost overnight (Kelsey, 1995). These changes hit Māori particularly hard (Poata-Smith [Te Rarawa & Ngāti Kahu], 2001), with one in five Māori of working age being made redundant between 1987-1989 (Te Puni Kōkiri, 1993). Funding to public services was slashed to maintain low state spending, and publicly-owned assets were sold at a dizzying rate to shed as much responsibility from the Crown as possible (Kelsey, 1995). Within a decade, work, welfare, and public services had been drastically reshaped, sacrificed at the altar of personal responsibility (Kelsey, 1995). This ideology and the political economic structure that shapes and is shaped by it was an influential part of the formation of what is now called the *Oranga Tamariki Act 1989* (the Act) (Hyslop, 1997).

The radical economic change of the 1980s was only one factor in the establishment of the Act. Hyslop (1997) has insisted that there were two other primary influences on its creation. First, there had been a rising recognition of child abuse globally as a widespread social problem, rather than isolated domestic incidents best kept behind closed doors. Hyslop (1997) attributed this to feminist theory and action, which during the 1960s-1970s had pushed the rights of women and children into the public sphere. The second key

influence identified by Hyslop (1997) was the impetus from Māori protest movements that were, at their heart, pushing for greater self-determination for Māori (Hyslop, 1997). In the twenty years preceding the writing of the Act, several high-profile protests regarding Māori rights to land, resources, language, and Māori control over Māori affairs, had taken place (Poata-Smith, 2001; Walker, 2004). These protests restoked the fires of rangatiratanga that had been trampled for generations since the incredibly destructive colonial invasion and land confiscations of the New Zealand Wars. The widespread removal of tamariki Māori into institutions and Pākehā foster homes detailed above did not pass unchallenged, with whānau, hapū, community and political groups pushing back against the state (Stanley, 2016). The growing voices of Māori discontent could not be ignored. A state inquiry in 1985 led by John Rangihau, of Ngāi Tūhoe whakapapa, systematically addressed the devastating impact of colonisation, racism, and Māori child removal on hapū and Māori communities (Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare [Ministerial Advisory Committee], 1988). The report from this inquiry, called *Puao-te-Ata-tu*, remains one of the most important documents in the history of child protection in New Zealand.

The 13 recommendations published in *Puao-te-Ata-tu* were informed by listening to Māori communities across Aotearoa, young people, social workers in the Department of Social Welfare, and legal experts (Ministerial Advisory Committee, 1988). First among the recommendations was to “attack all forms of cultural racism in New Zealand that result in the values and lifestyle of the dominant group being regarded as superior to those of other groups, especially Māori” (p.9). Also recommended was equitable resource and power sharing between the state and Māori; the involvement of community in the oversight of care and protection institutions; and the involvement of tamariki and their whānau in decisions regarding care and protection. Māori demanded the right to be included in the lives of their uri who had come into the care and protection system, and the clamour was now impossible to ignore. Though the government rejected most of the recommendations—particularly those that called for accountability from the Crown and power sharing with Māori—the report was hugely influential in the shaping of the original Act.

The Act espoused to protect the rights of families and whakapapa, giving wider whānau a say in the future of children that would likely have been institutionalised or placed with non-kin foster carers (Hyslop, 1997). It also stressed the responsibilities of families and extended whānau, and identified the family unit as having the absolute duty of care for their children. The Act attempted to combine newly progressive recognition of Indigenous rights and a philosophy of family integration while pairing it with neoliberal personal responsibility rhetoric. These apparent contradictions would continue to struggle over time. The Act laid the legal foundations for the massive deinstitutionalisation of children and young people from

care facilities in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Most institutions were shut down across the country and state spending on child care and protection was cut dramatically (Duncan & Worrall, 2000; Stanley, 2016). Thousands of children were sent back to families that were newly un-or-underemployed and fighting for less jobs with little security and worse pay. Many of these families were also renting homes that were now market-rate, rather than publicly subsidised.

The competing tensions between neoliberal economic imperative and the funding needed to adequately support whānau Māori to care for their tamariki during an era of worsening inequity were at stark odds. According to Hyslop (1997), the promise of the Act returning the care of tamariki to their whānau was initially realised, with a level of resourcing that met their perceived needs. However, the responsibility of whānau to care for their children was soon "stretched to include financial and material responsibility" (Hyslop, 1997, p.64). Even from the early days of the Act, social workers were found to be manipulating the new process of Family Group Conference (FGC) to match their desired professional outcome (Rimene [Rangitāne, Kahungunu, Te Arawa & Kai Tahu], 1994). Moyle (2014) found similar practices decades later in their research interviewing Māori practitioners, where participants noted that FGCs were being used as a "state-centred tool rather than a whānau-centred (or led) decision-making process" (p.60). Much like the Act itself, processes like the FGC and Māori-themed risk and safety assessments have long been criticised as being a Pākehā invention with only an illusion of tikanga or kaupapa Māori (Moyle & Tauri [Ngāti Porou], 2016).

Across the intervening years, several interconnected issues saw many reforms of the care and protection system. However, the root issues remained the same, despite name changes and desperate attempts to recapture popular support. A potent combination of tight and targeted public spending and a managerial focus on output to the detriment of outcomes for tamariki and whānau has created ongoing cyclical crises (O'Brien, 2016). Key issues include: a culture of surveillance that penalises poverty and individualises social problems (Keddell, 2017; Hyslop, 2013); a unrelenting media focus on both a supposedly violent underclass of inherently abusive Māori families (Beddoe, 2015; Hyslop & Keddell, 2018) and the failure of care and protection social workers to prevent serious harm (Staniforth & Beddoe, 2017); and continuing racism at every point in the system (Moyle, 2014). This high-pressure, resource-scarce, risk-averse child care and protection environment lends itself to a conservative system that tends toward early and heavy-handed statutory intervention in the lives of struggling families (Keddell, 2017). The scope of practice for individual care and protection social workers to respond in creative ways to these struggles are similarly limited. Moyle (2014) called this a system of "patch and dispatch" (p.58), with ever increasing pressure to close cases and ensure the physical safety of the child as quickly as possible

before moving on to the next family, often at the expense of whānau connection and whakapapa.

A resurgence of Māori resistance and challenge to this system has recently rippled throughout Aotearoa. One case involving a young Ngāti Kahungungu mother and the repeated attempted removal of her newborn infant from hospital in 2019 set alight what has been long simmering discontent (Māori Inquiry into Oranga Tamariki, 2020; Reid, 2019). Five concurrent enquiries into the case and wider racism and Māori child removal in the system followed, some from the Crown and others independent (1 News, 2019). Much like the circumstances surrounding the wero laid by Māori to the Crown in the lead up to the original Act, there has been a revitalisation of Māori political defiance in recent years. This includes high-profile land protests, struggle for criminal justice reform in response to Māori mass incarceration and racist policing, and the long-running Hands Off Our Tamariki movement centred on Māori control and kaitiakitanga of tamariki Māori in the care and protection system (Te Wharepora Hou, 2016). The underlying structural issues of today's care and protection remain the same as the issues of thirty years ago (Hyslop, 1997) and sixty years ago (Stanley, 2016), and indeed even a century ago as I will illustrate in this research. These issues remain despite the supposed revolutionary overhaul of the Act and a litany of reforms that have promised to fix this broken, racist system. To understand why these problems endure we must look wider than the care and protection system itself, and confront the historical, social, and political economic structure that has produced and reproduces these myriad injustices.

Understanding Precolonial Whānau and Hapū Māori

Whānau is fundamentally different to the Western conception of an atomistic nuclear family (Lawson-Te Aho, 2010). In her in-depth review of the term "whānau", Keri Lawson-Te Aho (Ngāi Tāhu, Ngāti Kahungunu, Rongowhakaata & Ngāti Porou, 2010) found that there have been several different definitions of this concept, some of which appear to contradict each other. In drawing together these ideas, Lawson-Te Aho (2010) stated that at its most essential, the precolonial concept of whānau was based on intergenerational relationships of people with shared whakapapa, usually to a recent ancestor. Taima Moeke-Pickering (Ngāti Pukeko & Tūhoe,1996) noted that "[k]eeping within the confines of their tribal affiliations, each whānau mixed, divided, rekindled, migrated and formed fresh relationships" (p.2). As whānau expanded and numbers increased over time, whānau membership would shift and change, based on relationships, needs, and resources. However, connections between these whānau remained as part of the same hapū or iwi with shared whakapapa (Moeke-Pickering, 1996). Generally, a whānau was made up of three or four generations of extended family, inclusive of groups of siblings of each generation (Moeke-Pickering, 1996). Makereti

Papakura (Tuhourangi, 1986) asserted that it was normal that people would consider themselves part of different whānau through whakapapa, marriage, and whāngai.

The whānau was the smallest unit in precolonial Māori economic and social organisation. According to Rose Pere (Ngāi Tūhoe, Ngāti Ruapani & Ngāti Kahungunu, 1982), whānau members were bound to each other through whakapapa, mutual loyalty and obligation. Whakapapa connected whānau members to present, past, and future generations of their hapū and iwi, and also to the atua and the environment (Lawson-Te Aho, 2010; Mikaere, 2017). As such, whānau were more than simply a collection of people with genealogical links to one another; their connections also had a metaphysical dimension that encompassed both the physical world and the "unseen realm of wairua or spirit" (Lawson-Te Aho, 2010, p.24). Though lines of direct descent between generations were profoundly important to Māori as part of tracing whakapapa, the deeply enmeshed lives among whānau meant that distinctions between "mother" and "aunt", or "father" and "uncle", as well as "sibling" and "cousin" were less important (Mikaere, 2017).

Whānau are central in the transmission of knowledge and culture between generations (Pere, 1982). In precolonial times, whānau also played an important role in both economic production and social reproduction, and therefore in the maintenance of Māori social and political economic worlds. Precolonial Māori society was certainly hierarchical, and access to leadership and political power was based primarily on seniority of descent from notable tūpuna (Poata-Smith, 2001; Walker, 2004). However, this seniority or lack thereof did not impact individual access to resources within the whānau, as all members were necessary for collective physical and spiritual wellbeing (Mikaere, 2017; Pere, 1982). Roles within whānau were largely organised by age and gender, with women generally doing less dangerous work such as gathering kaimoana, weaving, and gardening; and men tending towards heavier work like building, clearing land, and fishing (Mikaere, 2017). Despite these differences, all work was of equal importance. Mikaere (2017) stated that within whānau, "the very survival of the whole was absolutely dependent upon everyone who made it up, and therefore each and every person within the group was important" (p.54).

Tamariki are treasured in te ao Māori, today and in te ao kohatu. Mikaere (2017) asserted that caring for future generations was one of the most important tasks within the whānau, and was considered a privilege. Tamariki were raised collectively rather than by one set of parents, with the entire unit having responsibility for care and education (Mikaere, 2017; Pere, 1982). Couples and parents were an interdependent part of this whānau, and it was not possible to raise children alone and have an isolated nuclear family unit (Jenkins [Ngāti Porou], 1986). Older people within whānau, particularly grandparents, played a large part in raising their mokopuna. This had both a practical and spiritual aspect—it meant that the parents could do the more physically demanding tasks needed for the ongoing survival

of the whānau, and had the freedom to continue their own learning and growth as younger adults (Mikaere, 2017). It also connected the different generations of the whānau to those passed and those yet to come, as tūpuna link to the past and mokopuna to the future (Pere, 1982). The raising and teaching of children by the collective meant that tamariki Māori could learn and grow from many different people and be exposed to a wide range of knowledge, skills, and experiences (Mikaere, 2017). It was within whānau that mokopuna Māori learned about the world and their place in it, and where their identity as part of an inter-generational line stretching back to Hawaiki was nurtured (Moeke-Pickering, 1996).

Generations of Māori scholars have used the words passed down from our tūpuna, as well as the words written by early Christian missionaries, Native school teachers, and politicians, to help illustrate the tender and indulgent caregiving of tamariki Māori by their whānau (Jenkins & Philip-Barbara, 2002; Mikaere, 2017; Pere, 1982; Pihama et al., 2003). Violence perpetrated within the whānau was not common, and when it did happen was not tolerated (Jenkins & Philip-Barbara, 2002; Mikaere, 2017; Pihama et al., 2003). Mason Durie (2001), of Rangitane, Ngāti Kauwhata, and Ngāti Raukawa uri, explained:

> There is no historical support for claims that traditional Māori society tolerated violence and abuse towards children and women, or that some members of the group were of lesser value than others. An unsafe household demands a whānau response and, as an immediate priority, an assurance that safety can be provided—elsewhere if not at home. (p.208)

When violence against partners, elders, or children was committed, it was considered as harm to collective wellbeing and mana, and therefore required a collective response (Jenkins & Philip-Barbara, 2002). The interconnected strands of relationships within whānau and hapū guaranteed a strong support network for the victims of violence within whānau (Jenkins & Philip-Barbra, 2002; Mikaere, 2017). Perpetrators of family violence could face a long road to redemption, as collective responses ranged from muru (Mikaere, 2017)—the confiscation of resources that could not be met with retaliation through Māori law—to a long period of displaying accountability and regret, to the total disavowal from whānau and hapū (Jackson [Ngāti Kahungungu, Ngāti Porou], 1988; Jenkins & Philip-Barbara, 2002).

Precolonial Māori Social and Political Economic Organisation

Whānau were—and remain—the building blocks of hapū and iwi (Pere, 1982). Groups of whānau, connected by an ancestor, constitute hapū. If we understand whānau as the most important social unit in precolonial Māori society, then hapū were the primary political unit (Pere, 1982; Poata-Smith, 2001). As the majority of Māori society, particularly in Te Ika a Māui, adapted from a migratory hunter-gatherer living pattern to a more semi-permanent agricultural society based around seasonal planting and harvest, most hapū lived together as a large group centred around one or a handful of papakāinga and pā (Walker, 2004).

Hapū had a rangatira, the leader—usually but not always a man—who was generally of most senior whakapapa to an important tūpuna across the whānau groups. Despite this hierarchy, decision-making was largely collective. Seniority of whakapapa is what gave rangatira and tōhunga in Māori society the opportunity to hold positions of influence, however, it was the consensus of whānau and hapū that gave the mandate for leadership (Jackson, 1988; Walker, 2004). Individuals within the hapū derived their rights to land both through whakapapa and through developing, working on, and defending the whenua (Poata-Smith, 2001). The relationships Māori had with each other and the environment changed drastically over the centuries we lived on these islands before Pākehā interference (Poata-Smith, 2001; Walker, 2004).

Social norms, social control, and dispute resolution in Māori society were maintained through a legal system based on the concept of physical and spiritual balance (Jackson, 1988). These laws had their basis in "a religious and mystical weave which was codified into oral traditions and sacred beliefs" (Jackson, 1988, p.39). Ngā ture Māori were threaded through every aspect of life: through the connections between individuals and collectives, through the everyday work needed to sustain whānau and hapū, and through the relationships people had with atua and their natural environment. Jackson (1988) explained that the primary institutions of this law were tapu and noa, which was used to maintain the mana inherent in people (tangata, whānau, hapū, and iwi), the environment, and treasured objects. The practical expression of tapu could be seen in the use of rāhui to maintain stocks of kaimoana or harakeke, or to restrict access to an area where people had died (Jackson, 1988). It was also evidenced through the dispute resolution described earlier, where perpetrators of family violence and their whānau would submit to ritualised muru to restore the mana of all people involved (Mikaere, 2017). The responsibility of maintaining the balance of the collective was shared by all, which meant that the accountability for transgressions of tapu perpetrated by an individual were also shared (Jackson, 1988; Mikaere, 2017). This, again, illustrates the depth of investment Māori had in ensuring social conditions of equality and balance. From a Marxist perspective, the necessity of a legal and social superstructure that ensures communal accountability and balance is clear when the mode of production requires communal labour (Marx, 1990). Collective responsibility for maintaining resources year upon year, and for the continuing social stability of the hapū, are necessary when survival requires everyone to work together to raise children, grow and harvest crops, gather kaimoana and hunt birds, and build and care for the papakāinga.

Economic structures in Māori society were diverse and were rooted in the available environmental resources (Poata-Smith, 2001). Drawing on the work of Māori and Pākehā anthropologists, Evan Te Ahu Poata-Smith (2001) said that the "ideal subsistence economy in early Aotearoa was essentially one based on kūmara horticulture supplemented by

fishing, hunting and plant gathering" (p.70). However, what was ideal was not always possible. Where the fertile land and warmer climates that supported kūmara crops were not attainable, hapū tended to have a less settled and more mobile life, relying on fishing and hunting for seal and birds (Poata-Smith, 2001; Walker, 2004). These different economic realities would also have resulted in differences in social organisation, though these differences are now hard to determine with two hundred years of purposeful suppression of Māori knowledge and history (Walker, 2004). All precolonial Māori economies were subsistence economies, producing only enough commodities necessary to meet the material, social, and cultural needs of their communities (Kawharu [Ngāti Whātua], 1977; Poata-Smith, 2001). These needs not *only* encompassed the basic physical requirements to food and shelter, but also what was needed to fulfil social and cultural obligations and roles, as well as the needs for self-expression, art, and leisure.

The diversity of the natural environment and the available resources in Aotearoa meant that these needs could not always be satisfied within the kāinga. There is a significant amount of archaeological and anthropological evidence that points to large, sustained trade relationships between hapū Māori (Poata-Smith, 2001). However, as Poata-Smith (2001) articulated at length, the existence of trade and barter does not presuppose a capitalist mode of production. From a historical materialist view, it is the social relations of production that determine the mode of production—who owns the forces of production and the labour-power of others and who must sell their labour-power; who controls the distribution of production and what is produced; and who reaps the benefits of production. Though some historians, like Ranginui Walker (2004), argued that Māori society was stratified by class difference—the rangatira class, tutua or commoner class, and taurekareka or slave class—a Marxist perspective refutes this (Poata-Smith, 2001; Rākete [Ngāpuhi & Te Rarawa], 2019). According to Poata-Smith (2001), "classes arise when the direct producers have been separated from the means of production" (p.74). It is the alienation of people from the ability to create, use, and sustain the things they need that creates separate classes. Despite the clear social hierarchies that existed in Māori society, before the imposition of te ao Pākehā Māori people were not alienated from what they produced, and the forces and fruits of production were not controlled by a distinct minority for their own benefit (Kawharu, 1977; Poata-Smith, 2001). The Māori subsistence economy meant there was no drive towards the accumulation of surplus food or objects that were not required for the fulfilment of material, social or cultural needs of the hapū. As stated earlier in this chapter, the necessity of everyone within a whānau or hapū to the continued survival of the whole meant that what was produced, was shared. This form of collective economic and social organisation with no class divisions, an early form of communism, stood in stark opposition to the requirements of the colonial project and the expansion of capitalism around the world.

Understanding the Conditions of Capitalist Britain 17th-19th Century

British capitalism has a whakapapa that is woven through the society that preceded it, feudalism. Though capitalist history is far too large a subject to be tackled in any great depth here, it is essential for the purpose of this research that we grapple with the history of British capitalism from the 17th century onwards, as it is the cruel hunger of this political economic system that required the colonisation of Aotearoa. Capitalism, in its many historical expressions, requires continual expansion (Marx, 1990). To continue expanding and increasing the wealth of capitalists, it needs access to both more forces of production (natural resources and the tools used to shape them and create new resources), and the human labour-power necessary to create something socially useful or desirable from these forces (Marx, 1990). By the late 17th century, the new capitalism had entered a struggle with the old feudalism. Aristocrats in England controlled large plots of land that were not accessible to capitalists. The aristocracy of England extracted surplus value in terms of rent and agricultural commodities that they consumed rather than exchanged, meaning they were not transformed into capital (Bedggood, 1978). Outside of what peasants needed to survive, the lords and ladies also extorted all the commodities they produced (whether that was crops, cattle, wheat, or woven fabric), which also kept peasants from exchanging any such commodities (Bedggood, 1978). Simultaneously, it also meant that peasants both did not need to buy much, as they had access to the means of their subsistence on the land and resources they worked, and that they had little to no commodities or money to exchange for other commodities. Essentially, the peasantry as a purchaser of commodities, their labour-power, and all that they produced were almost entirely inaccessible to capitalism.

The enclosure of this land used by peasants (and tribespeople in the areas where feudalism had never fully taken hold, like much of Scotland) across Britain became crucial in transforming the economic system from feudalism to capitalism (Marx, 1990). The land that was used in common by the peasants for their survival, both the wood and waters where fuel or food was gathered as well as the land that was farmed, was enclosed either by purchase, law, or force, and became the private property of capitalists. This land was then used for large scale agriculture, was left as empty pasture or “sheep-runs”, or transformed into forests for the leisure of the wealthy (Marx, 1990). Though the land and resources it could produce was useful, even more useful was the expropriation of people from that land and their direct means of survival. Millions of acres of land were expropriated and masses of people were proletarianised from the 17th through 19th centuries through a process called primitive accumulation (Marx, 1990). These people who could once feed, clothe, and shelter themselves independently no longer had access to *any* of the forces of production, and thus had no access to the means of their survival from working the land (Marx, 1990). Charity had not yet become normalised, and vagrancy and pauperism were treated extremely harshly—

in some periods slavery or execution was a legal response to unemployment in England (Marx, 1990). This new working class was forced to sell their labour to capitalists and purchase most of what they needed, making them fully dependent on the capitalist system.

The explosive growth of capitalism in the early years of the industrial revolution, fuelled by centuries of expropriation and exploitation and a glut of wealth from imperial plunder and slavery in the colonies, had reached a critical juncture in the century preceding the signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Bedggood, 1978; Poata-Smith, 2001). At this period of British history, capitalist interests had won the battle over the landed aristocracy to capture most state power through Parliament. However, the protracted struggle between these two classes "resulted in a period of economic stagnation and social and political crisis" (Poata-Smith, 2001, p.61). By the late 18th century, most working class people were forced to live in the major industrial centres. The living conditions in these centres were incredibly poor for most working class people, who lived in dirty, unsafe, and overcrowded conditions (Poata-Smith, 2001). Competition for work was very high, and many people were unemployed with no way to support themselves or their family. Unsurprisingly, working class rebellion against the miserable conditions they were subjected to rocked all Western Europe at this time (Morgan, 2011; Poata-Smith, 2001). In Britain, the state solution to the widespread civil unrest of poor and working class people was manifold. First, the Poor Law system that began in the 1500s was reformed and centralised in the *Poor Law Amendment Act 1834* (UK), with the aim of stopping both charitable and capitalist interference in the free market and the "natural" laws of supply and demand (Morgan, 2011; Poata-Smith, 2001). Under the *Poor Law Amendment Act 1834* (UK), able-bodied unemployed people were forced to enter workhouses to receive any relief, with the intention being to keep conditions in these workhouses so horrible that people would rather go without (Morgan, 2011). The second part of this solution was the settlement of existing and new British colonies, essentially exporting the people that were surplus to the needs of capitalism in the hopes the social unrest would follow (Poata-Smith, 2001).

Prior to the 1830s, the official colonial enterprises of the Crown had been mostly focused on extracting resources—natural as well as human through slavery and pauperism—rather than the settlement of British citizens. These earlier British colonial projects had been hugely expensive, and therefore the state had been encouraging colonisation through free agents like missionaries, traders, and explorers who did not require state support (Orange, 1987). The volatile social conditions and the promise of new resources and markets meant that many capitalists sponsored colonisation schemes to fund the migration of working class people to both Aotearoa and elsewhere (Bedggood, 1980; Marx, 1990; Poata-Smith, 2001). For the future colonisation of Aotearoa, one of the most prominent idealogues behind the

concept of systematic colonisation was Edward Gibbon Wakefield, whose ideas were the basis for the New Zealand Company (Burns, 1989).

The core of Wakefield's idea for colonisation was to monopolise the sale of Indigenous land, buy very large tracts for very little money, and then sell individual lots at high prices to the wealthy of Britain (Burns, 1989; Marx, 1990). Selling the land at a high price would force working-class settlers to enter the same social relations of production in the colonies as in Britain (Marx, 1990). Wakefield and the other wealthy aristocrats and capitalists of the New Zealand Company were certain that the colonies could not flourish if the private ownership of land was widely accessible for settlers (or Indigenous peoples as potential proletarians). Their fear was that any workers would simply leave and create their own means of subsistence from the land and resources themselves, as had happened in other colonies (Marx, 1990). In a searing excoriation of Wakefield and his ideas, Marx (1990) explained the violent capitalist logic of the New Zealand Company and other capitalists who were not affiliated with the Crown. He said:

> We have seen that the expropriation of the mass of the people from the soil forms the basis of the capitalist mode of production. The essence of a free colony, on the contrary, consists in this, that the bulk of the soil is still public property, and every settler on it can therefore turn part of it into his private property and his individual means of production, without preventing later settlers from performing the same operation. This is the secret both of the prosperity of the colonies and their cancerous affliction—their resistance to the establishment of capital. (Marx, 1990, p.934)

Though the signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the Crown annexation of this whenua meant that the Company did not gain control of the sale of most of this land, their idea of systematic colonisation was influential in shaping the settlement of New Zealand (Burns, 1989).

