In NZ’s first parliament, the member for Motueka and Massacre Bay stood to ask the pointed question of whether the land in Motueka, which was given to the bishop of New Zealand to build an industrial school, would be kept. The question was pointed because the land he was referring to was the 918 acres of land that Governor Grey granted to the Bishop out of the Native reserve land, without the consent of the native trust or Māori.¹ The reserve land was part of the tenths reserves which allowed Māori to keep one tenth of their land. The rest, which was not occupied or cultivated according to Pākehā ideals, was regarded as waste land that the government bought cheaply and sold to settlers at a huge profit.² The profit from waste lands was then used to fund infrastructure and further immigration which had the effect that “Māori were subsidising the costs of their colonisation.”³ The tenths lands in Nelson were held in a trust for Māori, run by Pākehā to preserve “the inferior race”.⁴ The goal of the New Zealand Company was to create a small Māori aristocracy who would become honorary Pākehā.

The Company, having paid great attention to this subject, came to the conclusion that if the inferior race of New Zealand can be preserved at all in contact with civilised men it can only be by creating in civilised society a class of Natives who would retain the same relative superiority of position which they enjoyed in savage life. They determined, therefore, if possible, to make a native aristocracy, a Native gentry, and for that purpose to reserve lands as valuable property.⁵

Henry Sewell, who was on the Waste Lands Sub-Committee with the member from Motueka and Massacre Bay, said that even the reserves really belonged to the Crown, and they would make decisions for the benefit of Māori, “just as if they were infants or lunatics, not having legal capacities.”⁶

The land that Governor Grey illegally stole and gave to the church was called Whakarewa and came from the protected native reserves. It was some of the best land in the area. Local Māori immediately complained to the Provincial Council about the little land they had left being stolen from them. Thomas Brunner, a Crown surveyor, denounced this as a clear breach of the Treaty.⁷ However, the House of Representatives assured the member from Motueka and Massacre Bay, and his settler constituency, that the land would stay with the bishop. When Māori complained to the church, the patronising reply of the Bishop of Nelson was,

“I have received your words. They are not new. I have heard it all before. Your lands if you cultivate them produce to you corn and potatoes, Whakarewa produces a school for you. Use the school and the master, for yourselves and for your children, and you will not want more land. The Governor gave this land for a school. The Bishop of Whakatu built the school and you have the teaching.
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Everyone must have a school and must learn, and you would have to pay for a school if the land did not pay for it. You would be twice as rich as you are, if you used your school ...

Would you like to pay for your school? I am content, I am sure it is good for you as it is. All Pâkehâa pay for their school, Whakarewa pays for you – Do not pull two ways, we are in a double canoe and must be well fastened together – you have many thoughts – there are seven of you, seven thoughts all different, I am one, one thought, i.e. your good.”

The church’s intention was to lease the surplus land that was granted so that they could fund the school. Initially, Mâori were allowed to remain on the land to help break it in. Once this was completed, they were asked to leave the land that the Government had reserved for them, to make way for European lessees.

The Native School failed. Mâori did not want to send their children there because Whakarewa exploited their children for farm labour instead of education; Mâori did not want their children boarding away from home in Motueka; and, more importantly, Mâori did not want to send their children to that school and give tacit acquiescence to the process of land alienation. But, the church continued to refuse to return the stolen land. Mâori objections, petitions and deputations to the government about Whakarewa continued unabated for over 100 years. In the 1980s, the church tried to sell the land of the Whakarewa Estates, causing intense reaction from Mâori and many Pâkehâa. Finally, in 1993, after a 137 year battle, the land that was stolen was given back to Mâori.

This is one story among thousands of others that could be recounted by Mâori. I recount this story because it raises questions about my identity as a Pâkehâ Christian. I am a direct descendant of the member for Motueka and Massacre Bay who asked that pointed question. Alfred Christopher Picard is my great, great, great grandfather. When he returned from Auckland, the people of Motueka held a dinner to celebrate him and his work; especially his work on the waste lands. He had fought for the rights of hard working settlers to have access to land that was locked up in the monopolies of the New Zealand Company. His stirring speech was greeted with loud “hear, hear.”