The Coming of the Pākehā

> … Capital comes dripping from head to toe, from every pore, with blood and dirt. (Marx, 1990, p.926)

Since the first sighting of Te Waipounamu by Abel Tasman and the colonisers of the Dutch East Indies Company in 1642, the struggle between the gluttonous expansion of capitalism and imperialism on the one hand, and the Māori right to safety and self determination on the other, has been bloody (Ngata [Ngāti Porou], 2019; Walker, 2004). Abel Tasman, like Englishman James Cook more than a century later, was sent on state funded missions to find a theorised great southern continent ripe for capitalist plunder (Ngata, 2019). In the era of Abel Tasman, Holland had won the struggle against Spain and Portugal to become the great European imperial power, doing so through brutal dispossession of land and resources, exploitation, and slavery, much like its predecessors (Marx, 1990). By the time the Cook expedition reached these islands in 1769, the same was

true of Britain, which had in turn wrestled with Holland to become the ascendent global force. Indeed, the brutality and violence subjected on the lands they colonised and robbed was a point of pride, with each European power bragging “cynically of every infamy that served them as a means to the accumulation of capital” (Marx, 1990, p.924). A reformist and white supremacist history would like to paint these men and their crews as neutral explorers, scientists, and adventurers (Ngata, 2019), but even a brief examination of the economic base of their societies at this time illustrates this is simply not plausible (Marx, 1990).

Following Cook’s circumnavigation of this whenua and his recording of the richness of natural resources, small groups of Europeans began arriving primarily to hunt whales and seals and to harvest flax and timber (Walker, 2004). Though initially Māori would have bartered to trade with early visitors and settlers who were reliant on Māori hospitality and trade for their survival, it did not take long before money became a normal part of these trade relationships (Walker, 2004). Indeed, many hapū considered access to European trade and society so beneficial that they would cement an alliance with European ship captains and shore station managers to a hapū through marriage with a wahine of senior whakapapa, a common Māori tradition for sealing a political relationship (Walker, 2004). Some hapū sold or gifted small areas of coastal land for Europeans to use as a base for whaling or sealing operations. In these earliest days, these arrangements were mutually beneficial, and were not yet fundamentally shifting Māori political economic and social systems. The commodities used to trade with these Europeans, such as flax, fish, or kumara; and later pigs, corn, wheat, and potatoes, were still being produced within the hapū and the exchanged money or other commodities they received in return were still being used collectively by the hapū (Walker, 2004). Though some individual Māori sold their labour on sealing and whaling ships, this was not a necessity for survival, as Māori remained in control of the overwhelming majority of land and resources.

In time, the influx of new commodities like iron tools and guns created fierce technological competition between different hapū and iwi that would later have huge ramifications on Māori warfare (Walker, 2004). It also meant that more and more hapū needed access to European commodities, either to survive invasion from rival hapū, or because the scope of what was considered necessary and desirable had widened. Along with the influx of European commodities came the influx of European diseases, for which Māori had no immunity. The impact of mate Pākehā had immediate consequences, with influenza epidemics ripping through Ngāti Whātua in both 1790 and 1810, and with many other hapū experiencing debilitating illness and infertility through sexually transmitted infections (Walker, 2004). Though not necessarily here for the express purpose of stripping Māori of land and resources, and even with the mutually beneficial and generally harmonious relationships with hapū, these “whalers, sealers and traders were the advance

guard of colonisation" (Walker, 2004, p.79). Following closely behind these enterprising capitalists and their crews were the Christian missionaries, and with them, their connection to the Crown.

In this chapter I have provided an overview of the formation of the modern child care and protection system, a system that is hopelessly tangled up with contradictions and problems. I have also examined the basic structure of precolonial whānau and hapū groups and their social and political economic formations, and the preconditions for the eventual colonisation of Aotearoa. As I will soon demonstrate, it was the communist nature of Māori social and economic organisation that was most abhorrent to missionaries, capitalists, and the Crown, and which was the primary target for their brutal intervention. In this chapter, I have woven together a foundation that helps us understand the general social, historic, and political economic background that we must have as we turn now to the arrival of the missionaries, Ihu Karaiti, and the idea of the civilised nuclear family on these islands. In the next three chapters, I will explore the earliest whakapapa of child protection and its function in settler-colonial capitalism in Aotearoa through its different expressions in the missionary era, in the Native and Māori church boarding schools, and in the early child welfare system.

5. The Early Missionary Period 1805-1867

Ko te Taenga Mai o te Mihingare

The arrival and proliferation of missionaries across these islands had a huge shaping influence on the colonisation of Aotearoa and assimilation of Māori (May, 2005; Simon & Smith, 2001). From their earliest days in Aotearoa, the Anglican, Methodist, and Catholic missionaries were fixated on the drive to protect Māori from the wicked influence of sealers, whalers, and traders, and to "save" and "civilise" whānau Māori through religion and education (Jenkins, 1986; Jenkins & Matthews, 1995; May et al., 2014; Mikaere, 2017; Simon & Smith, 2001; Smith, 2012). In turn, Māori had a burning desire to learn about the world outside of the Pacific, different technologies, and the skills of reading and writing (Jones & Jenkins, 2011; Simon & Smith, 2001). By the time of the first meeting between the rangatira Te Pahi of Ngāpuhi and the missionary Reverend Samuel Marsden in 1805, the various denominational missionary efforts had already been underway for hundreds of years in other colonies across Africa, Asia, and the Pacific (May et al., 2014). Many of these relationships between cultures were not at all peaceful, nor were they always welcome, and encounters between missionaries and Indigenous peoples were often "fraught with fear and all manner of resistance" (May et al., 2014, p.36). Far from being naïve and submissive recipients of evangelising and assimilation, Indigenous peoples were aware that the missionaries brought with them a desire to transform not only their spiritual beliefs but their entire way of life in the image of Europe (Coulthard, 2014; May et al., 2014). This was certainly true among Māori of the missionary period, who wanted to expand their knowledge and experiences, but fought to do so while maintaining their rangatiratanga (Jones & Jenkins, 2011; May et al., 2014; Simon & Smith, 2001).

This chapter will focus on understanding the ideological and political economic intentions behind the removal of Māori children from their whānau and hapū during the early missionary period in Aotearoa. This period spans from the landing of Te Pahi in New South Wales in 1805, until the passing of the *Native Schools Act 1867*. Before 1867, the Crown had a mostly supportive role in the assimilation of Māori through childcare and education, and had their interests represented through the Church of England Church Missionary Society (CMS), and to a lesser degree the Wesleyan Missionary Society (WMS). This was a time of unprecedented change across Aotearoa, with the signing of He Whakaputanga o te Rangatiratanga o Nu Tirene; the signing of both Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the Treaty of Waitangi; the annexation of Te Waipounamu; systematic colonisation; mass land confiscation; and several brutal battles and wars among hapū and iwi, between settlers and iwi, and between iwi and the Crown. The creeping influence of missionaries and their schools was a constant backdrop to the tumultuous change of this era.

Three aspects of the missionary era will be explored in this chapter: the influence and interests of Samuel Marsden in the early 1800s, the spread of the mission boarding schools in the Bay of Islands in the 1820s-1840s, and John Morgan's Ōtawhao mission in the mid-19th century. The activities of Samuel Marsden and John Morgan provide us with useful demonstrations of the complex interests of influential missionaries at both the beginning and end of this period. Examining the work of these men also give us some clear insight into how these supposedly autonomous CMS agents tried to influence the colonisation and political economic transformation of Māori through proletarianisation. The exploration of the Northern mission schools in the interim years will contain a broader look at the mission school system, and the role they served in attempting to assimilate Māori to a colonial British ideal.

Te Mātene

Reverend Samuel Marsden was one of the first missionaries to come to these islands, and was certainly one of the most instrumental in our colonisation (May et al., 2014). A towering figure in New Zealand history, he is generally regarded positively by Pākehā as the man who introduced Christianity and literacy to Aotearoa and as a friend of Māori people (Davidson, 2004). An evangelical Protestant, Marsden was an early member of the CMS. Marsden was stationed in New South Wales from 1794-1838, first as the second chaplain to the Reverend Richard Johnson, before becoming the senior chaplain for the colony in 1800 (Lake, 2010). History shows him as a man who could be both incredibly critical of British imperialism and the unerring hunger of capitalist expansion, while also benefiting greatly himself from his own large landholdings in Parramatta and his brutal exploitation of Indigenous Australians and British convict labour (Lake, 2010). Marsden amassed more than 11,000 acres of land and thousands of sheep and cattle at his farm in Parramatta (Lake, 2010), which was deemed unusual and unseemly for a preacher by other chaplains, missionaries, and religious types in both New South Wales and Britain (Davidson, 2004; Jones & Jenkins, 2015).

Lake (2010) argued that Marsden's religious beliefs were inseparable from the idea of wordly agricultural industriousness and his drive for accumulating resources and wealth. Further, Lake (2010) suggested that he considered the "prosperity of his labours was a sign of divine vindication" (p.57.8) of the righteousness of his actions. This materially and spiritually encouraged his missionary zeal in both the colony of New South Wales, as well as Pēowhairangi, the Bay of Islands here in Aotearoa. Marsden's firm belief in the Protestant idea of one's wordly place in life and their hard work manifesting God's divine favour was also reflected in his perspectives on Indigenous peoples (Lake, 2010). Like many Crown functionaries, missionaries and settlers in the New South Wales colony, Marsden took moral offence at the different economic and social organisation of Indigenous peoples in Australia. According to Lake (2010), the many Indigenous nations of Australia had no outwardly clear

distinction between work and leisure, and, like Māori, no economic necessity to produce more than they needed. Their resistance to colonisation and the civilising influences of structured work was considered by Marsden a display of pervasive idleness and indolence. For Marsden, “diligent work was a yardstick against which he measured the civilisation of indigenes” (Lake, 2010 p.57.13).

Marsden decided that Indigenous peoples of Australia did not use their whenua and resources in the way he deemed fit, and suggested to the CMS that a large tract of land they wanted to put aside for missionaries and Indigenous people should be used instead for agricultural endeavours. He claimed that Indigenous Australians did not think of or plan for their future wellbeing and so the land was better used to sustain missionaries and settlers (Lake, 2010). Indigenous people *did* use and work their whenua, and many peoples had agriculture, mariculture, and sedentary communities, despite the colonial myths spun by people with a vested interest in their disposession (Pascoe [Koori], 2018; Lake, 2010). Though they were not ploughing the earth or grazing cattle, Indigenous people were using ecological knowledge passed down through hundreds of generations to manage their environment (Hallam, 2002). Pascoe (2018) went further, synthesising historical sources and contemporary Indigenous research to prove that many Aboriginal groups farmed tubers, grains, fish, shellfish, and more; planned seasonal harvesting and storing over winter; and built huge structures in large and complex sedentary communities with hundreds or thousands of people. More, he showed that the colonial farming practices that Marsden held so dearly were responsible for the destruction of carefully managed environment that Indigenous Australians had developed over tens of thousands of years.

Like all missionaries, Marsden’s “engagement with Aboriginal peoples was shaped and reshaped by shifting notions of race” (Lake, 2010, p.57.3). Certainly it was also influenced by his position as a settler living on Indigenous land and surrounded by Indigenous peoples who did not neatly conform to the colonial project, nor the Christian evangelising that came with it. It is well known that Marsden’s relationship with and views of Māori were significantly different to his opinions of Indigenous Australians (Lake, 2010). In New Zealand, Marsden is largely respected in Pākehā history as someone who thought highly of Māori and who aided Māori aspirations for international trade and wealth (Davidson, 2004). His Christmas Day sermon at Rangihoua in 1814, the first on these islands, is regarded as an historic moment in the narrative of the New Zealand settler-colony. As Marsden turned away from the idea of converting and assimilating Indigenous Australian people through mission schools and agricultural training, he turned towards Māori (Lake, 2010).

Education scholars Alison Jones and Kuni Kaa Jenkins (2011; 2015) have written extensively about the first relationships between Marsden and the Ngāpuhi travellers that

came to New South Wales. In the summer of 1805-1806, Marsden met Te Pahi, a powerful and enterprising Ngāpuhi rangatira from Te Puna (Jones & Jenkins, 2011). Te Pahi had many years of prior contact with English and other Europeans, and had initially come with members of his hapū to New South Wales to visit Phillip Gidley King, the then Governor of the colony. King had earlier been Governor of Norfolk Island and had a reputation for friendship and generosity toward Māori—despite his first meeting with Māori being predicated on the kidnapping of two men from near Matauri in 1793 (Jones & Jenkins, 2011). Te Pahi and his hapū companions travelled to see the colonial farms at Parramatta, and it was Te Pahi's keen interest in Marsden's agricultural and religious knowledge that "seemed to trigger in Marsden what was to become a lifelong passion: engagement with Māori" (Jones & Jenkins, 2011, p.52). Given Marsden's opinions of Indigenous Australians and their lack of interest in Western agriculture and their resistance to Christianity, this "passion" was clearly sparked by more than an appreciation of intelligence and curiosity. The rangatira Te Pahi was receptive to the idea of Marsden sending Pākehā settlers to his rohe, though Jones and Jenkins (2011) note that this was more in line with his quest to gain political influence than any real desire for an Anglican mission. Though a mission at Te Puna did not eventuate, Marsden was eventually successful in creating the first Christian settlement in Pēowhairangi.

The First Mission Schools for Māori

Nearly a decade later, and following a handful of return trips between New South Wales and the Pēowhairangi, the first religious boarding school for Māori was started on Marsden's land in Parramatta in 1815 (Jones & Jenkins, 2011). During this time Marsden had developed deeper relationships with other rangatira and hapū from the Bay of Islands, including the rangatira Ruatara and Hongi Hika (both of Ngāpuhi). Many Māori travelled to stay with Marsden, who they called Te Mātene, and his family at their homestead. Jones and Jenkins (2011) state that these young Ngāpuhi travellers were keen to learn both agricultural techniques and reading and writing from Marsden, however, they were less interested in his attempts at religious conversion. These authors noted that though Marsden called it a seminary, these rangatahi likely did not receive much in the way of religious education as they were too old to be easily swayed from their cultural beliefs. Instead, Marsden taught them the "management of horses, sheep and cattle, blacksmithing, nail-making, brick-making, cloth-making and flax manufacture, as well as many forms of European agriculture including wine-making and fruit-growing" (Jones & Jenkins, 2011, p.57). In a tradition that would continue throughout both the missionary and Native schools periods, some of these rangatahi also lived with Marsden and his family and worked as servants in his home (Jones & Jenkins, 2011). Though they did not know it, these travellers and learners would later be

thought of as collateral for the safety of the settlers at the future mission in Rangihoua (Jones & Jenkins, 2011).

Upon seeing the impact of literacy and new knowledge among the many Māori that travelled to New South Wales, Ruatara tried desperately to convince his hapū that building a mission at Rangihoua would be beneficial for the technological advancement and success of their people (Jones & Jenkins, 2011). Jones and Jenkins (2011) note that Ruatara was not totally confident in his decision to secure these missionary settlers for Rangihoua after learning more about the situation of Indigenous people in New South Wales. At the same time, Marsden had been securing support from the CMS to establish the first Anglican mission in Aotearoa (Jones & Jenkins, 2011). The missionary spent a great deal of time and energy in trying to draw good Christian families and the Crown to Aotearoa, and in attempting to convert Māori to both Christianity and capitalism (Jones & Jenkins, 2011; Lake, 2010). John Liddiard Nicholas (1817), the owner of a London iron foundry and would-be capitalist in the New South Wales colony, said of his friend Marsden's relationship with Māori:

> … [H]e rightly considered that moral lectures and abstruse religious discourses, however proper at a subsequent period, when the mind became susceptible of their importance, could do but little at first towards reclaiming a people so immersed in ignorance: therefore he resolved on a better plan, and paved the way for introducing the mechanic arts, by creating artificial wants to which they had never before been accustomed, and which he knew must act as the strongest excitement to the exercise of their ingenuity. (p.16-17)

With the founding of the CMS mission at Rangihoua in 1815 came a few missionary settlers with varied skills like carpentry and agriculture, picked by Marsden so that they would provide examples of Pākehā civilization to Māori (Jones & Jenkins, 2011; May et al., 2014).

Among these settlers was Thomas Kendall, a missionary and the first colonial official of Aotearoa. Kendall had been empowered as a magistrate by Governor Macquarrie of New South Wales to have power over which British ships and sailors could land in any place in Aotearoa (CMS, 1853). Kendall was coming to Aotearoa to be the first Pākehā teacher, however, he was encouraged by Macquarrie and Marsden to also assess the natural environment and resources for the colony (CMS, 1853). The mission day school at Oihi opened in 1816, and though Kendall certainly had a fondness for Māori that was uncommon among the early missionaries, the school would prove to be short-lived (May et al., 2014). The near total reliance of the missionary settlers at Rangihoua on the mana whenua meant that they were soon in a position of bartering much-coveted muskets in return for the food and resources needed for their survival, which was frowned upon by the CMS (Jones & Jenkins, 2015; May et al., 2014). At the same time, the huge increase in European and

American ships arriving in the Bay of Islands meant a booming trade for Ngāpuhi, who sold their extra food instead of sending it to the schoolhouse (May et al., 2014). Finally, there was also a significant cultural clash between the missionary settlers and the mana whenua that strained relations in the settlement (Jones & Jenkins, 2015). Kendall was eventually fired from his post at Rangihoua—his offences including providing muskets for Hongi Hika, an affair with a wahine Māori named Tungaroa who was his pupil and servant, and his sympathetic view of Māori culture and spirituality (Binney, 2005; Davidson, 2004).

Analysing Marsden's Role in Settler-Colonial Capitalism

The entanglement of the interests of the CMS and their agents, the British Empire, and traders and capitalists of all kinds are difficult to draw apart. Samuel Marsden was the first missionary to meet Māori—both a man of god and a man rich from colonial exploitation in Australia, a man with apparent affection and respect for Māori but whose primary drive was to incorporate Māori into the British economic and cultural sphere. Marsden's interests were clearly not only a singular desire to save Māori souls through conversion to Christianity, as he was so clearly focused on his desire to bring Māori people and Māori resources into the realm of the British Empire. At the time of Marsden, Kendall, and the Rangihoua mission, the Crown was still loath to sponsor official colonial exploits (Orange, 1987; Poata-Smith, 2001), and these CMS missionaries were useful agents of an expanding empire. Marsden's differing attitudes towards Indigenous Australians and Māori based on how they embraced Western technology and trade illustrated his instrumental approach to Indigenous people. Though Marsden was certainly friendly with individual Māori people, and appeared to have a patriarchal fondness for Māori in general, this clearly would not have been the case if Māori did not willingly engage with what he saw as the path for our growth into what he considered a civilised race. At the same time, the Ngāpuhi communities that welcomed the CMS entered these relationships as people wanting to secure their success and rangatiratanga in a rapidly changing time, when the influx of global interest in the plentiful resources of Pēowhairangi could not be easily stopped.

From a scientific Marxist perspective, however, the relationships must be analysed at the crux of class, race, and domination, and not through the idea of agency and choice. Though Marsden, like some other later missionaries, did not appear to be directly interested in displacing Māori from their whenua, he had witnessed and indeed encouraged this against Indigenous Australians in New South Wales (Lake, 2010). The Reverend had himself built wealth and economic power from thousands of acres of stolen Indigenous land at Paramatta (Lake, 2010), and supported the Governor of New South Wales in his bid to convince Indigenous Australian people to give their children up into the care of the colony under the guise of civilisation (Jones & Jenkins, 2011). In later years, Marsden (1837) would call directly for the annexation of Aotearoa by the Crown as "there is no hope these evils will be

reduced until the Native inhabitants are placed under the protection of some civil government where relief can be afforded them" (p.1). Marsden had, at this point, seen what four decades of colonial "relief" could look like for Indigenous peoples, and had played a central role in the destructive and genocidal growth of the New South Wales colony (Lake, 2010). Though it is possible his affection for Māori meant he hoped for a different path for Aotearoa, his fervent support for the civilising of tangata whenua through social, cultural and political economic change aligned the missionary's interests with those of the British Empire. Without Marsden's relentless push for the assimilationist mission schools in Pēowhairangi, the introduction of settler-colonial capitalism in Aotearoa may have looked markedly different.

Early Mission Schools in Aotearoa

Following on from the opening of the first CMS mission at Rangihoua in 1815, further Anglican missions followed in the Bay of Islands at Kerikeri, Paihia, and Waimate by the mid-1830s (May et al., 2014). Not far behind the CMS were the first WMS mission at Kaeo and the French Marist (Catholic) mission at Kororāreka, which caused great concern among British missionaries and Crown officials (May et al., 2014). Five years after the first signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, around fifty missions across these denominations had sprung up around Te Ika a Māui and Te Waipounamu; from Te Hiku o te Ika to as far south as the Ōtākou region (May et al., 2014). Most of these missions included a day school for tamariki and rangatahi Māori, and many had either boarding arrangements or room for a few pupils to stay on as servants of the missionary families (May, 2005; May et al., 2014). The tradition of young Māori living with and serving missionary families started with Samuel Marsden at his Parramatta station (Jones & Jenkins, 2011), and continued through the early missionary period with Thomas Kendall at Oihi (Binney, 2005), Henry and Marianne Williams at Paihia, Kerikeri, and Waimate (May, 2005), William Yate at Waimate (Binney, 1975), James Watkin at Waikouaiti (Woodfield, 2016), and John and Mary Morgan in Ōtawhao (Morgan, 1853b). It is difficult to estimate how many young Māori lived with missionary families as boarders and servants, as this information has not been systematised and even in missionary accounts is often spoken of only in passing. Unfortunately, little written information remains about what these tūpuna would have seen or experienced living with and working for the missionary families.

Historian Helen May (2005; May et al., 2014) explained that schooling for Indigenous children was a great concern for the CMS, who saw education as the key to converting the heathen colonies. Infant schools for poor children had become popular in the UK in the 1820s as a way to mold them into upstanding British citizens and workers, and the Church of England was eager to replicate this across the empire (May et al., 2014). With the closure of the school at Oihi in 1818, the CMS opened two more missions in quick succession at

Kerikeri and Paihia. Reverend Henry Williams and his wife Marianne Williams were sent to Paihia to establish a more structured schooling system for Māori children in Pēowhairangi (May et al., 2014). While Henry ran the church and mission, and acted as a liason between Ngāpuhi, the CMS and the Pākehā population, Marianne ran the mission schools. Later joined by her sister-in-law Jane Williams, the missionary wives' focus was just as much on instilling Christian norms and values as it was on teaching reading and writing. The women tried to separate boys and girls as much as possible, and their schooling for girls at the Paihia mission was particularly focused on obedience, rather than learning (Fitzgerald, 2003; May et al., 2014). The Williams family saw Māori girls and women as more debased in comparison to men and boys, and were thus a focus for their civilising efforts (Fitzgerald, 2003). This reflected the general missionary thought at the time, which constructed women as both "the problem but also the conduit for a conversion strategy" (May et al., 2014, p.188). This settler-colonial focus on Māori girls and women is examined in more depth in chapter six.

The CMS continued to expand across the North, with the opening of the Waimate mission in 1830 (May et al., 2014). Te Waimate was opened for the explicit purpose of being a model Pākehā Christian village, and was the picture of contemporary English life at the time, having a blacksmith, a mill, a printery, and even white picket fences in addition to a church and school (May et al., 2014). The Waimate school focused on children under ten with some students as young as 18 months, as the missionaries were more hopeful for their successful conversion. Older boys would leave with their fathers, brothers, and uncles to fight in battles for ahi kā, and all older children were likely to accompany their whānau or hapū on long journeys or for fishing, planting or harvesting (May et al., 2014). To this end, an infant boarding school was decided on as the best chance at transforming Māori society in the shape of Britain. May et al. (2014) explain:

> While the broad focus was on saving, taming, and eventually converting "heathen" peoples, the infant school timetable and its implied curriculum was, in common with British infant schools and the earlier charity and monitorial schools, about shaping the behaviour and demeanour of young children alongside the necessary acquisition of the three Rs as a foundation for worthy employment in a few years time. (p.215)

The boarding school at Waimate had a punishing timetable for these tamariki from 6am to 8pm, with their day split into half hour blocks where they had to learn much more than the "three Rs" of reading, writing, and arithmetic. The children could not leave the missionaries' supervision, and every hour of their day was planned (May et al., 2014).

The colonial missionaries had firm ideas about Māori caregiving and parenting (Barrington, 2008; Jenkins & Philip-Barbara, 2002; May, 2005; May et al., 2014; Mikaere, 2017; Pere, 1982; Pihama et al., 2003; Simon & Smith, 2001). Many considered it indulgent

in the extreme, and found the more equal relationships between adults and children, as well as the inclusion of children in every part of community life, to be bizarre (Pihama et al., 2003; May, 2005; May et al., 2014; Simon & Smith, 2001). The missionary William Yate (1835), who was stationed at the Waimate mission for several years before being fired under controversy surrounding his sexuality and sexual liasons with male pupils at the Waimate school, said:

> Formerly a parent would never correct a child for anything it might do; it was allowed to run riot in all that was vile, and to have its own way in everything. The evil of this was palpable. In New Zealand, as in every other country, a spoiled child is a great plague; but if the pest was in any one place more severely felt than in another, it was here. (Yate, 1835, p.95-96)

Like his contemporaries, Yate believed that the infant boarding schools were necessary to correct what the missionaries viewed as precocious and unruly behaviour of Māori children (May et al., 2014).

The mission day schools had limited success, and though Māori were embracing literacy with zeal, only limited numbers were converting to Christianity or changing their way of life (May, 2005; May et al., 2014). The CMS missionaries of this era maintained that the influence of whānau had to be mitigated. Reverend Joseph Matthews (1834), one of the founders of the mission at Kaitaia and teacher at their infant school, had an even more explicit opinion of the tamariki Māori who came into his care. In a letter to the CMS titled *Beneficial Tendency of the Infant-School System in counteracting Native Ferocity*, Matthews (1834) wrote:

> The children of the Natives run about naked, and are dirty and filthy, both in person and conversation. They go astray (most emphatically so), speaking lies, as soon as they are born. I said, that a savage learns to be savage when a child. (p.511-512)

Like Yate (1835) and the Williams family (May et al., 2014), Matthews believed that Māori children had to be removed from their whānau and communities and totally subsumed by Christian Pākehā life to become civilised.

For whānau and hapū Māori, there was “enthusiasm and bemusement as well as indifference, fear, anger, and disillusionment regarding the strange ways missionaries reared young children” (May et al., 2014, p.186). Māori were embracing reading, writing, and other new and useful technologies. Much like the initial vision of Ruatara when he invited Marsden and the CMS to join his hapū at Rangihoua, many Māori viewed missionary education as a key to accessing new knowledge and maintaining their rangatiratanga in a rapidly changing Aotearoa (May, 2005; Simon & Smith, 2001). However, Māori were not naïve about the connections that existed between missionaries, the Crown, and the Pākehā drive to own land and the interests that lay behind educating their tamariki (May, 2005; Simon & Smith,

2001). Before 1840 and the signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, missionaries had a level of autonomy from the Crown, though some deeply believed that the British annexation of Aotearoa was necessary (May et al., 2014).

The CMS missionary William Yate wrote to King William IV requesting official Crown involvement to protect Aotearoa from possible French annexation, which resulted in the arrival of James Busby, the first British Resident and an official liaison between Aotearoa and the Crown (May et al., 2014). Fearing French encroachment on British designs over Aotearoa, Henry Williams was supportive of He Whakapūtanga, the declaration of tino rangatiratanga signed by several rangatira from Ngāpuhi and elsewhere in Te Ika a Māui (May et al., 2014). Ironically, it was also Williams, along with his son Edward, who were responsible for the writing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi which differed so greatly from the English text in its promise of absolute sovereignty of tangata whenua (May et al., 2014). Williams and other Anglican and Wesleyan missionaries were also critical in securing Ngāpuhi support for Te Tiriti o Waitangi, which many Ngāpuhi would later come to resent as a ploy to expropriate their land (May et al., 2014). Regarding land, missionaries themselves had been involved in purchasing huge plots of land in the North. Samuel Marsden purchased 13,000 acres of land for the Kerikeri mission farm, and by 1840 Pākehā settlers, primarily missionaries, had bought another 14,000 acres at Waimate (May et al., 2014). After the first signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi on February 6 1840, the interests of missionaries and the Crown truly converged (May et al., 2014).

In the years immediately following the signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, relationships between many Ngāpuhi hapū and the missionaries based in the North soured (May et al., 2014). Many Ngāpuhi hapū had serious grievances with the Crown's annexation of their whenua which was at odds with what was promised by Te Tiriti o Waitangi; with Pākehā greed for land; and with the influx of colonists to the North that threatened Ngāpuhi rangatiratanga (May et al., 2014; Walker, 2004). Many Ngāpuhi hapū drew the connections between the Crown and the missionaries support of colonisation and the growing punitive treatment of Māori. In retaliation, many withdrew their tamariki and their support from the missionary schools (May et al., 2014). With the backdrop of rising discontent at British encroachment on their sovereignty through land and the use of Crown law on Māori across Aotearoa, the Governor of the colony Robert FitzRoy and his executive and legislative council passed the *Native Trust Ordinance 1844* (the Ordinance). The Ordinance was a departure from the espoused independence of missionary education for Māori in Aotearoa, as it guaranteed Crown financial and political support for missionary schools (May, 2005). It also declared in law that management of the lands either gifted or taken for missionary education was to be entrusted to Crown officials and the Lord Bishop of New Zealand (the Ordinance, 1844).

The Ordinance also made absolutely clear the Crown's intention behind supporting missionary schools:

> … [W]hereas great disasters have fallen upon uncivilized 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 practicable 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* (emphasis added). (p. 140)

Without Crown financial support, the failing missionary schools would likely not have been able to survive, as their reliance on hapū for trade, labour on their farms, and pupils dwindled. Without missionary schools, the Crown goal of assimilating Māori as "speedily as possible" may have had a different course. This official accord between the missionary and Crown endeavours was the start of the concentrated effort to transform Māori society and economy through ideological means.

John Morgan and the Ōtawhao Mission School

Examining the work and words of Reverend John Morgan, teacher, aspiring agricultural magnate, spy for the Crown, and Anglican missionary with the CMS, illustrates the tensions and interests that characterise the latter years of the missionary period in Aotearoa. John Morgan arrived in Aotearoa in 1833, and was a founder of several missions across Waiariki and Waikato (Pilditch, 2010). His longest post, and the period I will mostly be analysing, is his time at the Ōtawhao mission, in what is now Te Awamutu, between 1841-1864 (Pilditch, 2010). The people who whakapapa to the Te Awamutu and Waipā area include Waikato-Tainui, Ngāti Raukawa, Ngāti Koroki/Kahukura, Ngāti Maniapoto, Ngāti Apakura, Ngāti Haua, Ngāti Hikairo, and Ngāti Mahanga. It is their tūpuna that were the focus of John Morgan's interest, and also one of the main foci of the Crown during the New Zealand Wars of the 1860s (O'Malley, 2019). The Waikato area is known as a particularly rich and productive whenua, and today 53% of it is used for pastoral farming (Waikato Regional Council, 2019), and it is also home to 33% of New Zealand's total dairy cattle herd (Dairy NZ, 2018). The rohe of the many iwi that hail from the Tainui confederation is considered a valuable resource in modern times, just as it was in the past.

Before the explosion of dairy farming and widespread Pākehā settlement, this rohe was hugely coveted by both the Crown and would-be Pākehā farmers, and rebellion against Crown encroachment on this whenua was used as an excuse for both brutal punishment and huge land confiscations (O'Malley, 2019). Morgan had a significant role in the colonial military campaign in this rohe. He worked as an informant for the Crown, passing along information from settlers about the movement of Kīngitanga and allied iwi that were

determined to resist being expropriated from their tūrangawaewae (May, 2005). The settlement of Waikato today, with its massive farms and agricultural wealth, traces a direct line of descent from the Crown violence and raupatu of the 1860s (O'Malley, 2019). In the years before Morgan was pleading for the direct military support of the Crown to quell Māori rebellion in the area, his focus—like Marsden, Williams, and other missionaries before him—was on transforming Māori society and economy into a useful outpost of the British Empire (May, 2005). Morgan's unrelenting push for a boarding industrial school that would indoctrinate tamariki and rangatahi Māori into Pākehā capitalism was a tohu of what was to come. In the following section, I will critically examine the Reverend John Morgan's letters to the CMS and colonial officials to understand his thoughts on race and political economy as they relate to Māori.

Morgan on Race

John Morgan's ideas about race reflected the wider contemporary British ideas about Indigenous people in the colonies (May, 2005). A letter to a friend recounting his early years in Aotearoa demonstrated his deep distate for several Māori cultural, spiritual, and social practices, including haka, tā moko, waiata, and food and cooking (Morgan, 1846). His extremely exoticised and vulgar depictions of kaitangata following a large battle at Maketū in 1836 between several Te Arawa iwi on one side, and an alliance of several Waikato-Tainui iwi and Ngai Te Rangi on the other, were clearly meant to titillate and disgust the gentle Christian folk of Britain (Morgan, 1846). His recollections of ongoing warfare between Waikato and Te Arawa iwi during his trek from Maketū to the interior of the island in the 1830s, are peppered with odious descriptions of Māori people and culture, including of his servants and guides. In describing his hopes for the Anglican conversion of Māori in this letter, Morgan (1846) continued to call Māori "savages" and "cannibal New Zealanders". Interestingly, the sensationalised representations of Māori are mostly absent from his later letters to Government officials like Governor George Grey. This is true even when he was reporting on the movements of Waikato Māori moving against the Crown and begging for the intervention of the colonial military (Morgan, 1860). Though his language about Māori changed—perhaps a display of his political pragmatism—his underlying goals for civilising and proletarianising Māori did not. From his earliest days in Aotearoa through to his eventual expulsion from Ōtawhao in 1864, Morgan was determined to see the assimilation of Māori into the British Empire and colonial capitalism.

The creation of boarding schools for young Māori was central to Morgan's plan for transforming the social and economic worlds of Waikato Māori from the very beginning of his time at Ōtawhao (1846). The Reverend initially drew special attention to the apparently more civilised needs of Māori children with Pākehā whakapapa (1846), and this later turned into the idea for segregated boarding schools for tamariki and rangatahi Māori based on whether

they had Pākehā ancestry (1850). In April 1850, he wrote to Governor George Grey convinced that Māori and "half caste" Māori children could not be educated together. Here he argued that Māori children with Pākehā whakapapa needed an English style school separate from other Māori as it might "retard the half caste children in the acquisition of the English language, neither would a school on the mixed plan give satisfaction to the European parents in general" (Morgan, 1850, p.3-4). His grand plan revolved around a segregated boarding school for 100 Māori children, and several of his letters to Grey and other colonial administrators over the years updated them on the number of tamariki and rangatahi that were under his care (Morgan; 1851; 1853a; 1857).

Unsurprisingly, given his earlier characterisations of Māori (Morgan, 1846), Morgan argued that tamariki Māori with Pākehā whakapapa required more funding from the Crown, as "[w]e feel it is our duty to provide more comfortable accomodations, as well as better dietary for the half caste, than we should do for the Māori children" (Morgan, 1850, p.5). The segregation of education and boarding that Morgan planned at the Ōtawhao mission was indicative of his broader ideas about the role and position of Māori and Pākehā in the new colony (Morgan, 1850; 1853a; 1857). Morgan clearly considered tamariki Māori with Pākehā whakapapa as inherently closer in nature to a proper British colonial citizen, and therefore deserving of a higher standard of care and education. In contrast, Morgan was content to let tamariki Māori that did not have Pākehā ancestry subsist on a more meagre diet and standard of living. These ideas were of course not limited to Morgan, and some later Native schools continued the segregation of Māori children based on Pākehā whakapapa (Simon & Smith, 2001). Over time, the missionary became increasingly preoccupied with the idea of industrial schooling for Māori children and young people as the primary locus for economic and ideological change among Māori (Morgan, 1853a; 1857), as will soon become clear.

Morgan on Political Economy

Morgan was consumed with the desire to transform the local Māori economy. Along with his school updates to Grey and other Government figures in the 1840s-1860s, Morgan also provided a wealth of information about his observations of and efforts toward changing Māori production. Over his years at Ōtawhao, Morgan regularly commented on Māori farming, housing, and social relations across all of Waikato (Morgan, 1850; 1851; 1852; 1853a; 1853b; 1857; 1862). He was particularly interested in growing wheat and milling flour, and saw this as a central nexus of "advancing" Māori society. Morgan (1852) said to Lt. Governor Robert Henry Wynyard that he expected the wheat grown by Māori at Ōtawhao to:

> ... [S]upply the Auckland market with flour, and as civilisation advances there will no doubt be large supplies for expeditions to the neighbouring colonies... Civilisation will also tend materially to promote a friendly feeling on the part of the Maoris towards the English & thus secure the peace of the colony. (p.2)

This passage illustrates Morgan's desire for both the integration of Ōtawhao Māori into global capitalism and the wider empire, but also what he saw as the link between this economic integration and the wider goal of assimilating Māori. Paterson (2006) noted how critical Māori agricultural produce was at this time. Exports from Auckland to Britain and the colonies fell from £180,411 in 1854 to less than half that (£78,546) in 1861, when tensions between the Crown and Māori were rising rapidly in the Auckland and Waikato regions.

The missionary found collective Māori planting and harvesting patterns particularly vexatious. Māori adults would simply leave his farm to tend to their own seasonal gardens several times a year, and would usually take their children with them. Morgan (1851) complained to Grey that:

> For want of a division of labour amongst the Aborigines, at certain seasons every man is obliged to leave all other work to the planting of kumara, hue's, kiekie, and also in the autumn to the gathering in of these crops... (p.2)

Of course, Māori society *did* have divisions of labour amongst hapū members, as discussed in chapter four. However, it is clear that Morgan was not interested in any nuanced analysis of Māori social and economic relations as they already existed, and was focused instead on changing them. Though they were keen to learn reading, writing, and te reo me ngā ahuwhenua Pākehā, the mana whenua at Ōtawhao had no compunctions about leaving Morgan to attend to their own survival, as Morgan himself laments (1851). Morgan (1851) interpreted this as laziness, and proposed to Grey the need for a Pākehā overseer and a plantation-like system that would put Māori to work breaking earth for farmland as "Aboriginal tribes will seldom work themselves if they can get any person to do their work for them" (p.2).

From his earliest days at Ōtawhao, Morgan realised how difficult it would be to change Māori social and economic relations, and his vision for educating Māori included an eventual move towards a more industrial school system on the Ōtawhao mission (1846; 1853a, 1857). He decided that preparing tamariki and rangatahi for Pākehā labour would be a more fruitful endeavour in converting Māori economy and society. In recounting the early years of his missionary career with the CMS, Morgan (1846) outlined what he believed an industrial school for Māori at Ōtawhao would achieve:

> Nothing would more contribute to promote the civilisation and advancement of the natives than one or more such establishments and to forward their civilisation would be the surest way to improve the peace, the safety and the prosperity of the entire colony. The aborigines, seeing the inestimable blessings conferred upon them by the British Government, would soon find their property so increased that they would not—even if selfish natives alone influenced them—wish to stake them all to engage in a destructive and unprofitable war. They would find peace with the British

> Government indispensible to their own prosperity and feeling this they would "beat their swords into plough shares and their spears into pruning hooks". With such a state of affairs they would cheerfully submit, even in extreme cases, to the authority of the law and become dutiful and loyal subjects of our beloved Queen (1846, p.71)

Morgan's vision for peace and prosperity in the region was ultimately wrong, as the very rohe he then resided in became one of the most volatile regions during the New Zealand Wars of the 1860s (O'Malley, 2019). However, the rationale behind this idea was common of the time, and echoed the earlier designs of Marsden and other CMS missionaries. By drawing Māori into the capitalist system, by moulding them into civilised Christian workers, Morgan expected peaceful assimilation into the British Empire to follow.

Morgan initially planned five or six agricultural schools where young Māori boarders in his care would spend half of their time in school and half farming to help increase the "peace and prosperity of the colony" (Morgan, 1853a, p.3). For this, he decided the mission would need 1,000 acres of land, including two stretches of land that were wāhi tapu, where he expected that descendants would lift rāhui and remove the kōiwi so the whole block could be used (Morgan, 1853b). This was far beyond the 15-20 acres that was normally donated by hapū in exchange for a mission (or later, Native) school (Barrington, 2008). Even at that time it was considered an extremely valuable swathe of land in a productive region. Morgan and the CMS eventually amassed a huge 700 acres of land at the Ōtawhao mission, land that mana whenua later argued was never purchased fairly (Morgan, 1862). When Māori threatened to reclaim the whenua that they had been farming for the CMS if their sheep and cattle endeavours failed, and to drive missionaries and Pākehā settlers and workers away from the mission, Morgan pleaded with the Crown to intervene (Morgan, 1862).

Analysing Morgan's Role in Settler-Colonial Capitalism

Reverend John Morgan's preoccupation with Māori society went far beyond worry for religious salvation and education and extended into every domain of Māori life. Much like Marsden, Morgan was not under the direct control of the Crown, though he saw his work at Ōtawhao as deeply intertwined with the colonial project. This can be seen through his push for boarding industrial schools to create civilised British Māori (Morgan, 1846; 1850; 1853a; 1857), his involvement with Māori agricultural production (Morgan, 1851; 1852; 1853a; 1862), and his spying for the Crown and pleas for military intervention in Waikato (May, 2005; Morgan, 1860). The missionary was deeply concerned with Māori economy in particular, and a great deal of his thought, time, and money went into trying to instill both capitalist ideology and the social relations needed for capitalist production among Waikato Māori. Morgan's frustrations with traditional communal Māori agriculture and his triumphs at the expansion of Western farming and trade among Waikato Māori were likely not solely because he was invested in Māori agricultural success. Though it is certainly possible that

Morgan harboured benign or even affectionate feelings toward some Māori people and communities during his time as a missionary, the intention and impact of his actions are what should be analysed. In his letter to Governor George Grey where he complained of Māori leaving the mission to plant and harvest kūmara, hue, and kiekie, Morgan (1851) was setting out systematic complaints of Māori social relations of production and how he was planning to change them. These complaints were being made to the most senior representative of the Crown in New Zealand, and he was asking for the financial support of the Crown to implement these changes (Morgan, 1851). Over his years at Ōtawhao, Morgan regularly asked for Crown resources or intervention (1851; 1862), including from the military (1860).

Morgan clearly appreciated how difficult it was to change the Māori political economy. Despite being exposed to capitalism and the Pākehā world, and to Western agriculture and produce, Māori at Ōtawhao continued the farming needed to sustain their communities outside of the capitalist system. Waikato Māori had not yet been successfully removed from the means of their subsistence, nor had they been proletarianised as they held on to the balance of power in their rohe at this time. Their engagement with the market and with Pākehā was still largely on their own terms. This meant the paths open to Morgan to change Māori society in the Pākehā image were to either divorce Ōtawhao Māori from their whenua, or to ideologically shape them as much as possible into working class colonial citizens. Despite his growing collusion with the Crown over the two decades he lived in Waikato (May, 2005), Morgan did not have the political nor military power to force Māori from their land. What he did have available to him was the financial resources of the CMS and limited Crown support, a schoolhouse and hundreds of acres of fertile whenua, and a burning desire among Māori for learning about the world outside of Aotearoa.

In Morgan's letters addressing Māori schooling, he wistfully laid his plans for segregated boarding schools, where tamariki and rangatahi Māori would leave their whānau and hapū elsewhere in the Waikato region and live and learn on the CMS mission at Ōtawhao. The industrial education Morgan favoured for Māori at Ōtawhao would, the CMS and other missionaries at the time hoped, have both an ideological and economic impact on Māori society (May, 2005). In removing tamariki Māori from their whānau and communities, missionaries hoped to indoctrinate Māori into every facet of private and public Pākehā Christian life (May, 2005). While boarding, Māori children would be immersed in te ao Pākehā not only in the classroom, but at every point in the day. The laws and norms of Pākehā life, the rhythms of working, learning, living and relating to each other in a Pākehā way would become normal. The students at this school would then carry these norms and socio-cultural practices with them back to their communities and most importantly on to their own future tamariki and mokopuna. The maintenance of capitalism requires people to reproduce the social relations of production (Marx, 1990). This is done not only through

labour, but through the myriad other relationships and communities that shape our lives. When Pākehā could not simply force economic change on Māori, ideological change to smash the enduring collectivism of Māori social relations and replace it with individualism was crucial. Missionary boarding schools, like Morgan's CMS mission at Ōtawhao, Marsden's Parramatta seminary, and the infant boarding schools in the Bay of Islands, was one of the earliest ways that Pākehā attempted to do so.

The economic impact that Morgan hoped for at the industrial school was, of course, equally important. The incompatibility of Māori farming practices with the requirements of capitalist agriculture required a shift that could only be achieved through re-shaping the way Māori understood their connection to labour, money, and the environment. By removing young Māori people from their whānau and hapū and acculturating them to the requirements of capitalist Pākehā agriculture, Morgan aspired to produce future agricultural workers with the skills and mind-set that could fill the needs of settler-colonial capitalism. In most of his letters, Morgan did not appear to be particularly interested in dislocating Māori from their whenua, much like the other missionaries of this period. Instead, Morgan was more concerned with how Māori relationships with the land and environment impacted their assimilation into te ao Pākehā and producing commodities for the Pākehā market. He was not a land prospector or capitalist himself, though he was utterly absorbed with the quest for the proletarianisation of Māori and their conversion to Pākehā social and economic life.

Finally, the segregated schools the missionary was determined to create would reinforce colonial ideas of racial difference and the worldly place of different racial groups. As Morgan (1850) insisted in an earlier letter regarding segregated schools for tamariki Māori based on Pākehā whakapapa, he believed that children with a Pākehā parent deserved a higher standard of care and education. Implicit in this is that Māori children without Pākehā whakapapa deserved less. Though Morgan aspired to the assimilation of Māori into the Empire, he did not regard Māori and Pākehā as equal, and clearly believed in differential treatment for Māori based on whether they had Pākehā ancestry. In dividing tamariki by racial difference, and indeed by establishing a racial hierarchy between Māori children in his school, Morgan was injecting the idea that Māori were inferior to Pākehā into the everyday experiences of these children's lives. Tamariki and rangatahi that perhaps would have been cousins, whānau, or members of the same hapū, would be marked by their differences rather than their common ties to one another. This is not surprising when we consider Morgan's words about Māori when he was most frustrated or when Māori would not perform the tasks he wanted, characterising Māori as either cruel savages (1846) or intellectually dull and lazy compared to Pākeha (1850).

The CMS had initially been dubious about Morgan's call for imperial troops and the Colonial Defence Force to be stationed in Waikato to crush Māori struggles for survival and

rangatiratanga (Davidson, 2004). However, with the outbreak of open warfare between the Crown and the allied Kīngitanga and resistance Māori forces, the Church of England eventually supported his stance (Davidson, 2004). The Ōtawhao mission was taken over by the Crown in 1862, and by 1864 had become a base for the colonial forces (O'Malley, 2019). It was also the home of the reo Māori newspaper *Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke i runga i te Tuanui*, created by the Crown in 1863 as propaganda to combat the Kīngitanga paper *Te Hokioi o Niu Tireni e Rere atu na* which advocated for Māori sovereignty (Paterson, 2006). With his dreams for huge boarding schools to convert masses of tamariki and rangatahi Māori dashed, Morgan did everything in his power to support the colonial invasion and cruel war on Waikato Māori, drawing highly detailed maps of the area and arming the military with as much strategic information about local iwi as possible (Davidson, 2004; May, 2005). His final role before he died in 1865 was as a preacher for the colonial forces stationed in Waikato (Davidson, 2004).

The Broader Role of Māori Child Removal in the Early Missionary Period

The ideological and material subjugation of Indigenous people in the colonies was not only routine, but necessary for the maintenance of every imperialist power (Newsinger, 2013; Smith, 2012). Although slavery had technically been abolished in the UK two decades earlier, Britain remained a violent, racist, empire (May et al., 2014; Newsinger, 2013). In reality, slavery and indentured servitude continued in the British Empire, including across Te Moana Nui a Kiwa. The kidnapping and forced labour of hundreds of thousands of Melanesian peoples on plantations in Australia and Fiji, called "blackbirding", became popular during the years Morgan was at Ōtawhao (Horne, 2007). British colonialism looked different in different locations across the world at this time depending on the colonial interests (May et al., 2014). From the flooding of opium into China to quell rebellion, to the installation of a colonial puppet in the British Raj in India, to the numerous massacres of Indigenous Australians enshrined in law in the Australian colonies, the violence used against these peoples was different, but the overarching power relations were the same (Newsinger, 2013). These power relations of British domination and the exploitation of the mana whenua were reproduced through both official and unofficial means. The expulsion of mana whenua from their tūrangawaewae and the burning and pillaging of papakāinga during the New Zealand Wars, as well as the imposition of colonial sovereignty over people who had never ceded their rangatiratanga, were both mandated by the Crown. The cloistering away of Indigenous children from their whānau and communities at missionary boarding schools like those in the Pēowhairangi and Ōtawhao was not formally supported by the new colony, and yet this was critical for the success of colonisation.

The early missionary period of 1805-1867 was characterised by both the missionary and Crown attempts to drag Māori into the colonial world, and Māori determination to retain

their sovereignty and self-determination during a time of drastic change. Among the missionaries, there was a contradictory desire to bring the fruits of British civilisation to Māori while also maintaining a relationship of patriarchal control over the future of Māori social and economic development. For CMS missionaries like Marsden, Williams, Yate, Matthews, and Morgan, the development of the mission boarding schools was necessary for the related aims regarding the conversion of Māori to Christianity and the transformation of Māori social and economic worlds. The underlying justification for the missionary boarding schools was the peaceful assimilation of Māori into the New Zealand settler-colony, and this ethos carried through into both the Native and Māori church boarding schools that began in 1867, and in the later child welfare concerns of the New Zealand state.

In the chapter above, I have drawn a thread through the history of the colluding interests that shaped the early colonial history of New Zealand. Far from being the autonomous agents of Ihu Karaiti, the CMS missionaries had either implicit or explicit ties to the empire, and most supported the annexation of these islands through either treaty or military power. I have examined the roles of two influential missionaries, Samuel Marsden and John Morgan, at the respective beginning and end of the missionary period. Both of these men had explicit links to the colonial regime, and clear desires to transform Māori culture and Māori economy. Marsden's seminary at Parramatta, the first Māori boarding school, started the tradition of a focus on Māori as agricultural labourers and domestic servants that would continue throughout the missionary period and well into the 20th century. Morgan's extensive plans for Māori industrial schools and the role he saw in creating peace and prosperity through economic change would also thread their way through several generations of racist assimilative policy. In the intervening years between Marsden and Morgan, I provided a broad overview of the formation of the mission school system and the spread of the infant schools during this period. In the next chapter, I will explore the formation of the Native school system and Māori boarding schools, and analyse their larger function in settler-colonial capitalism in Aotearoa.