What my tupuna didn’t advocate or ask about was anything to do with Mâori. In all his speeches that I’ve read, there isn’t a single reference to Mâori. To him, they were simply invisible at a time when Mâori made up 2/3 of the population. It is this question of Pâkehâ identity in relationship to Mâori that I want to explore tonight, on this bi-centennial year that celebrates the relationship of Pâkehâ and Mâori. I want to do that by asking questions of myself and of us as Baptists.

Ani Mikaere has argued that the theory of the natural inferiority of Mâori has shaped NZ society to the present day. It shaped my tupuna, and it was subtly passed down to me by family, friends, sports clubs, schools, churches and NZ culture. Mikaere makes the point that the colonisers needed to create myths about the colonised in order to justify the way they treated them. An
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essential part of this myth-making was the natural inferiority of Māori to Pākehā, and it continues to shape our culture today. As many have argued, colonisation is not a historical issue, it is a contemporary issue. It’s not simply about churches trying to exonerate the early missionaries and show that they weren’t such bad chaps after all. It’s to truthfully examine our culture and ourselves and ask whether we are participating in the mutual flourishing of Māori and Pākehā, as promised within the covenant bonds of the treaty. It’s to notice the impact of the colonising language such as “the poor benighted heathens” or “the devil’s children” had upon New Zealand as a nation, both Māori and Pākehā. In my time growing up, it’s to notice the same impact from constant jokes that started, “There was an Englishman, Irishman and a Māori...” It’s to ask, how many Māori are in leadership in our denomination as Union leaders, College lecturers, pastors or elders? It’s to wonder aloud why it took 71 years before a Māori delegate spoke at a Baptist Assembly.

Colonisation is the ongoing process whereby Māori language, customs, culture, fields of knowledge are denigrated and regarded as inherently inferior.14 Zygmunt Bauman describes the western colonial project as the quest for the pure society – purifying otherness for the sake of togetherness. Otherness and difference are either assimilated into the unchanged status quo or they are expelled beyond the city gates.15 It is well documented that from 1867 the Native Schools were required by statute to conduct all education in English, and this continued until their disestablishment in 1969. They, along with a variety of other institutions, created assimilationist relationships of Pākehā to Māori: “We’re here. Great to meet you, now become like us.”16 Bauman’s other category is the exclusion of otherness by laying the stranger to rest in a state of suspended extinction.17 In Nelson, the idea of the tenths land was to reserve 10% of Māori land in the city so that Māori and Pākehā would be integrated. Whilst this was an ideal before the arrival of settlers, once the settlers themselves arrived, they did not want to relate to Māori. Māori were moved off the prime land of their native reserves to a swampy area away from the city to open their area up for settlers. The reason given by the Provincial Council was, “Many complaints are made of the nuisances caused by the Natives in these houses to residents in the neighbourhood. Their nasty mode of living, the various stenches about their habitations; occasional though perhaps slight indecencies from exposure of their persons; their cooking fires close to adjoining fences, are the subject of these complaints.”18 Bauman’s analysis of the colonial relationship with the stranger is helpful. “Resentment spills over everything one can associate with strangers: their way of talking, their way of dressing, their religious rituals, the way they organise their family life, even the smell of the food they like to cook.”19 This fear and resentment of strangers, difference and otherness has played itself in NZ through the relationship of Pākehā to Māori, with devastating effects.

For me, this raises the crucial issue of racism, and the reality that I have grown up a racist. When I confess that I have grown up as a racist, I don’t mean that I came from some racist lobby group. I mean something that’s far more common and dangerous than that; everyday racism or next-door racism. My relationship to Māori has been deeply shaped by the unspoken assumptions of my natural superiority to Māori, and a large part of my journey in recent years, and in years to come, is the journey of unbelonging to these narratives in order to learn how to live in relationship with

14 Ani Mikaere, “Kairangi: Expanding a Māori Conception of Excellence”, 69.
16 A Civilising Mission, 111.
18 ‘Report from Commissioners at Nelson’, 2 June. 1858, AJHR, 1858, E-4, 2.
19 Bauman, Life in Fragments, 62.
Māori. Part of this unbelonging is to confess my sins of colluding with racism and ask for forgiveness in the hope of a new future.