6. Native Schools and Māori Church Boarding Schools 1867-1939

> One morning Riripeti sat down by the track and said she couldn't go to school any more. Usually when she did that we would manage to persuade her, but that day I believed her. It was true that she couldn't go to school. Her spirit was out of her, gone roaming. Her hair was dry as a horse's tail, rough and hard, her eyes were flat like shadows, not at all like eyes. I had seen a dying dog look like that, which made me think it might be true what the teacher said, that my teina was changing into an animal... Down the bank she went, across the creek and into the trees where perhaps she would become an animal, a bird. (Grace, 1998, p.34).

The Native schools system began in 1867 as a parallel education system for Māori, and predated state schooling for Pākehā children by a decade (Simon & Smith, 2001). Following twenty years of intermittent war and colonial between Māori and the Crown, mission schools across Aotearoa had by this period been "virtually abandoned" (Simon & Smith, 2001, p.8). Mission schools now only remained in areas where iwi had allied with the Government in the hope of maintaining some degree of control over their land, and were markedly absent in areas were conflict had been greatest and land confiscations were most widespread (Barrington, 2008; Simon & Smith, 2001). A scathing report by the Under Secretary to the Native Department, William Rolleston, condemned the few church-run Native schools in 1867 as a failure as they had not been able to stamp out "Māori communism" (Walker, 2016, p.23). This represented a crisis for the Crown, who required "peaceful" relations with Māori to succeed in their colonial mission (May, 2005; Simon & Smith, 2001). Both the New Zealand Wars across Waikato, Taranaki, and Waiariki in the 1860s and the earlier Northern Wars in the 1840s had been hugely costly for the Crown, and had not resulted in obsequious iwi gladly assimilating into the Pākehā population (O'Malley, 2019). The solution pursued by the Government was to continue the quieter and less outwardly destructive path of assimilative education that had started with the mission schools in the North. This path contained both the genesis of the Native schools system, and continuing Government support for the few remaining mission day and boarding schools. By the outbreak of World War II in 1939, there were more than a hundred Native schools across Aotearoa (Barrington, 2008).

The Native schools were not created with the intention of removing Māori children from their kāinga. However, both the ideology and the legislation and policy behind them directly impacted the Māori church boarding schools, who were mostly subject to the same laws and oversight (Jenkins & Matthews, 1995). The Māori church boarding schools were also directly linked to the Native schools, as they were mostly secondary schools that accepted through scholarship or payment the most talented scholars from the primary schools (Jenkins & Matthews, 1995; Simon & Smith, 2001). For these reasons, it is

important that we consider this system in its entirety, rather than only analysing the Māori church boarding schools as though they stood alone. This chapter begins with a brief exploration of the village Native schools and the legislation and policy that shaped them. I also examine the ideological and material reasons behind the policies and practices in the schools. I then consider the Māori church boarding schools and how they continued the legacy of the earlier mission schools. Following this, I then focus on the special attention paid to the assimilation of young wāhine Māori throughout both the Native and Māori church boarding schools. Finally, I analyse the role of both systems in the early child care and protection system and the broader colonial history of Aotearoa.

The Native Schools System

The *Native Schools Act 1867* ("the 1867 Act") carried within it the goal of "Europeanising" hāpori Māori. Unlike its predecessors the *Native Trust Ordinance 1844* and the *Native Schools Act 1858,* the 1867 Act turned away from primarily subsidising missionary efforts and towards an espoused educational partnership directly between the Government and individual Māori communities (Simon & Smith, 2001). The 1867 Act allowed for agreements among Māori men and the Crown to create an "Educational District", whereby the iwi and hapū of the area, along with the Government, would pay for the establishment and maintenance of a school. Local Māori would then create a school committee that would "have the general management of the school subject to the provisions of this Act and to such regulations as may from time to time be issued by the Colonial Secretary in that behalf" (the 1867 Act, p.468). However, Simon and Smith (2001) argue that the power of these committees was limited, as they could not hire or fire teachers. The hapū committee members would instead show their confidence (or lack thereof) by voting with the removal of their tamariki from the school altogether (Simon & Smith, 2001). Despite being a supposed partnership, the balance of power remained with the Crown, who could veto the land offered by the hapū or iwi for the school, who regulated the finances, teaching staff, and to an extent the curriculum, and who controlled the Native Schools Inspector (Simon & Smith, 2001).

In the earliest years of the Native schools system, the new schools proliferated in areas where Māori had been loyal to the Crown (Barrington, 2008). Barrington (2008) noted that schools were most numerous in the parts of Te Tai Tokerau where loyalist Māori were strongest, the Takitimu and Horouta waka rohe of Tairāwhiti, Te Arawa strongholds Maketū and Ōhinemutu, and across the Ōtaki region. In contrast, in 1871 there were no Native Schools in Waikato, and Taranaki Māori also showed a clear "lack of enthusiasm" (Barrington, 2008, p.22). Simon and Smith (2001) use an example of whānau nearly abandoning the Te Teko Native school after a Pākehā teacher insisted on military drills for their tamariki. The authors note that the Ngāti Awa settlement was "in an area that had been

subject to invasion by soldiers and subsequent confiscation of lands, this was problably an issue about which the community was still extremely sensitive" (p.66). As in the missionary era, many whānau and hapū simply would not accept the use of corporal punishment on their tamariki, and the communities would withhold their children from the school until the offending teacher was replaced.

Both Barrington (2008) and Simon and Smith (2001) argued that Māori were not simply passive recipients bowing to Crown mandate. Much like the earlier mission schools, the goals here for hapū and iwi and the goals for the Pākehā Government were markedly different. Simon and Smith (2001) argued that:

> While the state sought English language schooling for Māori to fulfil its assimilation agenda, Māori sought it at this stage in an effort to maintain their sovereignty and ensure they would not be disadvantaged by the growing dominance of Pākehā. (p.160-161)

In their exhaustive research on the Native Schools system, Judith Simon and Linda Tuhiwai Smith (2001) found these differing aims continued well into the 20th century, with many parents using Native schools to increase their children's chances at survival in the Pākehā world. Simon and Smith (2001) stated it was certain that Māori engagement with the Native schools did not represent any desire to gain te reo Pākehā and access to the Pākehā world at the expense of te reo, whenua and mātauranga Māori.

The early Native schools continued the preference of the CMS during the missionary period of installing a married Pākehā couple at the school, usually with the husband as the head teacher and the wife as the sewing mistress and later as a teacher for very young children or an assistant (Native Schools Code 1880 [the Code], Simon & Smith, 2001). Included in every early agreement for a school was the requirement for the local hapū or iwi to build both a schoolhouse and a teachers cottage with a garden for the head teacher (the 1867 Act; the Code 1880). The Native Department (and later the Department of Education) intended both the house and the married couple to provide good role models of a respectable Christian existence for tamariki Māori and their whānau (Simon & Smith, 2001). In the earlier years of Native schools, Māori adults and young people would sometimes be hired as assistants, and would only become teachers in areas that remained loyal to the Crown and were considered "thoroughly civilised" (Simon & Smith, 2001, p.73). These assistants would often be older siblings or whanaunga to the pupils, which participants in Simon and Smith's (2001) research said gave the Native schools a more comfortable whānau environment than what young Māori experienced in the public school system. In the 20th century, when the hiring of Māori Native school teachers was more common, Māori were seen as expendable during times of economic crisis, and many were fired during the Great Depression to make space for Pākehā workers instead (Simon & Smith, 2001). Simon

and Smith (2001) posited that "one could argue that under this policy the Native schools were operating to serve the interests of Pākehā at the expense of Māori" (p.42).

The hoped-for civilising influence of the Pākehā teachers is clearly threaded throughout the Code. The directions to teachers from the then-secretary of Education, John Hislop, instructed that:

> Besides giving due attention to the school instruction of the children, teachers will be expected to exercise a beneficial influence on the Natives, old and young; to show by their own conduct that it is possible to live a useful and blameless life, and in smaller matters, by their dress, in their houses, and by their manners and habits at home and abroad, to set the Maoris an example that they may advantageously imitate.
>
> The Department would especially call your attention to the fact that it is extremely advisable that teachers should always keep their houses and gardens neat and tidy. In this matter the natives are, as a rule, very careless. It is highly necessary that teachers should be on their guard against allowing their own habits to degenerate under the influence of surrounding negligence. They ought rather to exert a steady influence tending to the elevation of the people among who they live. (the Code 1880, p.7).

The Code did not explicitly speak of assimilation and colonisation, however, the ideological implications are clear. By their presence as good British colonial citizens, the Native school teachers were expected to exert an assimilationist influence upon Māori, to encourage Māori to become more like them. The Code also provides a glimpse into how the schools socialised tamariki Māori into accepting and internalising the racial politics of the British Empire. The expectations for tamariki in standard four states that students must be able to answer questions such as "[w]hy do white people living in India require to have all hard work done for them by the Natives?" (p.2).

Many of the Native schools were considered dilapidated and unfit for purpose by pupils, whānau, and the Native schools Inspectors during this time period (Simon & Smith, 2001). Many past students remembered them as cold and drafty, cramped and under-resourced, and in need of constant repair (Simon & Smith, 2001). This likely exacerbated the effects of the devastating influenza and tuberculosis epidemics of the early 20th century, which hit Māori communities particularly hard (Barrington, 2008; Durie, 1994; Simon & Smith, 2001). The remoteness of many communities from the Pākehā settlements that had medicine, nurses, and doctors, combined with the legalised suppression of traditional Māori healing practices, meant that Māori had little defence against these illnesses (Durie, 1994). The communal mode of production had largely been superceded by the necessity to survive in the capitalist world as growers of market crops, servants, or labourers, and so many communities could no longer produce enough food to sustain their communities

independently (Poata-Smith, 2001). Poor nutrition, lack of adequate medical care, and the cramped conditions of the schoolhouses created fertile ground for the epidemics that tore a destructive path through hāpori Māori (Simon & Smith, 2001). During the 1918 influenza epidemic around 25% of the 9,000 people who died in Aotearoa were Māori, at a time when Māori were close to 4% of the total population (Rice & Bryder, 2005). The death rate for Māori during this epidemic was 42.3 per thousand people, seven times higher than that of Pākehā and one of the highest in the world (Rice & Bryder, 2005). The impact of this mate was so great that many of the more remote village Native schools were shut down, as the surrounding hapū and iwi no longer had enough tamariki to attend them (Simon & Smith, 2001).

Perhaps the greatest legacy of the Native schools is the use of punishment to suppress te reo Māori (Barrington, 2008; Simon & Smith, 2001; Walker, 2016). In interviewing dozens of past pupils, teachers, and the children of teachers of Native schools, Simon and Smith (2001) found that experiences of this were diverse. Some teachers and their children denied it ever happened, while many past Māori students gave specific and damning examples of racist cruelty used against tamariki Māori (Simon & Smith, 2001). The authors explain that punishing children for using te reo Māori had the dual effect of encouraging the use of English, while also communicating that “te reo Māori was inferior or bad” (p.17). The suppression of te reo Māori must be understood as not only a means to an obvious end of creating fluent English speakers, but also as part of a broader ideological project on the part of the Native schools. Simon and Smith (2001) also called attention to the re-writing of Māori history and colonial history. In these reimagined narratives, Māori were cast as bad, savage, or evil, while colonisation, settlement, and the expansion of British Imperialism was lauded. As one ex-pupil participant in Simon and Smith’s (2001) research succinctly articulated, “[m]assacres were massacres when the Pākehā was beaten. It wasn’t a massacre when the Māori was beaten” (p.183). The nature of all things Māori—culture, land, language, identity, knowledge, history, and society—was being continually undermined through both force and subversion in the Native schools system.

Also like the mission schools, the Native schools system had a deep connection to increasing Crown ownership of Māori land. Simon and Smith (2001) state that most Native school plots contained around 4-5 acres of hapū land, while Barrington (2008) suggested it was closer to 10-15 acres for each school. Like the control over teachers and curriculum, the power to decide what land would be part of the agreement between hapū and the Native Department (and later the Department of Education) ultimately lay with the Crown (Simon & Smith, 2001). Simon and Smith (2001) discuss the history of the Rātana pā Native school, where the community fought to include a special clause in their agreement with the Department of Education that would say their whenua would be returned after the school

was eventually closed. The Crown refused, stipulating that the land must be given "without any strings attached" (Simon & Smith, 2001, p.57). Access to Māori land was simply another facet of these highly assymetrical political arrangements.

The Māori Church Boarding Schools

Church boarding schools for tamariki and rangatahi Māori hold a special place in the heart of many whānau (Jenkins & Matthews, 1995; Simon & Smith, 2001). A handful of these schools, including Hukarere Girls College, Te Aute College, St. Joseph's Māori Girls College, and St. Stephen's School, are particularly famous for their role in educating some of the most influential Māori figures of the last century (Jenkins & Matthews, 1995). These schools were primarily for older tamariki and rangatahi who had excelled in the Native schools system (Simon & Smith, 2001). However, some, like St. Stephen's School, began as a missionary boarding school for primary-aged children before later changing to post-primary education (Davidson, 2004; Old, 1994). The ethos of the earlier mission schools—that it was necessary to separate tamariki Māori from their whānau and communities to transform their lives—remained a strong thread through the Māori church boarding schools. Kuni Kaa Jenkins and Kay Morris Matthews (1995) argued that a critical aspect of these schools was to remove children from their kāinga and take them where "they lived as Pakeha seven days a week" (p.16). And yet, like the Native schools system, the Māori church boarding schools are also fondly remembered by some as places that helped create pan-Māori identity and fostered Māori academic excellence (Jenkins & Matthews, 1995; Simon & Smith, 2001).

The earliest of the Māori church boarding schools were those that survived the mass closures following the deep political unrest and colonial violence in the earlier decades of the 19th century. As explained earlier by Barrington (2008) and Simon and Smith (2001), these were in areas where the majority of hapū and iwi either aided or were at least neutral towards the Crown. The small handful of schools that predated the *Native Schools Act 1867* were found in either Tāmaki Makaurau (St. Stephen's School and Wesley College) or Te Tairāwhiti, Heretaunga, and Wairarapa (Te Aute College, Waerenga-a-Hika College, and St. Joseph's Māori Girls College) (Davidson, 2004). The iwi and hapū that remained in the Tāmaki region in this era had already changed drastically from fifty years before. The expansion of Ngāpuhi newly armed with European muskets in the early 19th century pushed rival iwi like Te Kawerau ā Maki, Tainui, and Ngāti Paoa respectively further west, south, and east back to Hauraki (Simmons, 2013). The booming of Auckland as the nation's second capital and largest port created even more intense change, with growing Pākehā settlement and devastating land alienation among the Tāmaki iwi, particularly Ngāti Whātua (Simmons, 2013). Finally, George Grey's procalamation of 9 July 1863 demanding any Māori in the Manukau district either swear allegiance to the Queen or leave for Waikato on punishment of forced eviction was the final push for the desertion of most Māori from the Auckland area

(Simmons, 2013). St. Stephen's school, originally in Parnell, Auckland, was built on land donated by the Government and was proud to call Governor George Grey their patron (Old, 1994).

Similarly, the East Coast of te Ika a Māui was a region where many hapū allied with the Crown in this era. Ngāti Porou in particular had earlier sought protection from the Crown from Ngāpuhi, and much of their number had also fought alongside settler forces against pro-land retention and Māori sovereignty groups of Pai Marire—including Ngāti Porou Pai Marire—during the New Zealand Wars (O'Malley, 2019). The famous Te Aute college originated from an agreement between Governor Grey and the Anglican Bishop George Selwyn, who were anxious about future conflict between Māori and Pākehā settlers following land alienation in the area (Tyro & Scarlett, 1979). Like with St. Stephen's in Tāmaki, Grey promised 4,000 acres of Crown-owned land in Heretaunga for the school, with another 4,000 acres bequeathed by Ngāti Kahungungu on the promise of education for rangatahi Māori (Tyro & Scarlett, 1979). The founder of Hukarere Girls School, Bishop William Williams, of the prolific Williams missionary family reportedly said in 1871 that:

> East Cape Maori who had assisted Government troops in quelling the Hauhau disturbances have had 10,000 acres awarded to them out of the confiscated land at Turanga. This they have leased to the Government and they devote the proceeds to the support of the schools. (Williams, 1939, p.287).

Bishop Williams had founded a number of mission schools across the East Cape, and like his brother had been an enthusiastic supporter for the annexation of Aotearoa (Davidson, 2004). The history of these schools, like the earlier mission schools and the concurrent Native schools, is intertwined with the history of colonisation and disenfranchisement of Māori across this whenua.

Unlike the early mission schools and Native schools that were based in or near Māori papakāinga and usually educated tauira from within the same hapū, or at least related hapū or iwi, the Māori church schools generally did not have clear ties to any particular iwi, papakāinga, or rohe (Jenkins & Matthews, 1995). As these schools were not based on agreements between the Native or later Education Departments and hapū or iwi, they were in areas decided by missionaries or other religious leaders. This meant they were often in Pākehā settlements like the Auckland schools St. Stephen's and Queen Victoria, or on land owned by a missionary or church, like Hukarere Māori Girls School. Though their locations were far from politically neutral—and though they all existed on whenua Māori—their lack of ties with any particular iwi may have been a factor in their popularity across Māori communities. These schools, though certainly institutions crucial to the colonial project, were incredibly popular with Māori and their legacy remains so (Jenkins & Matthews, 1995; Simon & Smith, 2001).

Many of the students who attended these schools did so on scholarships that they were awarded for excelling in the Native schools or public systems, which was guaranteed in policy through the Native Schools Code 1880 (Simon & Smith, 2001). However, many whānau and hapū also made incredible economic sacrifices to send their rangatahi to these schools (Jenkins & Matthews, 1995). The Māori church boarding schools held the possibility of not only survival for these young people, but the possibility of thriving in what was a brutal apartheid system (Jenkins & Matthews, 1995). Despite the zeal and aptitude for learning, thinking and creating that tāngata Māori had demonstrated time and again over the near-century since Pākehā had settled in Aotearoa, in most schools Māori were only considered by those in power as suitable for labouring or servitude in the colony. In contrast, schools like Te Aute College and St. Stephen's School offered a chance at University and even the opportunity to be a collaborator with the Kāwanatanga if boys did well in their exams—and they often did (Simon & Smith, 2001). The first Māori men to enter University were educated at Te Aute College, and the school produced several of the Māori worlds most influential politicians who worked with the Pākehā Government (Simon & Smith, 2001). Despite also performing exceedingly well in their high school exams, very few girls that attended these schools were permitted to enter University, though many later trained as teachers and nurses (Jenkins & Matthews, 1995).

There were, of course, competing and contradictory influences within the Māori church boarding schools, and at many times the leadership of these schools bristled against the pressure of the Crown (Davidson, 2004; Simon & Smith, 2001). A particular sticking point concerned the Department of Education and Native Schools Inspectors pushing for more agricultural and domestic instruction among the schools, and less academic education (Simon & Smith, 2001). This began even before the *Native Schools Act 1867*, when an Inspector of mission boarding schools Henry Taylor (1862) said:

> I do not advocate for the Natives under present circumstances refined education or high mental culture, it would be inconsistent if we take account of the position they are likely to hold for many years to come in the social scale, and inappropriate if we remember that they are better calculated by nature to get their living by manual than by mental labour. (Taylor, 1862, p.38)

However, though the leadership of Te Aute and Hukarere pushed back against the assertion that Māori were incapable of higher education that befit Pākehā youth (Simon & Smith, 2001), some of the Māori church boarding schools embraced manual instruction for their pupils (Old, 1994). St. Stephen's school in Auckland developed a training programme in the early 1900s whereby the young boys would work as farmers on the school land, or as carpenters or fabricators, from 8am until 5pm, three days a week (Old, 1994).

This perspective was a clear continuation of the earlier missionaries view of Māori aptitude, most notably Reverend John Morgan and his quest for industrial schools at Ōtawhao which I discussed in chapter five. This view holds several assumptions about the inherent “nature” of Māori. First and most clear, is the assumption that Māori were only capable of manual labour in the new colony, and that any thoughtful, intellectual or creative pursuits were either not possible or desirable. Second, that the subjection of Māori to a lower social and economic position in New Zealand was fixed for “many years to come” (Taylor, 1862, p.38). Finally, this view assumes that the Crown accepted this stance and considered it useful to maintain these relations in Aotearoa through the use of agricultural instruction. These assumptions reflected not only the racist attitudes of the time, but also the economic and social roles Māori were needed to fill in the new colony.

Native Schools, Māori Church Boarding Schools, and Gender

Across the British colonial project, incredible effort was placed on converting Indigenous girls to good Christian mothers and housewives through religious schools (Glenn, 2011). Mikaere (2017) points to the central and valued position of women in both Māori cosmogony and daily life in pre-colonial times as being detestable to most Pākehā men, whether they were missionaries, Crown agents, or simply settlers or farmers. The missionaries brought with them not only Christianity and Ihu Karaiti, but English common law and social relationships between genders (Mikaere, 2017). Through the missionaries and churches, Māori cosmogony was systematically attacked and metamorphosed from a tradition that treasured women and held a balance between genders, to one that reproduced the supremacy of men in the modern Christian faith (Jenkins, 1988; Mikaere, 2017). Jenkins (1988) said that:

> What the colonizer found was a land of noble savages narrating his/her stories of the wonder of women. Their myths and beliefs had to be reshaped and retold… [I]n the re-telling of our myths, by Maori male informants to Pakeha male writers who lacked the understanding and significance of Maori cultural beliefs, Maori women find their mana wahine destroyed. (p.160-161)

Mikaere (2017) argues the colonisation of Māori cosmogony through early European writers, politicians, missionaries, and anthropologists had a devastating effect. The cultural and spiritual histories that were either ignorantly or willfully misrepresented by these Pākehā authors were replicated in Māori-language newspapers, in churches, in global anthropology and history texts, in European museums, and in the Native and Māori church boarding schools.

Mikaere (2017) contends that the supplanting of women in Māori cosmogony had a snowball effect across other aspects of Māori life. Where women once had a valued and special place in balancing the relationship between tapu and noa, women were now seen as

polluters of tapu (Mikaere, 2017). The whare tangata, respected for centuries as the powerful giver of life to all Māori, was now considered unclean through menstruation, sex, and childbirth (Mikaere, 2017). Māori women's sexual assertiveness and autonomy was reinterpreted as "immorality and lack of discipline" (Smith, 1992, p.49). Finally, the role of women in the whānau and hapū was transformed entirely from one of equal worth and importance to being subservient to men, both Pākehā and Māori (Mikaere, 2017; Pere, 1987; Jenkins, 1988). Though there were certainly some differences between gender roles in precolonial Māori society, there were no formal boundaries between what was considered "men's" or "women's" work (Mikaere, 2017; Pere, 1987). The communal lives of Māori meant that people had to be flexible about doing what was needed to sustain the whānau and hapū, whether that was weaving, gardening, gathering kaimoana, building, or looking after children (Mikaere, 2017). This was not true of the men and women in the Christian and capitalist European world (Jenkins, 1988; Mikaere, 2017).

In Aotearoa, the ideological attack on the mana of kōtiro and wāhine Māori started as early as the Paihia and Waimate mission schools with Jane, Marianne, and Henry Williams (Fitzgerald, 2003; May et al., 2014), and continued with increased effort through the Native and Māori church schools. As I examined in chapter five, many of the earlier missionary teachers had Māori girls and young women who were also pupils in their schools living with them as servants, which served both an ideological and economic purpose. The Code cemented this in Crown policy with a clause allowing kōtiro Māori students to board with married teachers in their home for three months in order to learn "the work of the house" (p.3). This continued for decades through the Native schools era (Simon & Smith, 2001). A daughter of Pākehā Native school teachers in the 1920s and 1930s stated that as a married teaching couple in the Native schools "you could get a Māori girl in the house for next to nothing" (Simon & Smith, 2001, p.16). The missionaries believed that assimilating Māori girls was the key to the peaceful colonisation of Aotearoa (Jenkins & Matthews, 1995). As mothers of future tamariki, they would have the primary role in socialising their children and shaping their view of the world. As future wives and housekeepers, they would provide a pious and civilised home for their husbands (Jenkins & Matthews, 1995). As Jenkins and Matthews (1995) argue, Māori girls were "seen to be the future guardians of morality through their roles as wives and mothers" (p.15). Therefore, special attention had to be paid to socialising these wāhine into the colonial gender roles they would be expected to fulfil.

In their book collecting several histories of Hukarere Girls College, Jenkins and Matthews (1995) present a complex mana wahine historical analysis of the school over time. Hukarere was opened in 1875 by the Williams missionary family, in the rohe of Ngāti Kahungungu ki Heretaunga, not far from Ahuriri. The land was donated by Bishop William Williams with the Bishop acting as superintendent, and his daughters Anna-Maria, Lydia,

and Catherine acting as teachers, assistants, and administrators (Jenkins & Matthews, 1995). Hukarere was opened to act as a “sister” school to Te Aute College, and to produce educated Māori wives for the old boys of Te Aute, who were considered by assimilationists to be of a higher class than other Māori men (Jenkins & Matthews, 1995). The success of Hukarere would be reproduced later with the opening of Queen Victoria College in Auckland, which would act as a girls’ counterpart to St. Stephen’s School (Jenkins & Matthews, 1995).

In both the Native and Māori church boarding schools there was a particular focus on instilling Pākehā domestic skills among kōtiro Māori (Jenkins & Matthews, 1995). In the Native schools, the academic expectations were the same among genders to graduate each standard, however, Māori girls were also expected to learn sewing and homecraft. The Code required teaching the youngest girls in standard one to hem, and the eldest girls needed to know how to sew buttons and button-holes and knit stockings in order to pass standard four. Though the battle to maintain the Māori church boarding schools as predominantly academic rather than industrial schools happened across both the girls’ and boys’ schools, schools like Hukarere had to struggle against the added dimension of sexism, as well as racism. Like with the boys’ schools, several teachers and administrators of Hukarere fought against the narrowed vision for Māori girls that was passed down from the Native and Education Departments, and particularly from the Native Schools Inspectors (Jenkins & Matthews, 1995).

Mere Hall, a Ngāti Rangiwewehi and Ngāti Whakāue woman who was a pupil, teacher, and finally the principal of Hukarere from 1927, argued for broadening the girls’ curriculum and advocated for greater inclusion of science and literature, as well as te reo and waiata Māori (Jenkins & Matthews, 1995). In a reply sent by the Department of Education (1937) to Bishop Herbert Williams—the grandson of William Williams and the third member of the Williams family to become the Bishop of the Māori diocese of Waiapu—the Director of Education said that advanced science was outside the realm of what was appropriate for Māori girls. The letter said:

> It has always been the Department’s attitude that in all post-primary schools for Maori girls a *practical* (original emphasis) prescription in home science, closely related to the conditions of the girls’ home environment, should be given… If sensible courses along these lines are prepared the girls will leave Hukarere with sound knowledge of and practical experience in home management, cookery, laundrying, sanitation, etc. (Department of Education, 1937, p.1)

The girls of Hukarere were expected by the Crown to treat being wives, mothers, and homemakers as their primary goal in life (Jenkins & Matthews, 1995). Even among the Māori men who had personally benefited from secondary education, there was no guarantee of support for Māori women’s continued learning. Maui Pōmare, a Te Aute alum and famous

Māori politician and doctor, said "[e]ducate the mothers to recognise the efficacy of the bathtub, cleanly warm clothes, plain and wholesome food, and you will regenerate the Maori quicker than by teaching the youths and maidens embroidery, Latin, and Euclid" (Barrington & Beaglehole, 1974, p.172-173).

Transforming Maori society was the ultimate goal among missionaries, teachers, and politicians for the young wāhine Māori who entered Hukarere (Jenkins & Matthews, 1995). However, there were tensions and contradictions around how this transformation would best be achieved when the girls' education was completed. Some factions expected the girls to return home to their kāinga and model a Christian way of life as civilised mothers and wives, others desired the girls the work as teachers or nurses among their people, while others still preferred the young women to become missionaries and spread the word of Ihu Karaiti (Jenkins & Matthews, 1995). Some, like Reverend Samuel Williams (1903) of Te Aute, said that Hukarere educated women could not return to their homes and must live among Pākehā as they would be "dragged down very much to the level of the ordinary Māori woman" (p.1). The fear held by Samuel Williams and other missionaries and politicians was that if these young women were to return to their hapū and papakāinga, they would return to the cultural, economic and social practices and relations that were so morally abhorrent to Pākehā (Jenkins & Matthews, 1995; Mikaere, 2017; Paterson, 2006). These fears included cooking and eating traditional Māori food instead of supposedly more wholesome British fare (Paterson, 2006); living in traditional Māori whare puni where men, women, and children slept together (Mikaere, 2017; Paterson, 2006); equitable gender relations and blurred gender roles (Mikaere, 2017); and most importantly the equal and relatively free sexual relations where women held as much or more power to choose their partners as men (Jenkins & Matthews, 1995; Mikaere, 2017). The paternalism that Māori women were subjected to by Pākehā missionaries, religious leaders, and politicians had as much to do with transforming them as "saving" them (Jenkins & Matthews, 1995).

The targeting of Indigenous girls as the conduit for social, cultural, and economic transformation was common across the colonial world. Native girls in the Americas were also considered to be civilising agents for their communities, as they embodied the "spirit of the home" (Glenn, 2011, p.50). Rathburn (2006) found that the girls of St. Boniface Indian School in Canada faced much more strict living and school conditions than the boys', and were under almost constant supervision by the nuns. Similar to the Native schools of Aotearoa, it was normal for these girls' and young women to board with teachers and other families, ostensibly to learn what a proper Christian household of the time should be like (Rathburn, 2006). The missionaries of St. Boniface were proud of this system, as it meant the girls would be "equipped to find better Catholic homes on the reservation" (Rathburn, 2006, p.167). This "outing" system of feeding young Native children to local families to work

as servants or labourers used in the Native schools of so-called US and Canada were a powerful tool to assimilate the children to Western gender norms (Paxton, 2006). Much like whānau and hapū Māori, the lines between gender roles were much less defined among the many Native peoples of Turtle Island (Paxton, 2006). In Australia, state and church intervention was similarly concentrated on controlling Indigenous women's sexuality and fertility (Jacobs, 2006). Explicit policies aimed at fully assimilating Indigenous people and their whenua into the white settler world encouraged marriage and sexual liasons between Indigenous women and white men to help with "breeding out the colour" (Jacobs, 2006, p.214).

The historical similarities regarding gender across the imperialist world during this era are not through chance. Recreating the gendered norms and relationships of Europe among Indigenous peoples was essential both for the Christianising mission and for the expansion of capitalism in the colonies. Several mana wahine and feminist scholars have stressed the centrality of Māori women to the religious and political "civilising" plan in New Zealand (Fitzgerald, 2003; Jenkins, 1988; Jenkins & Matthews, 1995; May, 2005; Mikaere, 2017; Pere, 1987). The effort to convert these women into the then-Pākehā ideal of feminine domesticity through the mission, Native, and Māori church boarding schools was critical to the assimilative project. However, socialising Māori women into the role of a British "angel of the house" (Jenkins & Matthews, 1995, p.15) would have consequences for both cultural assimilation *and* in reproducing the capitalist social relations of production and the labour-power of themselves and others. Māori women needed to perform the unpaid domestic tasks needed to reproduce the labour-power of the men in their lives, or those men could not be effectively proletarianised. The term social reproduction theory is used by Marxist feminists to describe the integrated system that comprises of capitalist production of goods and services on the one hand, and the reproduction of life that it requires to function on the other (Bhattacharya, 2017).

Social reproduction theory states that women's oppression among working class people stems from their "involvement in processes that renew direct producers, as well as their involvement in production" (Vogel, 2014, p.129). Women—including the Māori women and girls that were so targeted for assimilation—served dual roles within capitalism as both direct producers of commodities and as people who reproduce labour-power. According to Bhattacharya (2017) the reproduction of labour-power involves three related aspects. First, there is the renewal of workers' labour-power that is expended in production, which requires at its most basic food and rest in a safe home, but that encompasses all the physiological and emotional needs that must be met to return to work each day. Next, there is the same regeneration and maintenance of non-workers, children, elderly, and those otherwise unable to work. The final core aspect involved in reproducing of labour-power is the reproduction of

future workers through childbirth. Though these three processes fall outside of direct production, they are critical to the maintenance of capitalism. Without the regeneration of their labour-power, working people cannot continue to work and will grow exhausted, sick, or die (Marx, 1990). Without generational renewal and socialising children into the roles required to maintain capitalism, there would be no future workers. It was as or perhaps even *more* crucial for settler-colonial capitalism to mould young Indigenous women into wives and homemakers as it was to shape young Indigenous men into agricultural workers and labourers.

Transforming Māori Society and Economy Through the Native and Māori Church Boarding Schools

Despite the formation of the New Zealand state and secular state schooling, the impact of the missionary era continued through the Native schools period. The same beliefs surrounding Māori aptitude and our economic and social position in the colony was woven through both the Native and Māori church boarding schools. The early missionary period saw the entanglement of official colonial and religious interests at a legislative level, and the continuing economic support of and state pressure on the Māori church boarding schools from the Crown continued this. Perhaps even more important is the alignment of interests between these institutions around the transformation of Māori society and political economy. Though the church and missionaries did not have clear designs on whenua Māori beyond accumulation for their own use, the majority supported the annexation of these islands and the assimilation of Māori into the colonial world (Davidson, 2004). The Crown, of course, had a much more obvious stake in the disposession and assimilation of Māori. Constant warfare was certainly one path to controlling Māori land, and land confiscations during the New Zealand Wars had seen hundreds of thousands of acres of whenua Māori appropriated for colonial troops and settlers (O'Malley, 2019). However, this approach was not sustainable nor desirable for the Crown, and so legal mechanisms had to be created to aid the mass transfer of land from Māori to Pākehā (Mohi, 2019; Poata-Smith, 2001).

The Native Land Court was established through the *Native Land Act 1865* to provide a veneer of legality to raupatu and to aid in the extinction of customary Māori relationships to land use and ownership (Mohi, 2019). This legislation had mixed success in breaking apart Māori communal ownership through sale, as many hapū Māori simply would not accept its limit of ten owners on all land blocks irrespective of size (Mohi, 2019). There was significant cyclical reform of the Courts over the next five decades, with more than 500 statutes passed between 1865 and 1909 (O'Keefe, 1980). The Native Land Court was an incredibly costly system for Māori, with almost every point of contact between an individual or hapū and the Court requiring a hefty fee (Mohi, 2019). In several cases, the fees for application, history taking, establishing ownership, survey, and sale swallowed up the entirety or majority of the

payment (Mohi, 2019). One Judge overruled the English Common Law concept of primogeniture—where interest passed to one descendant or relative on death of an owner—and instead established that Native land must pass equally to all descendants. This was nominally to protect Māori interests, yet in effect splintered all Māori land into smaller and smaller individual blocks (Mohi, 2019). These individual blocks held little economic use for Māori who remained with their hapū once the land was broken up and sold, as the units were often too small to support the collective needs of the hapū (Mohi, 2019). However, they provided excellent small farms for Pākehā, market gardens, or village land for settlements (Mohi, 2019).

The transfer of Māori land to Pākehā settlers was now ensured through legal mechanisms that favoured Pākehā buyers, facilitating the divorce of Māori from the means of their subsistence. One of the largest remaining hurdles to the transformation of Aotearoa to a capitalist settler-colony was the transformation of Māori into proletarians (Barber, 2019; Poata-Smith, 2001). As with the gendered aspects of assimilation discussed earlier, the more critical literature on Native and Māori church boarding schools focuses on their civilising aspects (Barrington, 2008; Jenkins & Matthews, 1995; Simon & Smith, 2001). Certainly the push for agricultural and industrial education in the Māori church boarding schools confirmed both the Pākehā attitudes towards Māori aptitude as well as the function the new colony required of them. However, a deeper political economic analysis of the reasons behind this civilising mission in the schools is absent from the literature. Māori labourers were critical to formal New Zealand capitalism of the 19th century as forestry and agricultural workers, as road workers, and as domestic servants. However, even by the outbreak of World War II, not all Māori were fully integrated into settler-colonial capitalism as proletarians (Walker, 2004). While, the Native and Māori church boarding schools had an important function as institutions socialising tamariki and rangatahi Māori into what was required of them for the colony, functioning hapū communities were still necessary to capitalism even though they were not proletarianised. Hapū and whānau that remained as ahi kā on their unalienated whenua grew food crops and raised sheep and cattle to sell as commodities to buyers in the capitalist market (Walker, 2004).

The two types of schools examined in this chapter operated differently and focused on assimilating Māori in different ways. The Māori church boarding schools for secondary pupils acted to socialise the rangatahi who performed the best within the confines of the small Pākehā-controlled worlds of the Native schools into their roles as collaborators with the bourgeois class and the Kāwanatanga. The clearest example of this is the men of the Young Māori Party, created out of mainly Te Aute graduates of the late 1800s. These men, many of whom were sons and whanaunga of rangatira, became influential iwi leaders, composers, journalists, politicians and Crown officials, and land reformers (Walker, 2004; Tyro &

Scarlett, 1979). Like the rangatira of hapū and iwi who sided with the Crown in the earlier years of colonisation, it is likely that these men believed they were taking the best possible action for the survival and benefit of their hapū and communities in a hostile world. However, the leadership and advocacy of some of these men also resulted in further assimilation of Māori.

The Diverging Functions of the Native and Māori Church Boarding Schools

Maui Pōmare, a Te Aute old boy and the first Māori person to enter and graduate from medical school was a prominent advocate for raising the standards of Māori health (Durie, 1994). Pōmare later became the first Māori health official working for the Kāwanatanga (Durie, 1994). He was also an ardent supporter of the *Tohunga Suppression Act 1907* and “regarded tohunga as unhelpful and accused them of doing more harm than good” (Durie, 1994, p.46). The *Tohunga Suppression Act 1907* sought to destroy traditional Māori healing and cultural practices of many kinds, including rongoā, mirimiri, and matakite. It also had a clear political intent to undermine influential Māori leaders who posed a direct threat to Crown sovereignty, like the prophet Rua Kēnana (Durie, 1994). Pōmare’s friend and contemporary, Āpirana Ngata, was the first Māori lawyer and one of the most influential Māori political figures of the 20th century (Walker, 2001). Perhaps Ngata’s most famous contribution to modern Māori history is through his committment to retaining and revitalising Māori culture and language in a changing world (Walker, 2001). However, along with Pōmare and other lauded Young Māori Party members like the anthropologist Te Rangihiroa (also known as Peter Buck), Ngata was a vocal campaigner for Māori joining World War I, and all argued passionately for Māori conscription in this global imperialist war (Tyro & Scarlett, 1979; Walker, 2001). According to the celebrated alumni in the book *Te Aute College 125th Anniversity: 1854-1979* by Tyro and Scarlett (1979), dozens of Te Aute old boys became officers and celebrated heroes of the Great War, and just as many entered the Kāwanatanga in the early 1900s.

Hill (2004) contrasts the broadly assimilationist politics of these Young Māori Party men with the rival politics of Rua Kēnana and Te Puea Hērangi, who both opposed the spilling of Māori blood for the Crown during World War I. Hill (2014) also notes the intense political competition between men like Pōmare and Ngata, who were favoured by the Crown as passionate yet palatable advocates for Māori inclusion in New Zealand, and the Rātana movement. The Rātana movement advocated for much greater self-determination for Māori both politically and economically, and as such faced fierce opposition from the Crown for most of their early years (Hill, 2004). It is surely not a coincidence that many of the men shaped by the Māori church boarding schools of this era were such enthusiastic supporters of the New Zealand government and the British empire, who only fifty years earlier had led a brutal and destructive war against what they deemed “rebel” Māori. The pupils of the Māori

church boarding schools were largely chosen for their ability to adapt and excel in an environment dominated by a nakedly assimilationist agenda, and many would carry this ideology with them into the world where they would influence and lead Māori communities.

The Native schools, in many rural and semi-rural areas away from Pākehā settlements, acted to take Pākehā capitalist ideology, norms, and values near to the papakāinga (Barrington, 2008; Simon & Smith, 2001). These schools were partnerships—however unequal—between hapū and the Crown, and were built and staffed as models of pious Pākehā family life within or next to Māori communities (Native Schools Code 1880; Simon & Smith, 2001). The great majority of tamariki who attended these schools would not go on to attend the Māori church boarding schools, nor any mainstream public high school (Simon & Smith, 2001). Their role in the colony was to stay on or near their tūrangawaewae and work either for Pākehā farmers as agricultural or domestic labourers or Pākehā bosses as forestry or infrastructure workers within the formal sphere of capitalism, or within their own hapū collectives as part of the informal economy (Walker, 2004). Before World War II and the need for the reserve army of (Māori) labour to pick up the jobs of Pākehā men in the larger Pākehā settlements, less than 20% of Māori lived in towns or cities (Walker, 2004), compared to around 65% of the Pākehā population (Mulet-Marquis & Fairweather, 2008). Before the urban shift of World War II and the following years, Walker (2004) stated there was little social contact between Māori and Pākehā outside of rural churches or the Native schools themselves (Walker, 2004). The exception was where the two cultures met in the social relations of production—with Māori as either workers for Pākehā farmers or owners, or as sellers of agricultural commodities to Pākehā buyers.

The Formal and Real Subsumption of Māori Labour

Marx (1990) describes two distinct forms of the subsumption of pre-capitalist labour under capital—the formal and real subsumption of labour. On the one hand, the *real* subsumption of labour is where the capitalist now has direct control over both the process and division of labour of pre-capitalist economies. Under the real subsumption of labour, the capitalist can organise workers in place (eg., a factory, a farm), define their hours of work, tell them what to do, and how to do it (Marx, 1990). In the context of this time period in Aotearoa, the real subsumption of Māori labour happened largely on farms and in forests, where they entered into the Pākehā capitalist world that, while still in its infancy in these islands, was already the dominant mode of production (Poata-Smith, 2001).

In contrast, the *formal* subsumption of labour is where production is not directly controlled by capitalism, but is still bound by a social relationship between producers and capitalists. Capitalists do not have direct control over the labour process, and instead exploit the production of commodities that already exists in pre-capitalist societies (Marx, 1990). In describing the formal subsumption of labour Marx (1990) said that:

> ... [T]he fact is that capital subsumed the labour process as it finds it, that is to say, it takes over an *existing labour process* (original emphasis), developed by different and more archaic modes of production. And since that is the case it is evident that capital took an *available, established labour process...* If changes occur in these traditional established *labour processes* after their takeover by capital, these are nothing but gradual consequences of that subsumption. The work may become more intensive, its duration may be extended, it may become more continuous or orderly under the eye of the interested capitalist, but in themselves these changes do not affect the character of the actual labour process, the actual mode of working. (p.1021)

Marx (1990) further defines this idea by establishing its two core characteristics:

1. The subordination of workers/producers to capitalists is due to the economic power of the latter, and not due to a relationship of subjugation.
2. Both the means of production and the means of subsistence belong in some part to the capitalist, coercing the workers into this social relationship. As the capitalists ownership of the means of production and subsistence become closer to a totality, the formal subsumption of pre-capitalist labour becomes more complete.

The move from formal to real subsumption of labour to capital occurs when capitalism becomes the dominant mode of production and reduces the control and power of the pre-capitalist modes of production (Marx, 1990).

In the Native and Māori church boarding school era, most Māori were not truly proletarianised as they remained on the vestiges of the whenua still under their control and maintained communal production and distribution, rather than being individual wage-labourers (Poata-Smith, 2001; Walker, 2004). However, as stated earlier, Māori production was turned not only inward for the maintenance of whānau and hapū, but was now also geared towards the production of surplus commodities to be sold (Poata-Smith, 2001; Walker, 2004). As early as the third visit of Captain Cook in 1774, Māori in Tōtaranui had massively increased their population by drawing in nearby hapū and were "actually manufacturing artifacts for trade" (Waker, 2004, p.79). As cited in the previous chapter, one of the reasons given for the closure of the first mission school at Oihi was because hapū at Rangihoua were trading the majority of their produce and did not have enough food to maintain the school (May et al., 2014). Since the arrival of the first Pākehā in Aotearoa, what Māori viewed as necessary to their lives—their means of subsistence, in Marxist terms—changed. In the earliest days of contact between these cultures, what Māori desired from Pākehā was focused on food and tools, on potatoes, pigs, iron, and guns (Walker, 2004). Later, in the time period that is the focus of both this chapter and the next, this was more likely to be ploughs, mills, Pākehā houses and clothing, and understanding of the written word (Walker, 2004).

The ideological coercion of the Native and Māori church boarding schools transcended the socialisation and civilising of Māori towards accepting Christian, Pākehā, capitalist social relations. The schools also worked to produce a desire among Māori for aspects of Pākehā life that could only be realised through buying commodities that were produced and controlled by capitalism. Rākete (2019) stated that "the means of subsistence necessary to reproduce a worker are not invariable or trans-historical" (p.86). Marx (1902) wrote in *Wage-labor and Capital* that:

> A house may be large or small; as long as the neighboring houses are likewise small, it satisfies all social requirement for a residence. But let there arise next to the little house a palace, and the little house shrinks to a hut. The little house now makes it clear that its inmate has no social position at all to maintain, or but a very insignificant one; and however high it may shoot up in the course of civilization, if the neighboring palace rises in equal or even in greater measure, the occupant of the relatively little house will always find himself more uncomfortable, more dissatisfied, more cramped within his four walls. (p.10)

Though this is certainly a psychological process that shapes the needs and desires of individuals, this process is itself shaped by the economic base of any given society. As societies change, as the friction of class struggle produces inequality between groups, what people understand as necessary to survive also changes (Rākete, 2019). As discussed in chapter four, before the arrival of Pākehā, there was no real class division—and therefore no notable inequality—within hapū and iwi Māori. The same cannot be said of the years since, including the era that is the topic of this chapter.

In places where there was little contact between Māori and Pākehā, the Native schools and their teacher cottages, with neat English gardens and teachers dressed in much finer clothing than their students, with blankets and wood-fire stoves, with pots and pans and books, were a vivid illustration of what Māori life *could* look like.Though wood could be obtained for housing and furniture easily enough, iron nails and later glass to create a home or a church in the style of the Pākehā had to be purchased. Pākehā clothing could not be made on the kāinga without purchasing Pākehā tools (eg., looms) for creating suitable fabric, or the fabric itself. To purchase these things, things that were now necessary to maintain and develop their communities, hapū needed money. To get money, they needed to sell the commodities they produced, and to get enough money to buy the things they needed, they needed to produce much more than what they had traditionally needed to survive. Creating the means of their subsistence was becoming increasingly incorporated—subsumed—into capital.

The Native and Māori church boarding schools acted to adjust tamariki and rangatahi Māori to their future as part of settler-colonial capitalism. These schools, like the mission

schools before them, were ideological tools used by both religious leaders and the new colonial state to shape Māori into the roles that were required for the expansion of capital. The Native and Māori church boarding schools did this not only through their pedagogy and teaching content, but through their very environment as small Pākehā worlds built specifically to assimilate Māori into Christian Pākehā capitalism. The schools aimed to unravel Māori conceptions of gender relations, of work and leisure, of culture and language, and particularly of communal living and economic relations with each other and the natural world. In the following chapter, I will examine the genesis of the state and church child welfare system in this same time period, beginning with the *Neglected and Criminal Children Act 1867.* I will consider the role of industrial schools, borstal, orphanages, adoption, and the child welfare legislation, policy, and practice of this era, and how these influenced settler-colonial capitalism in Aotearoa.

7. Early Child Welfare 1867-1939

The earliest iteration of New Zealand's state care and protection system was built on Pākehā anxiety around the social and moral decline of Pākehā citizens and fears of potential "race suicide" (Cheyne et al., 2005; Dalley, 1998). Along with the formation of the Native school's system explored in the last chapter, the mid-to-late 1800s also saw the rapid expansion of all forms of public institutions and systems that were created by both the state and private charities (Cheyne et al., 2005; Dalley, 1998). From the 1880s, charitable assistance to the destitute, provincial hospitals and asylums, church homes, and the first pensions to elderly citizens were cornerstones of early New Zealand welfare history (Dalley, 1998). Historian Bronwyn Dalley (1998) argued that this social assistance was purposefully austere to "discourage the proliferation of the undesirable" (p.14). Similarly, Cheyne et al. (2005) said that in the earliest days, "[e]ven the existence of such institutions was resisted by settlers as evidence that pauperism had found its way into the colony" (p.24). However, even this meagre assistance was mostly only available to Pākehā, as popular sentiment at the time wrongly conceptualised Māori as privileged landowners and non-Pākehā tauiwi as not true colonial citizens (Cheyne et al., 2005). It was from within this context that our early child welfare system was born.

Meloni (2016) argued that the various emerging and traditional political ideologies across Europe and the former and current European colonies in the late 19th and early 20th century were united in their broad acceptance of ideas of heredity and eugenics. State and private intervention in the lives of citizens in both the imperial core and the colonies was beginning to be seen as necessary and even desirable to support the European races in their global military and political dominance (Lane, 1989; Meloni, 2016). The soaring popularity of eugenics and racial fitness around the European colonial world took hold in New Zealand, and was a significant driver of early social policy and private charity, particularly in regards to Pākehā maternal and children's health (Cheyne et al., 2005; Dalley, 1998; Lane, 1989). In New Zealand, this was demonstrated by a new middle-class interest in the welfare of the children of the poor and immiserated (Lane, 1989). A proliferation of private charities that focused on maternal morality and scientific child rearing like Barnardos and the Plunket Society soon followed the introduction of these ideas (Bryder, 2001). Truby King, the founder of the Plunket Society, openly supported the idea that the preservation of the British Empire required healthy Pākehā children to carry the imperial project and the white race into the future (Bryder, 2001). The new colonial state entrenched the ideology of racial fitness in law, and the principle of forcibly separating children from the perceived immorality of unmarried mothers, Māori foster parents, poor families, and other subjects of the Crown's moral judgements was the foundation of the early child welfare system that is the focus of this chapter.