The myth of the natural inferiority of Māori was something I imbibed in all walks of life. I grew up in South Auckland around Māori, and I had Māori friends and neighbours. But growing up around Māori is not the same as growing up with Māori. I grew up around Māori, but I knew very little about Māori culture. It was something that was other, and I thought it had no bearing on my relationship with Māori friends. They were one of “us”, and we made sure that their difference did not put a fly is our friendly ointment. Any assertion of Māori identity was quickly assimilated. I remember learning a variety of racist jokes at school, including this racist poem, named “I wish I was a Māori”, when I was ten years old:

I wish I was a Māori
Oh what a lovely life.
Ten kids on social welfare
And a big fat lazy wife.

I'd live in state-owned houses
No mortgages to pay.
A goat to keep the grass down
And in the pub all day.

I'd buy a scrap heap Holden
Dead battery, use a crank.
No warrant, get my petrol
From the next door neighbours tank.

I'd feed on bones and puha
And fish from out the sea.
The guy next door grows vegys
Sweet corn and apple trees.

I'd keep me cool all summer
Just layzing on the shore.
And keep me warm all winter
From the wood pile next door.

Each week I'd have a party,
"just bring a dozen mates"
Next day collect the empties
Enough to buy a crate.

And then I'd go to funerals
Where the beer flows like the tide.
With all my darn relations
There’s always someone died.

I'm not a Māori
I'm white, I work, I'm poor
I've spent my whole life supporting
The Mongrel Mob next door

Growing up, I had Māori friends, but I learnt that there was nothing to receive from them. We nicknamed our Māori friends, and giggled about the scholarships they could get. We made sure their difference didn’t get in the way of being one of “us”. The pattern continued in sport and on the workshop floor as a mechanic. In our fines sessions after a cricket match, we’d mock each other and hand out fines people paid that went towards buying the beers. When the one or two Māori who played the colonial sport took the stand, they were immediately, “$2, you know why.” The reason why was that they were Māori, and the fines session assimilated their otherness into our togetherness. During my time at high school, academic subjects like Latin and French were scaled up, and “non-academic” subjects had their marks scaled down. Apparently the difficulty of language learning depends on race. I was a late bloomer in education, and didn’t get very good grades. One report I took home had an A in Māori, with the teacher’s comment, “He tino pai, Anaru,” and I remember thinking, “if only it was in maths.” My wife remembers being told that if she had to learn Māori, she might as well stay home and do something useful. This is the everyday racism I mean.

When we first met, she’d just finished her degree in educational philosophy where she studied alternative education for people who they school system failed. I remember us having a “robust discussion” about Māori, the treaty and education. Drawing on my vast knowledge of the treaty as a twenty year old mechanic, I thought I’d won the argument by spouting my bigotry and racism louder than her. A few years later, I went to study theology and one of the courses was Christianity in Aotearoa with Allan Davidson. I remember I was the only Baptist in the course, and it was a shattering experience for me. By half-way through the course, Allan had outlined many of the broad, and significant, issues of the church’s interactions with Māori. I can remember being totally floored by the realities. All that I’d grown up knowing, hearing, believing was undone within the space of a few weeks. I remember feeling embarrassed, angry and betrayed. I asked my first question after Allan outlined the issues of land confiscations: “Why did I have to wait until I got into tertiary education to hear any of this?” A older Māori Anglican replied, “because that’s how racism works.” At school, I’d learnt English and American history, but never NZ history. History happened somewhere else.

In ministry, we had Māori people come to faith. They were told by one leader to renounce their Māori identity so that they could become Christians. She asked them to get rid of any Māori carvings or artefacts because of the spirits in them. One older Māori kuia started coming to church, and she wanted to give me gift. She asked if I had a ponamu, which I didn’t. She went away to her marae and asked her uncle to get some greenstone and carve the ponamu by traditional methods. It took a number of months, and she gave it to me to wear always. I remember the first day I wore it in church, two people came up to me after the service and said, “you’re being very PC today.” In these situations I might have mumbled a reply, but I lacked the courage and the language to adequately challenge these assumptions.

NZ historians agree that a fundamental shift occurred in NZ society in the late 1960s and early 70s. James Belich suggests that through the domestic process of decolonisation (1960-2000) there was both the ‘coming in’ of new influences and migrations and the ‘coming out’ of diversity.