In this chapter I will begin with an examination and comparison of the Māori practices of whāngai and atawhai and the early colonial legislation regarding private fostering and adoption in this time. This section also illustrates some of the common political discourse of Māori parenting and the differing restrictions placed on Māori and Pākehā adoptive families. The second section of this chapter has an analysis of the industrial and reformatory school system, which formed the basis of state care in this era. Here I examine the laws and practices that still maintain an influence on our current child welfare system today. I conclude the chapter with a consideration of the largely invisible relationship between Māori and the early child welfare system pre-1939. At the time of writing, the restrictions on public records of all kinds relating to this topic, as well as the even more inaccessible and scattered texts from private orphanages and industrial schools, make it difficult to create a more in-depth picture of Māori and the child welfare system before 1939.

Whāngai, Atawhai, Fostering, and Adoption

The *Adoption of Children Act 1881* was one of the earliest pieces of New Zealand legislation to concern the lives of children outside of the education system. However, compared to the long-standing traditional practices of whāngai and atawhai among whānau and hapū Māori, Pākehā adoptions facilitated by the state are merely a recent and radical practice (Newman, 2020). Erica Newman (tangata Māori—iwi unknown, 2020) described whāngai and atawhai as similar methods of caring for tamariki Māori between different whānaunga and kāinga that could be either temporary or permanent depending on the needs and desires of the original and whāngai whānau, and the wider hapū and iwi. The concepts of whāngai and atawhai are fundamentally different from Western conceptions of adoption, as tamariki always maintained the knowledge and connection to their whakapapa and original whānau, even in circumstances where the arrangement was permanent (Mead, 1997; Newman, 2020). The centrality of whakapapa to Māori both communal and individual identity as well as ties to whenua meant that the importance of the genealogical links between tamaiti whāngai and their birth whānau could not be hidden, denigrated, or extinguished among whāngai whānau (Newman, 2020).

According to Hirini Moko Mead (Ngāti Awa, Ngāti Tūwharetoa, Ngāi Tūhoe, & Tūhourangi, 1997), raising a tamaiti whāngai entailed “nurturing, educating, providing opportunities to grow up as a healthy individual with one’s mauri strong, one’s mana secure and one’s tapu intact” (p.207). Whāngai and atawhai arrangements were made for several reasons, including the illness or death of whānau caregivers, to maintain whakapapa ties between wider hapū or iwi relatives, or as a taonga to whānau where people were struggling to conceive (Newman, 2020). In chapter four I discussed how the communal structure of whānau and hapū Māori made it incredibly unlikely that children would be neglected, abused, or deserted without other whānau members to care for them, and this thread

connects to the practices of whāngai and atawhai. Newman (2020) noted that whāngai was originally recognised as an acceptable custom within the *New Zealand Constitution Act 1852*, but was later deemed ripe for legal regulation in the early 20th century through the Native Land Courts. Pākehā adoption was also informal until the passing of the *Adoption of Children Act 1881* (Gillard-Glass & England, 2002). At this time, contracts between birth and adoptive parents were sometimes created in an attempt to ensure the child could not be removed back into the care of their birth parents (Gillard-Glass & England, 2002). However, these contracts were not legally binding, as "the courts held that a birth mother could not transfer her rights or obligations" (Gillard-Glass & England, 2002, p.21).

Newman (2020) found that ideas regarding the survival and "civilising" of Māori requiring the removal of Māori children from their whānau and living with Pākehā families was present in political rhetoric as early as the 1850s. Newman (2020) used the following quote from a newspaper article titled *On the causes of decay among the New Zealand race* (1852) as an example of the discourse surrounding the adoption of Māori children into Pākehā families in the young colony:

> It is only necessary to look at a young Maori child which has been brought up in the house of a European and has been looked after by a European woman to see the beneficial effect which cleanliness, ease, and good food, would have on the whole New Zealand Race. The puny limbs of the young savage grow stout, the protuberant belly disappears, the languishing eye becomes bright, the face chubby and the complexion so clear that you can trace the blush of its red blood through its olive coloured skin. (p. 2)

Though this highly emotive and deeply political text focuses on the welfare and health of tamariki Māori rather than their moral and social development, it is otherwise indistinguishable from the rhetoric used by missionaries, politicians, and legislators to justify the existence of mission and Māori church boarding schools since the earliest days of colonisation, as discussed across chapters seven and eight. Ironically, the malady described in this editorial piece is malnutrition, a condition that would be unlikely in the extreme to be suffered by an individual child in isolation, as all resources were shared communally (Kawharu, 1977; Mikaere, 2017). Malnutrition certainly existed in pre-colonial Māori times, however, malnutrition in that period was the result of a failed harvest or a lack of food resources in the natural environment (Walker, 2004). If Māori children were suffering malnutrition in 1852, the cause was more likely to be the displacement and dispossession caused by the brutal wars of imperialist aggression that had just alienated Māori from their whenua and resources.

Despite the heated rhetoric above, records of Māori children being adopted into Pākehā families before the 20th century are rare, and Pākehā children living as tamaiti

whāngai with whānau Māori even more so (Newman, 2020). Unsurprisingly, the adoption and attempted adoption of Pākehā children by Māori in this era was scandalous when it did occur, with accusations of current or future neglect and immorality common in newspaper reporting (Newman, 2020). For tamariki Māori who also had Pākehā whakapapa, it was expected that they should be adopted by extended Pākehā family or placed in Pākehā institutions like industrial schools or orphanages should the European parent pass away (Newman, 2020). Newman (2020) argued that this reflected the idea that Māori children with Pākehā ancestry deserved what was thought of by Pākehā as a more respectable and civilised life than other tamariki Māori. As I examined in chapter five, this idea was fervently supported by many politicians and missionaries of the 19th century, particularly Reverend John Morgan. The increasing number of children with both Māori and Pākehā whakapapa in the 19th and early 20th century made this a clear anxiety for the colony. This had both an assimilative and economic aspect, as Māori children with Pākehā whakapapa had the potential to claim inheritance to not only their whenua Māori, but also any property of the Pākehā parent (Newman, 2020). The same was true of all Māori children adopted by Pākehā parents. A Māori child firmly rooted in te ao Māori claiming their Pākehā inheritance to land represented a real threat to the settler-colonial capitalist regime.

A core facet of early adoption legislation was to clarify the inheritance of adopted Pākehā children (Newman, 2020), who were now legally entitled to inherit the property of their birth parents as next of kin (Adoption of Children Act 1881). Though it became necessary to register whāngai among Māori in 1901, it was not until the *Native Land Act 1909* that the Pākehā court system had the control over approving or denying the adoption of Māori children by Māori parents (Gillard-Glass & England, 2002). Part IX of the *Native Land Act 1909* also stipulated that "[n]o person other than a Native or a descendant of a Native shall be capable of being adopted by a Native" (s164). This made the adoption of Pākehā or tauiwi children by Māori parents illegal. Of course, the reverse was never made illegal nor dissuaded either by legislation or societal pressure (Gillard-Glass & England, 2002). Adoption law for Māori parents remained under the control of the Native Land Courts until 1955 (Gillard-Glass & England, 2002). However, for Pākehā adoptive or foster parents of Māori children, jurisdiction lay with the mainstream child welfare and adoption legislation (Gillard-Glass & England, 2002).

Industrial Schools and Reformatories

The *Neglected and Criminal Children Act 1867* gave the early New Zealand provinces the power to create and financially maintain industrial schools and reformatories for the detainment of children and young people who were deemed to be neglected or criminal. Some private religious industrial schools, like the school at the Ōtawhao mission run by Reverend John Morgan, already existed. These schools were largely independent from the

state in the 19th century, though they were subject to audit by the provincial Government (Neglected and Criminal Children Act 1867), with some later becoming provincial or state schools (Beagle, 1974). Neglected children under this law had a very broad meaning, including those who had been caught begging; homeless children; children who had been seen wandering with no caregiver; children who lived with sex workers, drunkards, or thieves; children who had been charged with a criminal offence but were deemed too young for a reformatory; and children whose parents considered them uncontrollable. Any constable who witnessed a child in one of the above situations could arrest a child or young person without warrant and remove them to the nearest Justices of the Peace (Neglected and Criminal Children Act 1867). Dalley (1998) suggested that the two sides to this Act represent the competing public viewpoints common to the British Empire at the time of children as helpless and in need of protection from society on the one hand; and children as a threat to good social order on the other. Through this legislation, the Crown now took an active role in "deciding who was, and was not, fit to be a parent" (Newman, 2020, p.50).

The earliest of the state-run industrial schools were in Auckland and Dunedin (Caversham). They accepted girls of all ages and young boys, with the Canterbury reformatories detaining the delinquent girls at Te Oranga and boys at Burnham (Dalley, 1998). The lives of the children detained in such institutions were lonely and cruel, especially for children who did not receive visitors (Beagle, 1974; Dalley, 1998). The buildings themselves were "large dormitory-like barrack structures, often located on the outskirts of towns to keep recalcitrant youngsters away from public view" (Dalley, 1998, p.17). Beagle (1974) described Te Oranga as having a "prison-like atmosphere", with "grim buildings, twelve-foot high fence and locked cells" (p.72). While the industrial schools had, at least in theory, a dual focus on both education and industrial training like agricultural and domestic labour, the reformatories were almost entirely focused on punitive work. Later inquiries into the Burnham and Te Oranga reformatories divulged instances of excessive seclusion and violent punishment, of the young people being forced to "pull up tree-stumps and farming unyielding land", with many teachers describing their jobs as "pointless" (Dalley, 1998, p.29). Conditions in private institutions were equally dire. A review into Nelson's St Mary's Orphanage (an industrial school in all but name) in the year 1899 revealed over a hundred boys being overworked, receiving insufficient care and food, excessively violent corporal punishment, and the use of solitary confinement in dark cells (Dalley, 1998).

Though a focus on the care of children with disabilities is outside the scope of this research, it is critical to note that these children were also part of the industrial and religious home child welfare system. The Otekaike Special School for Boys opened in 1908 and was focused on the care of boys with cognitive or psychiatric disabilities, and joined the two existing schools for disabled children, an Auckland school for blind children and one in

Christchurch for the deaf (Beagle, 1974; Dalley, 1998). A special school for girls in Richmond opened in 1916 as a partner to Otekaike, and a later farm school for older boys in Templeton (Bardsley, 2001). Before the establishment of these institutions, children and young people that were perceived as being feebleminded or backward were held in asylums with the adult population. Bardsley (2001) stated that the primary driver for these schools—and a singular hospital home for children in Nelson—was not to care for children that society deemed unfit for public life, but rather to hide them until they could either be reformed or transition into adult institutional care. The special schools and the Templeton farm school would not accept children with more pronounced disabilities, as they required the children to work as farmers, carpenters, sewers, and in other duties to support the maintenance of the school (Bardsley, 2001). The children that could not meet these standards were sent back to their families, to the hospital home in Nelson, or back to adult asylums, with many eventually ending up in prison (Bardsley, 2001).

Several amendments to the *Neglected and Criminal Children Act 1867* and reforms of the industrial and reformatory system happened over the fifty years following its passage into law (Beagle, 1974; Dalley, 1998; Newman, 2020). Following the turn of the century, more state industrial schools for boys were opened in Levin (Weraroa Boys' Training Farm) and in Oamaru (the Otekaike Special School for Boys). Other formerly private institutions, like the above St Mary's Orphanage, were later absorbed by the state (Dalley, 1998). The increasing number of children entering state care required transitional receiving homes where children would be housed until they were placed in an industrial school, or during transfer from one to another (Beagle, 1974). Children as young as seven years old that were deemed to be criminal would instead be sent to adult jails and prisons until there was space in an industrial school or reformatory (Beagle, 1974). In 1881, 41 children under ten years old, and 93 between ten and 15 years were placed in prisons (Beagle, 1974). By 1916, most of the industrial schools had responsibility for hundreds of children, with the majority of those considered "neglected" being boarded out to private homes and businesses (Dalley, 1998).

The legal justification for boarding out—which was premised on positive socialisation in community care at no financial burden to the foster parent—was first laid in the *Master and Apprentice Act 1865*. This Act legally bound children older than 12 as indentured labour to farmers, tradesmen, or state institution for between three and seven years depending on their trade. The Act also allowed for tradesmen contracted by the Government to "take and receive such and so many apprentices as he may require to serve under him and his respective successors in office" (Master and Apprentice Act 1865, s5). Though the *Master and Apprentice Act 1865* made provision for parents to apply for their children to become indentured to a Master, the Act largely focused on orphaned children in private institutions. Davidson (2004) considered this Act an early attempt to combat the growing number of

deserted and orphaned children following booming Pākehā settlement. For children, the punishment for desertion from their post could be up to three months in jail. For the Master, the punishment for ill-treatment or neglect was a fine. Boys over 14 years that had been bound as apprentices could also suffer three days of solitary confinement for disobedience or misbehaviour (Davidson, 2004). Boarding out, though less transparently focused on child labour, was a direct successor to the practice and policy of this Act.

Dalley (1998) and Lane (1989) argued that boarding out had both a socialising and fiscally pragmatic aspect. The espoused end goal of the industrial schools was not to institutionalise young people, but to return them back into society as useful citizens and capable workers (Lane, 1989). Boarding out hugely reduced the cost of running these schools, as the children and young people did not need to be fed or cared for directly by the state, with foster families receiving a stipend much lower than the cost of institutional care (Lane, 1989). Of course, the families and business owners who sponsored the children outside of these institutions also benefited, as these young people were expected to work as labourers or domestic servants (Dalley, 1998). Many boarded-out children over the age of 12 years were doing adult work, and were legally permitted to perform up to 12 hours of labour per day (Lane, 1989). Younger foster children were also allowed to work, but were required to be on lighter duties (Lane, 1989). The use of boarding out also had a third feature in reifying the ideology and economic impetus of liberal capitalism. The liberal state of the late 19th and early 20th century, like the rest of the British Empire and its former and contemporary colonies of the time, stressed individual responsibility over that of the community or state (Cheyne et al., 2005). The broad political view of the time was that "[m]oral virtue was made of self-help and needing assistance was seen as a symptom of personal failing" (Cheyne et al., 2005, p.24). Through work, these children were contributing to their care and were pulling themselves up by their proverbial bootstraps, rather than remaining a drain on state coffers (Lane, 1989).

Child Welfare Legislation 1893-1925

The combination of the boarding out system through the state, as well as private agreements between birth and adoptive or foster families that had a financial element, led to state supervision and intervention in the conditions of orphanages and foster homes (Gillard-Glass & England, 2002). "Baby-farming" scandals, whereby foster parents would adopt or foster the infants and toddlers of single mothers or families otherwise unable to care for their babies and neglect or purposefully harm them, were common in the late 19th century colonial world (Dalley, 1998; Gillard-Glass & England, 2002). The economic and social pressure on single mothers, particularly unwed mothers, was a driving factor of the popularity of baby farming (Dalley, 1998; Lane, 1989). In 1893, the Commissioner of Police, Arthur Hume, stated that he knew of 20 baby farms in the Canterbury district alone (Beagle, 1974). The

Infant Life Protection Act 1893 was an early state response to baby farming, and required that all foster homes that cared for very young children must be licensed and subject to state inspection. This Act also outlawed the receipt of money to care for a foster or adoptive child under two years old unless the foster home was registered. A much clearer moral and legal focus on both unwed single mothers and their children, as well as child abuse and neglect emerged through a series of reforms that culminated in the *Infant Act 1908* (Lane, 1989). This Act gave the state the legal power to decide if unwed mothers, either single or widowed, were fit to care for their children (Lane, 1989). The influence of this legislation would go on to have a formative influence on child welfare law until 1975 (Dalley, 1998).

The popularity of industrial schools had plummeted by the early 20th century, and despite cyclical reforms to policy and practice required a significant overhaul to return them to public favour (Dalley, 1998). According to Dalley (1998), views on children were changing to regard them as “investments for the future and the wellspring of continued racial health” (p.69). To this end, three major changes occurred in industrial schools (now called special schools) and reformatory system: a massive focus on boarding out and fostering children; the building up of the probation system; and the introduction of the *Child Welfare Act 1925* (Dalley, 1998). During World War I, the number of children in special schools and reformatories became untenable, leading to increasingly dire environmental conditions. At the same time, the number of staff dropped precipitously, leaving a higher number of children and young people under a smaller amount of supervision and care, and working with reduced resources from a wartime Government (Dalley, 1998). The Christchurch reformatories of Burnham and Te Oranga were closed in 1917—against great public controversy—with the former inmates released to labour or domestic service or transferred to special schools. In particular, the closure of Te Oranga endured significant backlash from the Christchurch public fearing the influence of the perceived sexual immorality of the former residents (Lane, 1989). Several special schools were also closed, and others transformed into receiving homes, where children and young people would be assessed for suitability for boarding out and—it was hoped—avoid institutionalisation at all (Dalley, 1998).

One of the most important changes of the *Child Welfare Act 1925* was the introduction of a distinct youth justice system. Though the separation between neglected and delinquent children had been made nearly 60 years prior with the *Neglected and Criminal Children Act 1867*, the new Act divorced the judicial pathways for these young people from the moment they came before the Court system (Dalley, 1998). The *Child Welfare Act 1925* introduced separate children’s courts that were protected from public view, and also expanded the system of both paid and voluntary child welfare officers and probation officers. Whereas child welfare officers supervised and reported on the welfare of children and young people who had been boarded out, fostered, or adopted in the community, probation officers

originally had legal powers equal to the Police and could forcibly remove children from their foster homes and take them to jail or Court (Dalley, 1998). Child welfare officers were largely middle-class Pākehā women, many of whom were unpaid workers in charity organisations (Dalley, 1998). These officers had diverse responsibilities, including “court appearances, supervision, inspections of foster homes and private institutions, and investigations into the details of family life” (Dalley, 1998, p.97). Child welfare officers were also responsible for reporting on the home conditions of single mothers with illegitimate children (Lane, 1989). The expansion of this system into rural areas in the 1930s is where Māori communities first came to the attention of the state and private child welfare system in any notable numbers (Dalley, 1998).

Māori and Early Child Welfare

Dalley (1998) found that tamariki and rangatahi Māori were a “tiny minority” (p.24) of children who came into the care of the early child welfare system. However, this may have been difficult to prove, as some of the earliest available records of industrial schools, such as the *Register of Past Inmates 1883-1896* (Department of Education, 1896) and *Record of Children Boarded Out 1885-1886* (Department of Education, 1886) did not record ethnicity. A lack of identifiably Māori names is not necessarily proof that Māori children were absent from these institutions, especially in the context of colonisation and assimilation. Māori research has also shown that until World War II, most Māori lived in areas that were largely isolated from the Pākehā world, including the eye of the child welfare system (Walker, 2004). When Māori did come to the attention of child welfare in this era, Dalley (1998) stated that it was preferred by the Court they be sent to private religious institutions rather than those run by the state, and as such records of Māori in care are few. The only notable mention of Māori and the child child welfare system before World War II is in the thesis *Child or Chattel?: The Boarding Out System, 1900 to 1938, with Special Reference to the Auckland Region* by Kathryn Lane (1989). Importantly, this is a historical work with a highly critical sociological lens, and focuses primarily on the economic and ideological institution of the family and the use of child labour in foster families.

Lane (1989) argued that there was disagreement and unrest from Māori communities about the fostering of tamariki Māori with Pākehā families under the care of industrial and later special schools. She noted that the Akarana Maori Association in particular was sceptical of the deeper intentions behind tamariki Māori being sent to live away from whānau and hāpori Māori. The suspicion among Māori at the time was that: “[i]f orphans and delinquents could be moulded into hard-working, law-abiding and healthy citizens through being put in foster or probationary care, then it was possible that Maori children could be made to become good ‘brown-skinned Pakehas’” (Lane, 1989, p.33). Lane (1989) stated that the Akarana Maori Association understood the system as a form of “racial imperialism”

(p.33), and that Pākehā farmers and business owners were profiting from the use of Māori "cheap labour" (p.49). In one case illustrated in a letter from the president of the Akarana Maori Association, George Graham (1930), to the Minister of Education, a Māori mother complained that her children had been uplifted from her care by the court and boarded-out without her consent or knowledge. This suggests that Māori were not absent from this system as the very clear gaps in research and commentary might lead us to conclude, but rather that they were *made* invisible through decades of reporting and research that did not think to look for them. Despite this perceived lack of contact between the child child welfare system of the time and whānau Māori, this emerging order would go on to have dire consequences for Māori.

The *Neglected and Criminal Children Act 1867* legislated the first aspect of Crown judgement and control over children, families, and parenting. This Act also made both moral and legal distinctions between innocent children who were deemed in need of care because they were neglected or ill-treated, and delinquent children who required correcting for anti-social or criminal behaviour, although these would not be formalised until the passage of the *Child Welfare Act 1925*. The focus on individual parental morality and care—and *particularly* maternal morality and care—across all of the early child welfare legislation has been foundational to the way our care and protection system has operated for more than a century. As early as 1867, judgements by the provincial government regarding dilapidated environments and financial hardship in an era with little reliable social welfare other than charity could result in children being removed from their homes and families and placed into institutions or middle class families. Lane (1989) argued that the child welfare legislation and practices of this era were tantamount to class warfare upon the working class people. She stated that "[t]he ideas by 'liberals' that children of the 'lumpen prolitariat' [sic] could be raised or rehabilitated into valuable, productive and law-abiding citizens, were connected to the desire to control the masses" (p.7).

The individualising narrative that runs through the child welfare practices and laws of a century past are the same that form the basis of our care and protection system today. Whānau Māori are no longer isolated from the grasp of state surveillance and intervention, and are instead its prime targets. The class warfare that Lane (1989) described has a clear racial aspect both historically and in the modern day. In the next chapter, I will weave together the strands of the early child care and protection system, the Native and Māori church boarding school system, and the early missionary period in a final discussion of how these contributed to settler-colonial capitalism in New Zealand.

8. Weaving These Many Threads

> For a while she was happy and we played together, then when it was near time to go to school again she became sick and couldn't eat. Her throat closed and wouldn't let any food go down. Her skin was moist all the time and she couldn't get out of bed.
>
> Not long after that she died.
>
> Killed by school.
>
> Dead of fear.
>
> My heart broke for my teina. Oh I cried. She was mine, she was me, she was all of us. She was the one who had died but we were the ones affected, our shame taking generations to become our anger and our madness. (Grace, 1998, p.38)

This research consists of three separate but connected strands. The strands that make up this tāniko need to be woven together to understand the full pattern. The first strand of this tāniko is the arrival of the missionaries and their mission schools. It was the missionaries who first introduced the idea of removing tamariki Māori from their whānau for the supposed benefit of Māori within the British Empire.This betterment, to missionary and colonial eyes, looked like the total assimilation of Māori into Pākehā social and economic systems, and the eradication of traditional pre-colonial Māori ways of life. As early as the 1820s, missionaries were encouraging the boarding of tamariki and rangatahi Māori away from their whānau and hapū in missionary schools where they would be totally immersed in te ao Pākehā. These schools were constructed to gain greater control over how Māori lived in and understood the world and their relationships with each other, with Pākehā, and with the natural and spiritual worlds. Some whānau and hapū Māori embraced these new institutions, as through them they gained access to reading, writing, the English language, and Pākehā technology that they could incorporate into their own lives. However, Māori entered these relationships with missionaries with the expectation that the benefit would be reciprocal, and not used as an eventual gateway for colonisation. When many Māori came to see the underlying assimilatory purpose of the mission schools—such as Ngāpuhi and the Waikato-Tainui confederation during the New Zealand Wars—most were deserted.

The second strand of the pattern is the Native and Māori church boarding schools following the *Native Schools Act 1867*. This legislation empowered the creation of a national network of Native schools that were nominally based on agreements between the Crown and individual hapū or a small group of related hapū. This era also saw a small group of elite Māori church boarding schools that were predominantly in areas that had been mostly loyal to the Crown. These two aspects of the Māori school system, one essentially controlled by the Kāwanatanga, and one by the Anglican and Catholic churches of New Zealand, tried to entrench Pākehā social, economic, and political dominance over Te Ika a Māui and Te Waipounamu. These schools were part of a *system*, and even the private religious schools

were still subjected to Government oversight. As such, the policies and ideology that tamariki and rangatahi Māori were subjected to through these schools were *systemic* and part of a clear national assimilative plan. The schools and Pākehā teachers themselves were required to be models of good, Christian, Pākehā society and to influence the Māori communities where they resided. The Native and Māori church boarding schools were more than simply "civilising" agents that were built to create acceptable Māori colonial citizens who would be absorbed into Pākehā society. These schools were intended to be agents of total social, cultural and economic change on a national scale. The Native and Māori church boarding schools socialised Māori into the roles expected of them in the colonial world: an underclass of agricultural producers, domestic servants, and labourers; obedient Christian wives and mothers raising tamariki that fit neatly into te ao Pākehā; or Māori community leaders that were supportive of the Crown and Empire.