20 Interestingly, the poem remains available in the comments section on many Pākehā blogs. http://www.whaleoil.co.nz/2013/11/called-tough-guy-wants-lighter-sentence-Māori/

21 See Allan Davidson, Christianity in Aotearoa.
otherness and dissent as the settled myths of colonial discourse were challenged and repealed. There was the coming in of influences from outside through TV, air travel and immigration, as well as a coming out of difference and otherness. A significant part of this coming out was the rise of Māori identity and the issues of historical injustices that came to the fore through the development of the Waitangi Tribunal in 1975. With the loss of settler mythologies, the issues of NZ’s colonial past came strongly to the surface and meant that both the colonised and the coloniser were renegotiating their self-identity. The Waitangi Tribunal understood its purpose to be a mechanism for truth-telling. “[t]he settlement of historical claims is not to pay off for the past, even were that possible, but to take those steps necessary to remove outstanding prejudice and prevent similar prejudice from arising; for the only practical settlement between peoples is one that achieves a reconciliation in fact.” For many Pākehā, this new setting meant learning how to shift from a settler narrative of possession to a manuhiri narrative of belonging in relationship with tangata whenua.

The quest for Pākehā identity is not easy. The narrative in NZ, including NZ Baptists, up until the 1960s was that there are no racial problems in our country. R. P. Staples addressed the World Baptist Congress on behalf of N.Z. Baptists and proudly stated, “Our population is only 1,700,000, including 100,000 Māoris, the early inhabitants of New Zealand. Māoris now occupy four seats in Parliament, and I can assure you there is no race problem in New Zealand.” We now live in the time when that myth has been exposed, and Pākehā have to learn to move out of our naivety and into a different sort of life.

Many scholars on contemporary Pākehā identity have made the point that the quest for Pākehā identity begins by acknowledging that Pākehā identity only exists in relation to Māori. Europeans in New York or London are not Pākehā. Being Pākehā is defined by being in relationship with Māori. And it is not just any relationship with Māori, but loving and non-violent relationship with Māori and their postcolonial struggle for justice which will change Māori and Pākehā alike. Alistair Reese in his important doctoral work on Pākehā Christian identity, highlights that Pākehā who are searching for a narrative of belonging in relationship with Māori, need to go on a journey of unbelonging. For those on the journey of unbelonging there is the uncomfortable process of rejecting prior convictions, and leaving behind much of what gave their world meaning. This unbelonging and leaving behind often includes family stories, long-held assumptions and a shared discourse that makes sense of the world. It also means confessing the myths that have shaped us, learning new discourses and challenging old assumptions (such as my tupuna). Unsurprisingly, the journey of unbelonging and reframing reality is often a source of conflict. If I want to spoil Christmas dinner I need only mention the treaty of Waitangi or even more scandalous is to mention te tiriti o Waitangi. To stand in front of our churches and say “Kia Ora, whanau” is to politicise worship and know that there a conversation to be had with someone at the end of the service.

Unlike Māori, the bi-cultural journey is optional for Pākehā. But if we are to be faithful to the gospel, the church or our society in 21st century Aotearoa, is there really an option? For me, to learn
to live in relationship with Māori means refusing to collude with the narratives of racism which I’m often entrenched in. It is to refuse to collude with myth-making or rewriting the past in my favour. I’ve thought, why don’t we just forgive and forget so that we can move forward together? This call to forgetfulness about our past is often part of an avoidance mechanism. “Let’s not face the uncomfortable past (let alone the present) and move forward as one big forgetful family.” But many Māori ask that instead of forgetting the past to move forward, we learn to remember.

To forget the past is to dishonour the many Māori who lost their lives, their land, their language, their culture and their security, and it means we remain silent on the myths that perpetuated this story—myths such as the natural inferiority of Māori. As uncomfortable as it may be, remembering rightly allows us to face the truth and offer the hope of a different future. At his table, our Lord commanded us to learn to live in the present through memory and hope.