The final strand of this research is the formation and implementation of the early child child welfare system that encompassed both state and private child welfare. It was through this system that the Crown first gained control over defining what was or was not acceptable parenting. This system was not used predominantly against Māori, as Māori remained mostly in isolated rural areas out of the grasp of the Courts, Police, and child welfare officers. However, early child welfare had a clear class aspect. This system entrenched the liberal views of the era that conceptualised poverty and struggle as individual problems that were caused by poor choices or moral defecit. The punishment for poor parents or those that otherwise did not meet the moral standard of the time was the removal of their children who would mostly be placed in state industrial schools. The *Neglected and Criminal Children Act 1867* became the foundation for the split care and protection and youth justice system that exists today. The use of reformatories for young people that were considered juvenile delinquents began the New Zealand tradition of criminalising and institutionalising children and adolescents that had been made victims of unjust social and economic structures. This early system had a clear emphasis on shaping children under its care to be morally upstanding and productive workers, first through the use of industrial training in institutions, and later through placing the young people with families and businesses who expected them to work for their keep. Also during this era, the Crown forced its control over fostering practices among Māori that had been alive for centuries. The state gave itself the power to determine the suitability of whānau Māori in caring for their whāngai tamariki.

When we view these three threads woven together as a tāniko, the pattern they create emerges. These threads are not separate, but are connected—through the British Empire and its colony of New Zealand, through white supremacy and the hoped-for destruction of Māori social and economic relationships, and through its attempted replacement in settler-colonial capitalism. The pattern of tāniko is full of repetition. The same

design is carefully duplicated over and over, woven through the length and width of the fabric with absolute attention. The same is true of the three aspects I have examined in this research. The missionary era, the Native and Māori church boarding schools, and the early child welfare system repeat the same patterns throughout their whakapapa. It was the same capitalist impetus that birthed these three ideas, the same drive for imperialist domination of Indigenous peoples and lands to be exploited for profit and power. The two core aspects of this pattern I will discuss next are the attempted ideological control that supposedly aimed to transform Māori into "brown-skinned Pākehā", and the economic reasons why the social, cultural, and economic transformation of Māori was considered necessary for the advancement of the settler-colony.

Ideology and Hegemony

The theory of cultural hegemony (Gramsci, 1971) argued that modern societies are organised not through force, but through ideology. The ruling class of society—in this case, the capitalist class—exercises control over the lower classes by creating and reproducing a shared set of values, beliefs, practices, and ideas that support their political and economic goals. Critiquing and advancing this idea, Althusser (1977) explains that ideology functions according to the needs of the economy through repressive and ideological state apparatuses. Repressive state apparatuses (RSAs) are the arms of the capitalist state that control ideology through violent or administrative force, such as the justice system or the child care and protection system. Ideological state apparatuses (ISAs) shape ideology through institutions like religion, education, and the media. Importantly, neither ideology nor cultural hegemony are totalising or static—both are contested as part of class struggle (Gramsci, 1971). One of the most prominent narratives of assimilation in this country is that of the attempted civilising of Māori through institutions like mission and Native schools (Barrington, 2008; May, 2007; May et al, 2014; Simon & Smith, 2001; Walker, 2016; etc etc), through intensive propaganda campaigns in churches and newspapers (Paterson, 2006), and the use of later policies that aimed to break apart collective whānau and hapū structures like placing isolated whānau Māori in Pākehā neighbourhoods (Walker, 2004).

The civilising mission—to reform Māori into colonial citizens that were but for their phenotypical presentation indistinguishable from Pākehā—was certainly one powerful ideological aspect of assimilation. Gramsci's (1971) idea of hegemony would argue that by becoming absorbed peacefully into te ao Pākehā by these means, the colony could advance without costly and destructive wars and without ongoing racial and political tension. By adapting to Pākehā society and by being forced to eliminate all the distinctive aspects of their "Māoriness", Māori would theoretically join the Pākehā citizens of New Zealand in civilised society. The reality, however, is that the global imperialist project does not require nor promote an equal society for all when once this level of civilisation has been achieved.

Despite forced assimilation and the near eradication of te reo Māori and pre-colonial Māori life, Māori remained a racialised underclass that were seen as fit mainly for agricultural or domestic labour (Simon & Smith, 2001). The intention was not to turn Māori into brown-skinned Pākehā, but to make Māori more palatable and amenable to te ao Pākehā while they lived in a land that became dominated by racist class oppression.

Stamping out Māori communism was essential to transforming Māori social and economic systems in the capitalist Pākehā vision (Barber, 2019; Poata-Smith, 2001). However, the New Zealand Wars had been hugely costly, and the destructive Crown campaign had nearly bankrupted the new colony by less than thirty years following the signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi (O'Malley, 2019). By waging a quieter but equally coercive ideological campaign, the Crown could avoid both the criticism from religious and somewhat socialist Pākehā circles both in New Zealand and elsewhere in the British Empire. One of the key aspects of the ideological settler-colonial capitalist endeavour was to make Māori fundamentally reimagine their identities and societies as individualist, rather than collective. This was attempted through every iteration of Māori schooling in the post-Cook, pre-World War II era (Simon & Smith, 2001; Walker, 2016); in every sermon or newspaper article that preached self-reliance and the "natural" order of the nuclear family and the roles within it (Mikaere, 2017; Jenkins, 1986; Paterson, 2006); and through the Pākehā legal system imposed on Māori (Jackson, 1988; Ministerial Advisory Committee, 1988).

The internalisation of individualist Pākehā social and cultural norms atomised hapū and iwi Māori, obscuring whakapapa to the living and dead, as well as the importance of ancestral relationships to whenua, awa, and moana (Mikaere, 2017; Walker, 2004). The tearing apart of Māori collectivism would create not only a foothold, but a ladder for the implementation of settler-colonial capitalism. First and most importantly for early capitalism in New Zealand, it made for easier access to whenua Māori and all the tāonga that thrive on and within Papatūānuku. An unrelenting psychological operation that sprung from every facet of early Pākehā society told Māori that prioritising their own or their family's individual gain over the wellbeing of their hapū was the best and only way to survive in this rapidly changing world (Mikaere, 2017). The earliest mechanisms of the Native Land Court that only allowed for ten owners per land title sealed this in law (Mohi, 2020).

The hegemonic campaign was also necessary to shape Māori into the underclass of agricultural and domestic labourers the British Empire sorely needed, particularly before the widespread settlement of Pākehā in these islands. Throughout the mission, Native, and Māori church boarding schools, as well as what we know of the industrial schools, reformatories, and orphanages of the pre-World War II era, there was a concentrated effort on preparing young Māori for the roles capitalism required of them. Tamariki and rangatahi Māori were trained physically and technically for these tasks, but more importantly these

institutions prepared them psychologically and socially into accepting a future as proletarians or agricultural producers working for Pākehā farmers, wealthy settlers, and business owners. Most of these institutions aimed to isolate young Māori from their communities and more generally the influence of the outside world, and all of them endeavoured to instantiate them in the norms, values, and practices of te ao Pākehā. The white supremacist ideological bombardment that Māori were subjected to in this era was intended to make Māori accept that the Pākehā way of life, their knowledge, their social, cultural, political, and economic world was inherently superior to Māori and the only option for Māori survival. This ideology did not spring into the world without its own whakapapa—it was shaped by and in turn influenced the economic base of the imperialist mode of production, capitalism (Althusser, 1977).

The Economic Base of Early Colonial New Zealand

> Capital, arriving in Aotearoa with the nation-state and European laws in tow, insinuates itself between Rangi and Papa and forces a nuptial with the earth. (Barber, 2019, p. 56)

To examine the relationship between the ideological and political mechanisms of the settler-colony and their relationship with capitalism, we return to Althusser's (1977) model of the house illustrating the economic base and superstructure. The ISA's of the Māori schools throughout the missionary and Native school's era (May et al., 2014; Simon & Smith, 2001), the family (Mikaere, 2017; Pere, 1987; Jenkins, 1987), the religious doctrine espoused by the Anglican and Catholic church (Davidson, 2004), and the newspapers and books rewriting and exoticising Māori life (Paterson, 2006; Mikaere, 2017) make up the top floor of this whare. Like any house, the lower floor and foundation must be strong to support this top floor up in the wind and rain. The ground floor in Althusser's (1977) example is the politico-legal level, the Government and the laws and courts that are used to administer state control over people and Papatūānuku. In this research, this level is primarily the Crown and its many arms of state power following Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the annexation of this whenua, however, even before 1840 the British Empire and it's agents were already attempting to instill this control over Aotearoa. These two floors make up the superstructure that rest on the foundation of the economic base, the mode of production that supports the house. This is what Althusser (1977) also calls the substructure, and it is not always immediately visible as a determining factor in the functioning of the ideological and politico-legal superstructure, as it appears as simply another aspect of life that is no more or less important than, for instance, laws or cultural practices.

Marx (1990) and later Marxists (Althusser, 1977; Gramsci, 1971) warned against economic determinism that argues for a simple unidirectional relationship between the economic base and the superstructure of society. The economic base creates the foundation

for the superstructure and is the largest factor in shaping it (Althusser, 1977). In turn, both the politico-legal and ideological aspects of society's structure act as mechanisms to maintain the economic base, while they also shape and mold it, although their influence is not so dominant (Althusser, 1977). An explicit example of this in Aotearoa is the laws and policies surrounding the administration of Māori land law in the 19th and 20th centuries, starting with Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Instilled in Te Tiriti o Waitangi was the promise to protect Māori land and people from exploitation by settler avarice (Mikaere, 2017; Orange, 1997), which certainly acts against the interests of liberal capitalism and the necessity of primitive accumulation to capitalist dominance (Marx, 1990). In 1840, Crown control over Aotearoa was far from ensured (Poata-Smith, 2001). However, after Pākehā political and legal control had been more firmly established in the aftermath of the New Zealand Wars, the Native Land Court was created to aid in the mass transfer of Māori land to Pākehā ownership (Mohi, 2020). The several legislative reforms of the Native Land Court that followed went back and forth in favour of protecting the interests of Māori or of facilitating settler access to land (Mohi, 2020). However, in *practice* the more protectionist aspects of these laws were not implemented, with the Courts almost always making judicial or administrative decisions that were detrimental to Māori collective ownership (Mohi, 2020).

Engels (1972) argued that the state does not simply exist to facilitate absolute and total domination over society by the mode of production. Instead, the state is a site of class struggle, and mediates to varying degrees the conflict between those who control and benefit from the maintenance of the mode of production (capitalism) and those who are subjected to it (Engels, 1972). However, the state is part of the superstructure of society and so is subjected to the power of the economic base more than it can exert influence over the base—at least until the dialectical tension of class struggle is resolved (Engels, 1972). This is part of the reason why the Crown, even while desiring the extermination of Māori culture and social formations during the 19th century, did not simply force Māori into different living arrangements that were more acceptable to Pākehā and more useful for capitalism. It is also part of the reason why the Crown did not facilitate the enslavement of Māori despite the desperate need for Māori production in the early days of the colony. Despite capitalism being the dominant mode of production in the colony from the latter 19th century, absolute and brutal control through nakedly genocidal and inhumane processes like slavery and wars of extermination were no longer politically justifiable by the Crown—particularly when Māori had shown they were capable of organised military rebellion (O'Malley, 2019) and were looking to examples like the Haitian revolution (Paterson, 2006).

In the nearly 140 years spanning from the first contact between ngā iwi Māori and the early missionaries to the start of World War II, the Crown and it's agents were determined to establish and maintain the capitalist relations of production in whatever way possible. This

included through the mission schools, the Native and Māori church boarding schools, and the early child welfare system. The ideological and political means used to do this were inherently connected to capitalism. In the earliest days of Pākehā settlement, the new settlers needed Māori commodity production to survive. The earliest farmers and mission stations needed Māori labour on their farms, just as they needed Māori labour in their homes to mind their children and maintain their lives in the way they had been accustomed to in Europe. Following more widespread settlement in the era of the New Zealand Wars, Pākehā and the Government needed Māori labour for food production on private farms and outside of the formal capitalist economy to keep the colony fed and clothed. During World War I, an imperialist war where the British Empire's economic interests were at stake, they needed Māori soldiers. Most importantly, at all stages examined in this research, they needed Māori land (Barber, 2019; Poata-Smith, 2001). Barber (2019) states that the violence of settler-colonial capitalism imposed upon tāngata and whenua Māori was exemplified in the cruel exploitation and degradation of Papatūānuku for profit.

Drawing on Coulthard (2014), Barber (2019) argues that the dispossession of land from Māori was deeply important to capital. This starts with the process of primitive accumulation (Marx, 1990), where in a pre-capitalist Indigenous society this requires the unwilling separation between people and whenua (Barber, 2019; Coulthard, 2014). Coulthard (2014) said of Native disposession of their ancestral whenua in Turtle Island that:

> It was this horrific process that established the necessary preconditions underwriting the capital relation itself: it forcefully opened up what were once collectively held territories and resources to privatisation (disposession and enclosure) which, over time, came to produce a "class" of workers compelled to enter the exploitative realm of the labour market for their survival (proletarianisation). The historical process of primitive accumulation thus refers to the violent transformation of noncapitalist forms of life into capitalist ones. (p.7-8)

Barber (2019) likens Papatūānuku herself to the Māori people who were ideologically and economically compelled to become proletarian, both forced to work beyond what their bodies can bear, exploited and exhausted in the pursuit of wealth for the capitalist class.

The process of primitive accumulation was well underway by the final days of the New Zealand Wars. By the time of the *Native Schools Act 1867* and the *Neglected and Criminal Children Act 1867*, nearly the entire whenua of Te Waipounamu was in Crown and settler control, as was most of Te Ika a Māui (Walker, 2004). Barely more than fifty years later, only 8% of whenua Māori remained under Māori ownership according to the Pākehā legal system (Walker, 2004). Thus removed from the means of their subsistence, many Māori would have had little choice but to interact with the capitalist system, either as proletarians or as commodity-producers not yet fully incorporated into the capitalist

economy. The mission schools, as well as the Native and Māori church boarding schools supported this transformation through socialisation and through technical training. These industrial schools and reformatories, though not particularly focused on Māori, prepared the children from working class and poor backgrounds that found themselves in these institutions for similar futures as labourers and servants at the bottom of the social hierarchy. The adoption of tamariki Māori, rather than being decided on among whānau, whanaunga, and hapū as it had been for centuries, was now controlled by the same Native Land Courts that were created for the express purpose of divorcing Māori from the whenua of their tūpuna. These systems held multiple differing interests, but their core relation, their unifying pattern, was of compelling whānau Māori to surrender to settler colonial capitalism.

Weaving History into Today

This research presents my own pattern of the whakapapa of Māori struggle against the settler-colonial care and protection system, and is woven from generations of work by Māori and tauiwi scholars, historians, dreamers, storytellers, and warriors. This work of remembering has shown that there is much left to do in the future. The first and most critical work that has resulted from this kaupapa is specific research on the interaction between Māori and early state and private child welfare. Future research in this field requires an immense effort on the part of any researcher, as the texts are scattered across dozens of religious institutions and restricted by the state. However, they form a hidden part of Māori and colonial history that has been either purposively or unwittingly forgotten by generations of Pākehā record-keepers and historians. Next, explicitly Kaupapa Māori study on early missionaries would help fill the gaps in our understanding of their purpose and work across these islands. The works of Jones and Jenkins (2011; 2015) on Reverend Samuel Marsden represents the first step in this kaupapa, and the scholarly future teina can look to their research as an example. Prolific missionaries like John Morgan, whose horrific narrative was a large part of this thesis in chapter five, would be an excellent subject for an in-depth, explicitly pro-Māori examination of his many diaries and letters to CMS and Crown officials. The large and influential Taylor missionary family, who so greatly shaped the mission and Māori church boarding schools, would also make for useful research from a Kaupapa Māori perspective.

Mikaere's (2017) thesis *The Balance Destroyed* formed the basis for much of my whakaaro regarding the colonisation of Māori girls and women. A complementary research project that examines the colonisation of tāne Māori from a Māori perspective is missing. The imposition of colonial Pākehā gender norms had a profound effect on Māori boys and Māori men and their expressions of whatukura (Jenkins, 1986; Mikaere, 2017). The colonisation of traditional gender roles and ira tāne of Māori men is similarly tied up with the attempted destruction of Māori cultural and ethnic identity. In particular, an examination of

how the mission, Native, and Māori church boarding schools attempted to shape Māori masculinity in the image of Pākehā men would be a useful companion to Mikaere's (2017) work and was a clear gap I encountered in writing this thesis. A critical Kaupapa Māori exploration of the collusion between the men of the Young Māori Party with the Kāwanatanga would also be a significant addition to current research. This would certainly require a scholar with kaha, as this is a tender topic in Māori history. These men are towering figures in the narratives of Māori cultural revitilisation, and yet were also central figures in the assimilative project of the early 20th century.

Remembering and Acting in Social Work

In the methodological outline of this research found in chapter three, I argued that social work in Aotearoa and globally was yet to wrestle with its role in the darkest parts of modern history. Social work historically and currently is an essential part of oppressive state machinery (Graham & Al-Krenawi, 2010; Park, 2006; Margolin, 1997; Shaw & Holland, 2014). The difficult history of this profession, bound up as it is with the immiseration of peoples who continue to be subjected to racist imperial violence cannot be forgotten. To forget the role of social work in historical and current injustice is to weave "myths that serve to ease the conscience of those upon history does not reflect well" (Mikaere, 2011, p.105). This forgetting absolves social workers of the responsibilty to the memory of tūpuna and the lives of working class and poor people subjected to our intervention and power today, and it puts our profession at risk of blindly repeating the damage of the past (Graham & Al-Krenawi, 2010). The espoused liberatory aims of the social work as both a practice-based profession and an academic discipline (International Federation of Social Workers, 2021). cannot ever be met if we continue to march forward without looking back.

In the context of Aotearoa, a truly liberatory social work profession that works to undo the damage of the past would look like an unwavering committment to a future of tino rangatiratanga. This does not mean the conception of tino rangatiratanga as individual empowerment, but as collective self-determination for mana whenua and the abolition of Crown and capitalist control over Māori lives and Māori futures. The continuing collaboration of our profession with these structures, despite the individual critical and radical social workers that struggle fiercely and tirelessly against them, makes this an unfortunately unlikely future. Recent changes to the *Social Workers Registration Act 2003* compounds this, as all who call themselves "social workers" must now register with the Social Workers Registration Board, a Crown entity. As a state regulated profession through this entity, social workers have professional standards that are to some degree agreed upon by the Crown. However, for those social workers who are committed to that vision of tino rangatiratanga, we have no ethical option but to remember the past and actively organise to support that future, whether it aligns with Crown-mandated ethical responsibilites or not.

Kia Whakatōmuri te Haere Whakamua

Like all weaving, and like all of te ao Māori, the tāniko created from these three strands has a whakapapa that stretches into the past and the future. It is a whakapapa full of change. The tāniko continues to pattern our world today, through our modern economic and social order, and more specifically our modern child care and protection system. It stretches from as far back as the enclosure of the commons in England and the UK into the early colonial days of New Zealand, through two World Wars where Māori were expected to sacrifice themselves for a nation that considered them second-class citizens, and beyond the genocidal Māori child removal policy and practice that has characterised the last seven decades of child welfare in this country. The mass uplifts and institutionalisation of predominantly Māori children during the four decades following World War II are a part of this whakapapa. So, too, is the current system that oversees hugely disproportionate numbers of tamariki Māori filtering in and out of revolving placements in institutions and unfamiliar foster homes, when their own whānau and whanaunga and could indeed care for them if they had the resources and the power to do.

The social democratic and neoliberal eras of child protection in New Zealand are usually conceptualised as being very distinct reactions from the state to different social and political economic pressures (Keddell, 2017; Stanley, 2016). These distinctions are certainly useful for analysing the policy and practice of the child care and protection system over time, and in particular how it is shaped and changed by social structures. However, despite how diverse these expressions of the care and protection system and the social structures that create and maintain that system appear, these supposed distinctions are more internally related than they seem. The response of the New Zealand care and protection system and the Governments that control it to the ongoing powerful challenges from Māori and tauiwi allies is typified by change that is either marginal or temporary, and usually both (Hyslop, 1997; Moyle, 2014). On the rare occasions those changes have appeared to be positive at a deeper systemic level, such as the creation of the *Children and Young Persons Wellbeing Act 1989* following the well-evidenced and persuasive arguments put to paper in *Puao-te-Ata-tu* (Ministerial Advisory Committee, 1988), the transformation that was promised was never realised (Hyslop, 1997; Moyle, 2014). In this particular example, it was never realised partly because the neoliberal political economic environment was unequivicolly hostile to higher public spending (Hyslop, 1997); because the work had not been done to stamp out racism at any level of the department (Moyle, 2014); and because economic reform meant a previously unseen number of families struggling to survive (Kelsey, 1995; Poata-Smith, 2001). In reality, the actual changes that survived—such as a return to higher rates of fostering and ultimate responsibility lying with families rather than the state, meagre welfare

and public spending, and deinstitutionalisation (Hyslop, 1997; Keddell, 2017)—were a repitition of the same pattern of adaptation to the needs of capital.

In a more contemporary context, Duncan (2014) asserts that the national debt New Zealand owes to the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank means the country must continue the relatively austere "fiscal responsibility" policies. If the New Zealand state did attempt to drastically change social policy, the country would likely face a downgraded credit rating that would make further borrowing impossible and increase interest repayments. Spolander, Engelbrecht, and Sansfaçon (2015) agree, stating that this kind of debt beholden to capitalist interests, as well as hugely expensive and influential corporate lobbying, create a stranglehold on social spending around the world. Inequality is inherent and absolutely necessary for the maintenance of capitalism (Marx, 1990). Even within the working class, there is stratification and inequality between different types of workers (Marx, 1990). It is strategically useful to capitalism to have an immiserated underclass, a lumpen-proletariat, that help drive down wages and that are forced to do the distasteful, precarious, laborious, and poorly paid work that others do not want (Marx 1990). This underclass also serves as a reserve army of labour who can be sucked into process of production as workers whenever it is convenient to the capitalist class to do so, and expelled back into precarity and poverty when it is not (Marx, 1990). Since the imposition of capitalism in Aotearoa, Māori have comprised a large portion of this lumpen-proletariat (Poata-Smith, 2011).

In this research, a clear illustration of Māori as an economic and social underclass was in the firing of Māori Native school teachers around the time of economic depression to create jobs for Pākehā. The frantic and constant push for agricultural and domestic training for Māori when farm and servant labour was needed is similarly demonstrative. During the early days of neoliberalism, Māori were the first in the firing line as they were much more likely to work in the primary and manufacturing industries that were the target of this hugely destructive economic transformation (Kelsey, 1995). In modern New Zealand, Māori remain the bulk of this labour underclass, with Māori 30% more likely to be in "low-skilled" work than the general population, while also being subjected to double the rate of unemployment of Pākehā at June 2020 (Ministry of Businesses, Innovation & Employment, 2020). These phenomena are not coincidental—the architects of neoliberal political economy state that a relatively high rate of unemployment must be maintained to keep wages down (Friedman, 1977). The interpersonal and structural cruelty of dispossession, genocide, and racism that Māori have been subjected to historically and in the present compound this problem for tangata whenua.

There is an undeniable relationship between financial deprivation and contact with the child care and protection system both in New Zealand (Hyslop, 2020; Keddell et al., 2019) and globally (Gupta et al., 2018). Despite this, successive New Zealand Governments

have remained committed to low benefits that cannot meet peoples needs and that create an incredible amount of stress and strain on struggling families (Hyslop, 2020). At the same time, the racism that pervades every level of our child protection system remains, shaping individual decisions about child welfare that become an epidemic when multiplied across the large number of whānau Māori that come to the attention of the system (Keddell, 2017). Racist political and media commentary intensifies this heady mixture by pushing the idea of a "savage Māori underclass" (Hyslop & Keddell, 2018, p.5) as largely responsible for continuing high rates of child abuse, and the reason for earlier and more punitive state intervention (Beddoe, 2015). Critical child care and protection researchers Hyslop and Keddell (2018) argue that the over-representation of tamariki Māori in New Zealand's child protection system is "largely a product of how the historical legacy of colonisation, structural inequality and institutional racism continues to play out in the lives of individuals and families" (p.6).

Before World War II, the removal of tamariki and rangatahi Māori from their whānau and kāinga was lashed to the needs of early settler-colonial capitalism: to assimilate, to transform social and economic relations, to civilise, to crush gender equality, to proletarianise, and to dispossess. The needs of a contemporary settler-colonial capitalism with absolute dominance in New Zealand are different. Modern capitalism not only produces and reproduces the child care and protection system as it exists now, it justifies the system's existence through other economic and social phenomena that are also shaped by the relations of capital. The missionaries justified removing tamariki Māori from their people by extolling the virtues of Pākehā civilisation and demonising Māori ways of life in a time of rapid colonial expansion. The Native and Māori church boarding schools justified their naked fixation on assimilating and proletarianising Māori by pointing to the needs of Māori to survive in a society that was being turned upside down by Pākehā capitalism. The early care and protection system justified its existence by professing to rescue children subjected to social problems like poverty, while the poverty was caused by the very foundations of that society.

New Zealand's care and protection system does the same today. In a self-reinforcing loop, its existence and practices are justified by the continued immiseration of Māori, of the poor, of working class people. Simultaneously, the system itself causes *further* immiseration by continuing to remove tamariki Māori from their whānau and whakapapa, by continuing to subject children to the care to prison pipeline, and by continuing to punish the perceived moral deficiencies of parents rather than resourcing healthy and strong families and communities. When we look backwards as we walk towards the future, we can see how this pattern repeats across time. Though there are differences, the child protection system is always adapted to fit the needs of settler-colonial capitalism, both in how it is shaped through

legislation and resourcing, and through its impact on the world. For the deep pain and trauma caused by so many generations of Māori child removal to end, there is no other option than the abolition of the state care and protection system. For the abolition of this system, settler-colonial capitalism must also end, as its own existence creates and maintains the need for this system. Survivors, advocates, scholars, hapū, iwi, and community members have long been calling for the resources and power of the care and protection system to be turned over to Māori control (Māori Inquiry into Oranga Tamariki, 2020) and nothing short of Māori liberation from the thousand threads of settler-colonial capitalism will realise this. Despite two centuries of Crown and capitalist devastation, the collective tender caregiving of whānau Māori for our tamariki, our taonga, remains. Māori are the inheritors of hundreds of years of survival and struggle and visions of a liberated Māori future. It is up to us to remember, and to fight. Ake tonu ake.

9. References

1 News (2019, October 25). Waitangi tribunal launches fifth Oranga Tamariki baby uplifts inquiry. *1 News.* https://www.tvnz.co.nz/one-news/new-zealand/waitangi-tribunal-launches-fifth-oranga-tamariki-baby-uplifts-inquiry.

Adoption of Children Act 1881.

Alston, M., & Bowles, W. (2018). *Research for social workers: An introduction to methods* (4th ed.). Allen & Unwin.

Althusser, L. (1977). Ideology and ideological state apparatuses (notes towards an investigation). In *Lenin and philosophy, and other essays* (2nd ed.) (Ben Brewster, Trans.) N L B.

Amore, K., Viggers, H., Howden Chapman, P. (2020). *Severe housing deprivation in Aotearoa New Zealand, 2018.* University of Otago. https://www.hud.govt.nz/assets/News-and-Resources/Statistics-and-Research/2018-Severe-housing-deprivation-estimate/Severe-Housing-Deprivation-2018-Estimate-Report.pdf.

Andrews, J., & Reisch, M. (1997). The legacy of McCarthyism on social group work: An historical analysis. *Journal of sociology and social welfare, 24*(3), 211-238.

Barber, S. (2019). Māori Mārx. *Counterfutures: Left thought and practice Aotearoa, 8*(1). https://counterfutures.nz/8/Barber%20article.pdf.

Bardsley, S. (2001). The Otekaike Special School for Boys 1908-1950. In B. Brookes and J. Thomson (Eds.), *'Unfortunate folk': Essays on mental health treatment 1863-1992*. University of Otago Press.

Barrington, J. & Beaglehole, T. (1974). *Maori schools in a changing society: an historical review*. Council for Educational Research.

Barrington, J. M. (2008). *Separate but equal? Māori schools and the Crown, 1867-1969.* Victoria University Press.

Beagle, J. (1974). *Children of the state: A study of the New Zealand industrial school system 1880-1925* [Unpublished masters thesis]. University of Auckland.

Beddoe, L. (2015). Making a moral panic: "Feral families", family violence and welfare reforms in New Zealand. Doing the work of the state? In V. E. Cree, G. Clapton, & M. Smith (Eds.), *Moral panics in theory and practice: Gender and family moral panics in theory and practice* (55–65). Policy Press.

Bedggood, D. (1978). New Zealand's semi-colonial development: A Marxist view. *The Australian and New Zealand journal of sociology, 14*(3), 285-289. 10.1177/144078337801400319.

Bhattacharya, T. (2017). How not to skip class: Social reproduction of labor and the global working class. In T. Bhattacharya (Ed.), *Social reproduction theory: Remapping class, recentering oppression* (68-93). Pluto Press.

Binney, Judith (2005). *The legacy of guilt: A life of Thomas Kendall*. Bridget Williams Books.

Binney, Judith. (1975). Whatever happened to poor Mr Yate? An exercise in voyeurism. *New Zealand journal of history, 9*(2), 111-125. http://www.nzjh.auckland.ac.nz/document/document/?wid=1436.

Bryder, L. (2001). New Zealand's infant welfare services and Māori, 1907-1960. *Health and history, 2001*(3), 65-86.

Burns, P. (1989). *Fatal success: A history of the New Zealand company.* Heinemann Reed.

Cheyne, C., O'Brien, M., & Belgrave, M. (2005). *Social policy in Aotearoa New Zealand: A critical introduction* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Child Welfare Act 1925.

Church Missionary Society (1853). *Missionary register (New Zealand sections 1814-1853, incomplete).* Church Missionary Society. http://www.enzb.auckland.ac.nz/epubs.

Coulthard, G. (2014). *Red skin, white masks.* University of Minnesota Press.

Curtis, B., & Curtis, C. (2011). *Social research: A practical introduction*. SAGE Publications Ltd.

Dairy NZ (2017). *Quick stats about dairying-New Zealand.* https://www.dairynz.co.nz/media/5788611/quickstats_new_zealand_web_2017.pdf.

Dalley, B. (1998). *Family matters: Child welfare in twentieth-century New Zealand*. Auckland University Press & Department of Internal Affairs.

Davidson, A. K. (2004). *Christianity in Aotearoa: A history of church and society in New Zealand.* Education for Ministry.

Department of Corrections (2020). *Prison facts and statistics – September 2020.* https://www.corrections.govt.nz/resources/statistics/quarterly_prison_statistics/prison_stats_september_2020.

Department of Education (1886). *Record of children boarded out 1885-1886*. Archives New Zealand (Series 8306, Box 3, Item 4), Wellington, New Zealand.

Department of Education (1896). *Register of Past Inmates 1883-1896.* Archives New Zealand (Series 8306, Box 1, Item 1), Wellington, New Zealand.

Department of Education. (1937). [Letter to Bishop William Williams regarding Mere Hall]. Archives New Zealand (Series 17240, Box 186, Item R19234969), Wellington, New Zealand.

Duncan, G. & Worrall, J. (2000). Window on the world: Social policy and social work in New Zealand. *European journal of social work, 3*(3), 283-295.

Duncan, G. (2014). After neo-liberalism: What could be worse? *New Zealand sociology, 29*(1), 15-39. 10.3316/informit.497621947027355.

Durie, M. (1994). *Whaiora: Maori health development*. Oxford University Press.

Eketone, A. (2005). *Tapuwae: A vehicle for community change* [Unpublished masters thesis]. University of Otago.

Eketone, A. (2008). Theoretical underpinnings of kaupapa Māori directed practice. *MAI review, 2008*(1), 1-11. http://www.review.mai.ac.nz.

Engel, R. J., & Schutt, R. K. (2013). *The practice of research in social work* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications Inc.

Engels, F. (1972). *The origin of the family, private property, and the state*. Pathfinder Press.

Engels, F. (2005). Introduction to the dialectics of nature. In M. Redcrift (Ed.), *Sustainability: Critical concepts in the social sciences* (p. 28-42). Routledge.

Fanon, F. (1991). *Black skin, white masks* (C. Lam Markmann, Trans.). Grove Press.

Ferguson, I. (2008). *Reclaiming social work: Challenging neo-liberalism and promoting social justice.* SAGE Publications Ltd.

Fisher, R., & Dybicz, P. (1999). The place of historical research in social work. *Journal of sociology and social welfare, 26*(3), 105-124.

Fitzgerald, T. (2003). Creating a disciplined society: CMS women and the re-making of Ngāpuhi women 1823-1835. *History of education review, 32*(1), 84-98.

Friedman, M. (1977). Nobel lecture: Inflation and unemployment. *Journal of political economy, 85*(3), 451-472.

Ghodsee, K. R. (2018). *Why women have better sex under socialism: And other arguments for economic independence*. Vintage.

Gillard-Glass, S., & England, J. (2002). *Adoption in New Zealand: The never-ending story*. Harper Collins.

Glenn, C. (2011). *American Indian/First nations schooling: From the colonial period to the present*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Grace, P. (1998). *Baby no-eyes*. Penguin Books.

Graham, G. (1930, December 11). [Letter to the Minister of Education]. Archives New Zealand (Series CW40, Box 25, Item 26), Wellington, New Zealand.

Graham, J. R., & Al-Krenawi, A. (2010). Historical research. In B. Thyer (Ed.), *The handbook of social work research methods* (2nd ed.), (493-503). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks* (Q. Hoare & G. Nowell-Smith, Trans.). Lawrence and Wishart.

Gupta, A., Blumhardt, H., & ATD Fourth World. (2018). Poverty, exclusion and child protection practice: The contribution of the 'politics of recognition and respect'. *European journal of social work, 21*(1), 247-259. 10.1080/13691457.2017.1287669.

Hallam, S. J. (2002). Peopled landscapes in southwestern Australia in the early 1800s: Aboriginal burning off in the light of Western Australian historical documents. *Early days, 12*(2), 177-191.

Hill, R. (2014). *State authority, Indigenous autonomy: Crown-Maori relations in New Zealand/Aotearoa 1900-1950*. Victoria University Press.

Horne, G. (2007). *The white Pacific.* University of Hawai'i Press.

Humphries, B. (2008). *Social work research for social justice*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Hyslop, I. (1997). The promise and the practice: Child protection legislation in New Zealand. *Asia Pacific journal of social work and development,* 7(1), 59-67. 10.1080/21650993.1997.9755751.

Hyslop, I. (2013). The 'White paper for vulnerable children' and the 'Munro review of child protection in England': A comparative critique. *Aotearoa New Zealand social work, 25*(4), 4-14.

Hyslop, I. (2020). Child protection, capitalism and the settler state. Policy Quarterly, 16(1).

Hyslop, I., & Keddell, E. (2018). Outing the elephants: Exploring a new paradigm for child protection social work. *Social sciences, 7*(105), 1-13. 10.3390/socsci7070105.

Infant Act 1908.

Infant Life Protection Act 1893.

International Federation of Social Workers. (2021). *Definition of social work.* https://www.ifsw.org/what-is-social-work/global-definition-of-social-work/.

Jacobs, M. (2006). Indian boarding schools in comparative perspective: The removal of Indigenous children in the United States and Australia, 1880-1940. In C. Trafzer, J. Keller, & L. Sisquoc (Eds.), *Boarding school blues* (p.202-231). University of Nebraska Press.

Jenkins, K. (1986). *Reflections on the status of Maori women* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. University of Auckland.

Jenkins, K. (1988). *Working paper on Maori women and social policy*. Royal Commission on Social Policy.

Jenkins, K., & Morris, K. (1995). *Hukarere and the politics of Maori girls' schooling.* Dunmore Press.

Jenkins, K., & Philip-Barbara, G. (2002). *Mauri ora: Māori womens stories*. Huia Publications.

Jones, A., & Jenkins, K. (2011). Māori teaching and learning in Australia in the early nineteenth century. *New Zealand journal of educational studies, 46*(1), 49-67.

Jones, A., & Jenkins, K. (2015). *Words between us.* Huia Publishers.

Kawharu, H. (1977). *Maori land tenure: Studies of a changing institution*. Oxford University Press.

Keddell, E. (2017). The vulnerable child in neoliberal contexts: the construction of children in the Aotearoa New Zealand child protection reforms. *Childhood, 25(1),* 93-108. https://doi.org/10.1177/0907568217727591.

Keddell, E., Davie, G., & Barson, D. (2019). Child protection inequalities in Aotearoa New Zealand: Social gradient and the 'inverse intervention law'. *Children and youth services review, 104*(2019), 1-8. 10.1016/j.childyouth.2019.06.018.

Kelsey, J. (1995). *The New Zealand experiment: A world model for structural adjustment?* Bridget Williams Books/Auckland University Press.

Lake, M. (2010). Samuel Marsden, work and the limits of evangelic humanitarianism. *History Australia, 7*(3), 57.1-57.23. 10.2104/ha100057.

Lane, K. (1989). *Child or chattel? The boarding-out system, 1900-1938, with special reference to the Auckland region* [Unpublished masters thesis]. University of Auckland.

Lawson-Te Aho, K. (2010). *Definitions of whānau: A review of selected literature.* Families Commission.

Lenin, V. I. (1977). *Collected works* (G. Hanna, Trans.). Progress Publishers.

Māori Inquiry into Oranga Tamariki. (2020). *Ko to wā whakawhiti, it's time for change: A Māori inquiry into Oranga Tamariki – Report.* Whānau Ora Commissioning Agency.

Margolin, L. (1997). Under cover of kindness. *Under the cover of kindness - The invention of social work*. Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia.

Marsden, M., & Royal, C. T. A. (2003). *The woven universe: Selected writings of Rev. Māori Marsden*. Estate of Rev. Māori Marsden.

Marsden, S. (1837, date unknown). [Observations on the native inhabitants and Europeans who reside in the Bay of Islands]. Hocken Library, Dunedin, New Zealand.

Marx, K. (1902). *Wage-labor and capital*. New York Labor News Company.

Marx, K. (1990). *Capital: A critique of political economy (Vol.1).* (B. Fowkes, Trans.). Penguin Books.

Matthews, J. (1834, January 20). Beneficial tendency of the infant-school system in counteracting Native ferocity. In Church Missionary Society (Eds.), *Missionary register, 1834.* Church Missionary Society. http://www.enzb.auckland.ac.nz/document/ ?wid=3105&action=null.

May, H. (2005). *School beginnings: A 19th century colonial story.* NZCER Press.

May, H., Kaur, B., & Prochner, L. (2014). *Empire, education, and Indigenous childhoods: Nineteenth-century missionary infant schools in three British colonies.* Ashgate.

May, T. (2011). *Social research: Issues, methods and research* (4th ed.). Open University Press.

Mead , H. (1997). Tamaiti whangai: The adopted child. In H. Mead (Ed.) *Landmarks, bridges and visions: Aspects of Maori culture* (204–212). Victoria University Press.

Meloni, M. (2016). *Political biology : Science and social values in human heredity from eugenics to epigenetics*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Mikaere, A. (2011). *Colonising myths, Māori realities: He rukuruku whakaaro.* Huia Publishers and Te Wānanga o Raukawa.

Mikaere, A. (2017). *The balance destroyed*. Te Wānanga o Raukawa.

Mikahere-Hall, A. (2017). Constructing research from an indigenous kaupapa Māori perspective: An example of decolonising research. *Psychotherapy and politics international, 15*(3), 1-14. 10.1002/ppi.1428.

Moeke-Pickering, T. (1996). *Māori Identity within whānau: A review of the literature* [Unpublished research report]. University of Waikato.

Mohi, G. (2019). *He whakaaro hou: A critical legal theory perspective on the future of Māori land reform* [Unpublished honours dissertation]. University of Otago. https://www.otago.ac.nz/law/research/journals/otago741892.pdf.

Morgan, J. (1846, date unknown). [A letter by John Morgan outlining his career as a missionary]. Hocken Library, Dunedin, New Zealand.

Morgan, J. (1850, April 4). [Letter to Governor George Grey from Ōtawhao]. Hocken Library, Dunedin, New Zealand.

Morgan, J. (1851, February 6). [Letter to Governor George Grey from Ōtawhao]. Hocken Library, Dunedin, New Zealand.

Morgan, J. (1852, October 19). [Letter to Lt. Governor Robert Wynyard from Ōtawhao, “Report respecting native schools under his charge.”]. National Archives, Wellington, New Zealand.

Morgan, J. (1853a, January 13) [Letter to Governor George Grey from Ōtawhao.]. Hocken Library, Dunedin, New Zealand.

Morgan, J. (1853b, May 16). [Letter to Governor George Grey from Ōtawhao.]. Hocken Library, Dunedin, New Zealand.

Morgan, J. (1857, June 27). [Letter to Governor Thomas Gore Browne from Ōtawhao.]. Hocken Library, Dunedin, New Zealand.

Morgan, J. (1860, October 2). [Letter to Governor Thomas Gore Browne from Ōtawhao]. National Archives, Wellington, New Zealand.

Morgan, J. (1862; May 26). [Letter to John Gorst from Ōtawhao]. National Archives, Wellington, New Zealand.

Morgan, K. (2011). *The birth of industrial Britain: Social change 1750-1850* (2nd ed.). Pearson Longman.

Moyle, P. (2014). Māori social workers' experiences of care and protection: A selection of findings. *Aotearoa New Zealand social work, 26*(1), 55-64. 10.11157/anzswj-vol26iss1id55.

Moyle, P., & Tauri, J. M. (2016). Māori, family group conferencing, and the myths of restorative justice. *Victims & offenders, 11*(1), 87-106. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/10.1080/15564886.2015.1135496.

Mulet-Marquis, S., & Fairweather, J. (2008). *Rural population and farm labour change*. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/35459104.pdf.

Native Land Act 1909.

Native Schools Act 1867.

Native Schools Code 1880.

Native Trust Ordinance 1844.

Neglected and Criminal Children Act 1867.

Neglected and Criminal Children Act 1867.

New Zealand Constitution Act 1852.

Newman, E. (2020). Practice of adoption in New Zealand before the 1881 Adoption of Children Act. *Aotearoa New Zealand social work, 32*(3), 43-53. https://anzswjournal.nz/ anzsw/article/view/768.

Newsinger, J. (2013). *The blood never dried: A peoples history of the British Empire* (2nd ed.). Bookmarks Publications.

Ngata, T. (2019). *Kia mau: Resisting colonial fictions*. Kia Mau Campaign.

Nicholas, J. L. (1817). *Narrative of a voyage to New Zealand: Performed in the years 1814 and 1815, in company with the Rev. Samuel Marsden, volume 1*. J Black and Son. http://www.enzb.auckland.ac.nz/epubs.

O'Brien, M. (2016). The triplets: Investment in outcomes for the vulnerable–reshaping social services for (some) New Zealand children. *Aotearoa New Zealand social work, 28*(2), 9-21. Retrieved from https://anzswjournal.nz/anzsw/article/view/220/290.

O'Keefe, J. (1980). *Maori land ownership: Introductory readings.* Auckland Law Society.

O'Malley, V. (2019). *The New Zealand Wars: Ngā pakanga o Aotearoa.* Bridget Williams Books.

On the causes of decay among the New Zealand race (1852, 26 May). *New Zealand spectator and Cook Strait guardian*.

Oranga Tamariki (2020a). *Quarterly report: September 2020 – text only.* https://www.orangatamariki.govt.nz/about-us/reports-and-releases/quarterly-report/text-only/.

Oranga Tamariki (2020b). *Babies and children entering Oranga Tamariki care.* https://www.orangatamariki.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/About-us/Report-and-

releases/data-about-how-we-work-with-children/Babies-and-children-entering-Oranga-Tamariki-care.pdf.

Orange, C. (1987). *The treaty of Waitangi.* Allen & Unwin.

Papakura. M. (1986). *Life of the old time Māori.* New Women's Press.

Park, Y. (2006). Constructing Immigrants: A historical discourse analysis of the representations of immigrants in US social work, 1882-1952. *Journal of social work, 6*(2), 169–203. 10.1177/1468017306066673.

Pascoe, B. (2018). *Dark emu* (2nd ed.). Magabala Books Aboriginal Corporation.

Paterson, L. (2006). *Colonial discourses: Niupepa Māori 1855-1863*. Otago University Press

Paxton, K. (2006). Learning gender. In C. Trafzer, J. Keller, & L. Sisquoc (Eds.), *Boarding school blues* (p.174-186). University of Nebraska Press.

Pease, B., & Nipperess, S. (2016). Doing critical social work in the neoliberal context: Working on the contradictions. In B. Pease, S. Goldingay, N. Hosken, & S. Nipperess (Eds.), *Doing critical social work: Transformative practices for social justice* (p. 3-24). Allen & Unwin.

Pere, R. (1982). *Ako: Concepts and learning in the Maori tradition.* University of Waikato.

Pere, R. (1987). To us the dreamers are important. In S. Cox (Ed.), *Public and private worlds: Women in contemporary New Zealand* (p.53-66). Allen & Unwin.

Pihama, L. (2005). Asserting indigenous theories of change. In J. Barker (Ed.), *Sovereignty matters: Locations of contestation and possibility in indigenous struggles for self-determination* (p. 191-210).

Pihama, L., Jenkins, K., & Middleton, A. (2003). *"Tiakina te pā harakeke": Family violence prevention for Māori – Narrative report.* University of Auckland.

Pilditch, J. (2010). *Letters and journals of Reverend John Morgan, missionary at Ōtawhao, 1833-1865, Volume 1.* Zeticula.

Poata-Smith, E. (2001). *The political economy of Māori protest politics 1968-1995: A Marxist analysis of the roots of Māori oppression and the politics of resistance* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. University of Otago.

Poata-Smith, E. (2011). Inequality and Māori. In M. Rashbrooke (Ed.), *Inequality: A New Zealand Crisis*, (148-158). Bridget Williams Books.

Poor Law Amendment Act 1834 (UK).

Prashad, V. (2017). *Red star over the third world.* Pluto Press.

Public Works Act 1928.

Rākete, E. (2019). *Beneath the prison, a faultline: A historical materialist analysis of mass incarceration in Aotearoa* [Unpublished masters thesis]. University of Auckland. https://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/handle/2292/49670.

Rathburn, T. (2006). Putting Lucy Pretty Eagle to rest. In C. Trafzer, J. Keller, & L. Sisquoc (Eds.), *Boarding school blues* (p.155-173). University of Nebraska Press.

Reid, M. (2019, June 11). NZ's own taken generation. *Newsroom.* https://www.newsroom.co.nz/investigations/nzs-own-taken-generation.

Rice, G., & Bryder, L. (2005). *Black November: The 1918 Infuenza Pandemic in New Zealand*. Canterbury University Press.

Rimene, S. (1994). *The Children Young Persons and their Families Act 1989: From a Māori perspective* [Unpublished masters thesis]. Victoria University of Wellington.

Rubin, A., & Babbie, E. R. (2014). *Research methods for social work* (8th ed.). Brooks/Cole Cengage Learning.

Schutt, R. K. (2015). *Investigating the social world: The processes and practice of research* (8th ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Shaw, I., & Holland, S. (2014). *Doing qualitative research in social work.* SAGE Publications Ltd.

Simmons, D. (2013). *Greater Maori Auckland*. The Bush Press of New Zealand.

Simon, J. A., & Smith, L. T. (2001). *A civilising mission? Perceptions and representations of the Native schools system.* Auckland University Press.

Smith, G. H. (1992). Research issues related to Māori. In M. K. Hohepa & G. H. Smith (Eds.), *The issue of research and Māori* (p. 19-28). Research Unit for Māori Education, University of Auckland.

Smith, L. T. (1992). Maori women: Discourses, projects and mana wahine. In S. Middleton & A. Jones (Eds.), *Women and education in Aotearoa 2* (p.33-51). Bridget Williams Books.

Smith, L. T. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples* (2nd ed.). Otago University Press.

Staniforth, B., & Beddoe, L. (2017). Five years in the news: A media analysis of Child, Youth and Family in two daily newspapers (2008–2012). *Aotearoa New Zealand social work, 29*(4), 5-18. https://anzswjournal.nz/anzsw/article/view/382/537.

Stanley, E. (2016). *Road to hell: State violence against children in postwar New Zealand*. Auckland University Press.

Stats NZ. (2020a). *Māori population estimates: At 30 June 2020*. https://www.stats.govt.nz/ information-releases /maori-population-estimates-at-30-june-2020.

Stats NZ. (2020b). *Wellbeing statistics: September 2020 quarter.* https://www.stats.govt.nz/information-releases/wellbeing-statistics-september-2020-quarter#money.

Steinberg, D. (2015). *The social work student's research handbook* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Taylor, H. (1862). Report on native schools. *Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives, 1862* (1). E4.

Te Puni Kōkiri (1993). *He kākano: A handbook of Māori health data.* Te Puni Kōkiri.

Te Wharepora Hou (2016, October 9). #Handsoffourtamariki: An open letter. *Te wharepora hou.* https://tewhareporahou.wordpress.com/2016/10/09/hands-off-our-tamariki-an-open-letter/.

Tohunga Suppression Act 1907.

Tyro, K., & Scarlett, K. (1979). *Te Aute college 125th anniversary, 1854-1979.* Te Aute College.

Vogel, L. (2014). *Marxism and the oppression of women: Toward a unitary theory*. Haymarket Books.

Waikato Regional Council (2019). *Land use.* https://www.waikatoregion.govt.nz/environment/environmental-information/environmental-indicators/land-and-soil/land1-report-card/.

Walker, R. (2001). *He tipua: The life and times of Sir Āpirana Ngata*. Viking.

Walker, R. (2004). *Ka whawhai tonu matou: Struggle without end* (2nd ed.). Penguin Books.

Walker, R. (2016). Chapter one: Reclaiming Māori education. In J. Hutchings & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Decolonisation in Aotearoa: Education, research and practice.* NZCER Press.

Walker, S. (2002). *Maatua whangai: The perspective of caregivers* [Unpublished masters thesis]. University of Otago.

Walker, S., Eketone, A., & Gibbs, A. (2006). An exploration of kaupapa Maori research, its principles, processes and applications. *International journal of social research methodology, 9*(4), 331-344. 10.1080/13645570600916049.

Williams, F. (1939). *Through ninety years—1826-1916. Life and work among the Maori in New Zealand.* Whitcombe and Tombs.

Woodfield, M. (2016). *Sowing the gospel of peace: Missionary James Watkin at Karitāne and Wellington, 1840-1855* [Unpublished masters thesis]. Victoria University of Wellington. https://viewer.waireto.victoria.ac.nz/client/viewer/IE193259/.

Yate, W. (1835). *An Account of New Zealand and the Church Missionary Society's mission in the northern island*. R.B. Seeley and Burnside.