Remembering New Zealand Baptists and Māori

For many in our churches, this is a year to celebrate the coming of the gospel to NZ. The coming of Samuel Marsden to NZ is the important and complicated story of the Anglicans, followed by the Wesleyans and the Catholics. Whilst these are NZ’s important and complicated stories in general, they’re not the NZ Baptist story in particular. NZ Baptist’s relationship with Māori is not one that’s well known nor often told. Many Baptists sense that we have a story, and that it’s probably bad, but we don’t know it.

This year marks the 131st anniversary of NZ Baptist’s first Māori mission that emerged out of the Auckland Baptist Tabernacle. An American Baptist, William Snow had moved to the area of Te Wairoa to see if the mineral pools could help his disability. In conjunction with the Haszard family, who taught led the Native School at Te Wairoa, Snow offered to pay half the salary of a Baptist missionary in the area. Thomas Spurgeon wrote to his Father Charles Spurgeon to send a graduate from Spurgeon’s College. He sent William Fairbrother to become the first Baptist missionary to Māori in 1883. Upon Fairbrother’s arrival, Spurgeon wrote, “A fair brother is going to proclaim the gospel to his dark brethren. In this we do and will rejoice.” In January of 1883, Spurgeon wrote with delight of the Baptist Māori Mission, “We may venture to hope that the NEW ZEALAND BAPTIST will have to chronicle, in years to come, the ingathering of the heathen in this our adopted land through the preaching of our own men.” In a little more than two years, Spurgeon’s great hope was gone and it did not return for 70 more. Local Māori sent a letter to the Tab with one request, “Can you please remove Mr Fairbrother”. Whilst Fairbrother had made some progress, his puritanical views on alcohol and tobacco gave him little love for Māori. Roy Bullen suggests that Fairbrother’s tendency was “to despise the sin and the sinner.” The myth of Māori inferiority, which was common in the day, was deeply entrenched in Baptist assumptions. At the end of the first year, Fairbrother wrote, “I only hope that by-and-bye I shall be able to exert greater influence over the poor dark Māori.” As a passionate Blue-ribbon man, when a local Māori appeared drunk, Fairbrother refused to preach in that “polluted place” again. He wasn’t beyond throwing his walking
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stick at Māori women who caused disturbances in his meetings. Pipes were snatched out of the mouths of Māori men, followed up with sharp public rebuke. When the meetings went over time, and his schedule needed him elsewhere, Fairbrother simply left. It turns out that in the eyes of Māori, he wasn’t such a “fair brother” after all.

With the fading of the first mission, there were regular petitions to the Baptist Union to start another Māori mission. The Canterbury/Westland Association wrote the Union asking for greater focus on Home Missions, especially “amongst the miners and those of our own race who are living where no sound of the Gospel ever strikes their ears, and evangelising work amongst the swarthier skins worn by our Māori brothers.” Official investigations found that a Māori mission wasn’t feasible because of expense. One minister, returning back the UK, said that when it comes to Māori, we do nothing. He pleaded for the rise of a mission to the pagans of our own land. The only thing he managed to raise was the anger of the Secretary of NZBMS. H. H. Driver’s terse response said it was convenient that the minister suddenly became interested in Māori mission just as he was leaving. Driver gave three reasons that such a mission was not possible:

- The mission could not fund the work in India and a Māori mission;
- Other denominations had much longer and stronger historical links to Māori and it could be left to them;
- It was better for Baptists to put their money into permanent races, like the Indians, rather than the Māori race whose extinction was inevitable.

Interestingly, only 17 years earlier, when the mission to Te Wairoa was underway, Thomas Spurgeon dismissed the idea of the dying out of Māori. “The rising generation at Wairoa is particularly interesting. Signs of the “dying out” of the Māori race are not abundant thereabouts—indeed it is rather the other way.” Baptists flip-flopped on the theory of the dying out of Māori once again in 1949 when they agreed to investigate the possibility of another Māori mission. “The work Baptists began among our Māori people last century was allowed to die. It was not a united venture and it was widely believed the whole Māori race was dying. Under the strong leadership of Rev. Alfred North and missionaries like Rev. Charles Carter the missionary enthusiasm of New Zealand Baptists was diverted to India. But time has proven that the Māoris have no intention of dying as a race.”

Either the fortunes of Māori as a race followed Baptist decision-making, or the “dying out” theory was a convenient arrow which Baptists shot into the air when needed, and painted a bulls-eye wherever it landed.

In the 70 intervening years between the first and second Baptist Māori Mission, without the relational engagement with Māori, discussion about Māori was limited, speculative and sometimes weird—like the suggestion that the Māori word for “pa” resonates with the English word for father, and this proves that we all descend back to one common ancestor. Perhaps more disturbing is the waxing lyrical of how the land wars were really over the English failing to keep their word on
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prohibition, not land.\textsuperscript{42} The most common Baptist fable about Māori was the speculated mission of Samuel Pearce to Māori in 1789. Pearce’s speculated journey was found in the publication of Pearce’s biography, \textit{Samuel Pearce: The Baptist Brainerd} by S. Pearce Carey, which was listed among books every Baptist should buy.\textsuperscript{43} Pearce was a very highly regarded Baptist missionary pioneer, whose portrait hung on the wall of the Baptist College dining room,\textsuperscript{44} and New Zealand Baptists latched on to this reference to a proposed Baptist mission to Māori. They celebrated the idea that, had Pearce followed through, Baptists would have probably conducted the first mission to Māori, instead of Marsden.\textsuperscript{45} This story became part of Baptist folklore and was an often repeated Baptist fable.\textsuperscript{46} Pearce was a friend of William Carey, the great Baptist missionary, who had earlier recorded the need for mission to New Zealanders (Māori) because, “They [Māori] are in general poor, barbarous, naked pagans, as destitute of civilization, as they are of true religion.”\textsuperscript{47} However, the plans of Pearce and Carey to come to New Zealand via Australia in 1786, did not eventuate. This did not stop New Zealand Baptists from celebrating their ponderings. The story was regularly repeated in the \textit{Baptist} and it even made its way into the series on NZ Baptist history, \textit{A Handful of Grain}.\textsuperscript{48} This celebration of “what could have been”, perhaps captures an element of the NZ Baptist story with Māori. Baptists were passionate about the idea of mission and ministry with Māori, but less enamoured by the reality. Regular stories were told of missionaries engaged in Māori mission, but these did not prompt a Baptist Māori mission. Baptists were passionate mission people, but mission seems more exotic through stories than lived reality. Mission always sounds and seems exotic from a distance, but living in relationship with those who are different and other is difficult, fraught and messy, and likely to demand change on all sides.

Without relationship with Māori, Baptists often uncritically celebrated veterans of “the Māori Wars”. Veterans who fought in government campaigns were regularly celebrated within the pages of the \textit{Baptist}. One veteran of the Waikato campaign against the Māori uprising was honoured at his passing in 1915, along with his “gallant regiment”.\textsuperscript{49} This was just 10 years before a Royal Commission was launched into the injustices of the Waikato invasion of the King Country, which the Crown later acknowledged as a raupatu (confiscation). The Manukau Report of the Waitangi Tribunal (1985) concluded: “all sources agree that the Tainui people of the Waikato never rebelled but were attacked by British troops in direct violation of Article II of the Treaty of Waitangi.”\textsuperscript{50} Where Māori concerns intersected with Baptist concerns, Baptists became interested in Māori. This was especially the case with alcohol. Baptists passed a strongly worded resolution supporting the protests against attempts to remove prohibition in the King Country.\textsuperscript{51} This was something which Māori themselves were protesting. However, when it came to issues that mattered to Māori, such as the Royal Commission into the invasion of the King Country on two years later, Baptists remained silent.

Without the relationships with Māori, the issues were simply not seen nor engaged.
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In 1939, E. P. Y. Simpson wrote an analysis on why Baptists were failing with Māori. It gave a serious critique, but it also offered a different way forward. Baptists are like the Priest and the Levite, and pass by the problem of Baptists and Māori. In his analysis, we were simply unaware a problem exists.\(^5\) Simpson argued that Baptists tend to either patronise, colonise or Europeanise Māori into Christianity and blithely move on assuming their duty is done. Views of Māori were formed by looking at the dregs of Māori society and assuming that the goal is to get them to give up racing, beer and dancing and come to Pākehā church services.\(^5\) Simpson recounts an old Māori man’s reflections on a missionary: “‘He does not really care for my people. He wants to save their souls, but he does not try to understand them. He does not love them.’” “The Māori is justifiably indignant when he is "patronised" by the Pākehā. The older generation does not forget that the Pākehā destroyed much of the old Māori culture, and would even to-day stifle what remains of it. Nor can the older Māori forget that his ancestors were a highly cultured people when the ancestors of the Pākehā were savages.”\(^5\) These colonial ideals, says Simpson, label Māori as savages simply because Māori culture is different to European. The consequence of these prejudices, according to Simpson, is that Māori have an antipathy to things Pākehā, and who is to blame them? “The Māori has had very little reason to think of the Pākehā as his friend.” Such shallow mission needs to be transformed into deep mission where the missionary “goes native” in their speech, thinking, and living, so that their life as well as their speech is a witness that Christ is mighty to save. Simpson gave the example of a young couple who are living among Māori, learning from them and loving them.\(^5\)

The couple were Normal and Phyllis Perry. The Perry’s were Baptists who went to work for the Presbyterians among Māori. Simpson’s judgment of the significance of their work proved to be true. Sir Norman Perry went on to be knighted nearly forty years later for his lifelong services to Māori.\(^5\)

The late 1940s and the 1950s saw the rise of the second Baptist Māori Mission which has transformed into the Baptist Māori Ministries we know today. After a long scoping process by some committed people such as Ralph Page and Arthur Mead, the quest for a second Baptist Māori Mission finally saw the light of day. Some 70 years after its predecessor, the second Māori mission began with Des Jones and Joan Milner joining the growing Māori work at Pukekohe, which had developed from the vision of Ian Christensen. This was at a time when Pukekohe was known by some as the racist capital of NZ. Māori were made to sit downstairs at the movie theatres, had to sit in separate barber’s chairs for their haircuts, and were refused service at the pub.\(^5\) At the 1954 Assembly, tribute was given to the persistent and tenacious work of Ralph Page and Arthur Mead over the many years of work that led to this point.\(^5\) This marked a significant change in Baptist relations to Māori, as the denomination became impassioned for the new Baptist Māori Mission. Descriptions of the newly begun work in Pukekohe were nothing less than dramatic. “Our Māori Session was quite breath-taking. T. R. Page, who might easily be taken for a dweller by some Lake Placid, was almost as volcanic as Ngauruhoe. Likewise the Rev. Ian Christensen, of Pukekohe. We are really going to town in this work.”\(^5\)

\(^{52}\) NZB, August 1939, 245.
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\(^{55}\) NZB, August 1939, 245.
\(^{56}\) http://www.nzherald.co.nz/business/news/article.cfm?c_id=3&objectid=10395732
\(^{58}\) NZB, Dec 1954, 274.
\(^{59}\) NZB, Dec 1955, 299.
The work of Des and Joan Jones and Joan Milner in Franklin, Tuakau, Port Waikato and Waiuku was remarkable. They embodied Simpson’s call to love Māori culture, Māori thinking, Māori language and Māori life. They spent time living among Māori on the marae, learning the language and Māori culture. David Moko tells me that Des’ children were given Māori names by the kaumatua at birth, and their family are now part of the whakapapa of the marae where they worked. Both Des Jones and Joan Milner are alive today—I’m told that Joan is in her 90s and still attends Franklin Baptist—I’d love to listen, learn and celebrate their stories.

It is interesting to note the shift in Baptist discourse towards Māori. Whilst there remained a passion regarding alcohol’s impact upon Māori, this became tempered by the acknowledgement that the contemporary plight of Māori was bound up in the Pākehā colonisation of Māori. There became an acknowledgement that there was a need to “Blame the Pākehā” for the colonising past which had had a devastating impact upon Māori. Evangelistic concern about the spread of Mormonism amongst Māori was now tempered by the failure of Pākehā in their treatment of Māori. “Then there was the introduction of alcohol—a story of which every white man in New Zealand should be thoroughly ashamed. Over all lay suspicion of the British seizing Māori land. This ultimately provoked the Māori wars. They were a bad blow to the spread of Christianity in New Zealand. These factors should be remembered when we speak of the spread of Mormonism among the Māoris.” Des Jones wrote on the issues of alcohol amongst Māori in the early 1960s and the impact of urban drift.

The impact of the European upon Māori life has been such as to cause them re-occurring problems and perplexities. Some investigators hold that the adjustments that Māori society is called upon to make are as great today as in the time when trader, settler and missionary brought new standards and asked the Māori to accept them. For many today, the main cause of upheaval is the necessity to leave the country districts and move to the town in search of work. New values and a new order of life have to be made or at least is expected of them overnight and many are embarrassed as they are not sure what is expected of them—let alone being able to accomplish it. It would be true to say that the widespread drunkenness is symptomatic of their bewilderment. Through the growing relationships with Māori, Baptists became aware of some of the complexities involved in considering issues Māori were facing as a result of colonisation. This shift in discourse was a result of Baptists living in relationship with Māori.

Whilst Pākehā Baptist missionaries like Des and Joan Jones and Joan Milner need to be celebrated, Baptists also have to learn from and celebrate the Māori communities and maraes who partnered with the Baptist missionaries. History is not just found in reading the journals of Pākehā missionaries, it’s also in the oral traditions of the people who hosted them, loved them and developed them. Mission and ministry doesn’t simply flow one way, it is a shared partnership and journey of transformation under God. What are the stories of the people of the maraes where they lived and visited? David tells me that there’s three or four generations of Māori Christians in those areas. I’d love to hear their stories, in which we find more of the Baptist story. Another I’d love to hear is the story of Temuka Baptist who, out of their small resources, ran a Sunday School ministry at Arowhenua marae from 1953 until the early 1990s. They responded to a request of “a cultured
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Māori lady” for a Sunday School. What was her name and what was her story? She instigated a significant ministry in one of our churches. It’s interesting to note that Māori weren’t named in the Baptist for years — they were that cultured Māori, or a poor Māori, or the first Māori delegate. What were their names? Also, can we learn the stories of the marae at Te Wairoa, Tahuna marae (where the Jones’ lived), Tauranganui marae, Arowhenua marae and the marae of South Auckland where Des and Joan Jones and Joan Milner were hosted, supported and loved? Reading through the Baptist, there were a variety of marae where Baptist churches worked throughout the country. In this research, it was a surprise to see how many churches were visiting marae, singing Māori worship songs with United Māori Mission in their service, or having guest Māori speakers (like Hone Harawera’s grandfather who often preached in Baptist churches). What might we learn about the Baptist story in these stories? What might we learn from listening to the stories of some of our Māori leaders like Sam Emory, Lionel Stewart, David Moko, Sandy Kerr, Peter Mihaire, Rewai and Josie Te Kahu, Luke Kaa Morgan or many others?

It is in these real relationships of belonging with Māori that we begin to learn what it means to be Pākehā. The church, as the community of the Spirit, has been called into one body to display God’s purposes to reconcile all things in Christ to the world. The church, in its rich variety, displays God’s reconciling purposes to the cosmos. This reconciliation is not the casting aside of our cultural difference for some Christ culture (which often means dominant culture). It is not, “great, I’m so pleased you’re here, now change to become like me.” It’s, “great, I’m so pleased you’re here, now how is Christ changing us to become more like him in our distinct expressions?” It is this reconciliation of a community of otherness-in-relation that displays God’s wise purposes to the world in its rich variety. It is a call to learn to love one another as an other. To love the otherness of the other, in all our graced complexities.

This image of the church as a reconciled body has been at the core of Baptist self-understanding. In her recent Whitley lecture, Helen Dare suggests that Baptists are people who are “on the way, and in the fray.” To be “on the way” is to be in committed covenant relationships with one another as an other. This understanding of covenant relationship is something that the Baptists of Aotearoa might be able to enrich through as we learn to honour the treaty. To be “in the fray”, is the acknowledgement that such relationships are not imagined relationships, but real relationships. Relational space is negotiated space, and being “in the fray” is a commitment to struggle with one another as an other. Instead of the negative depiction of bickering Baptists, Dare argues that this commitment to struggle with God, life and one another empowers our otherness. The scriptures give witness to God’s commitment to be in the fray. Walter Bruggemann, the Old Testament scholar, who writes, “The God of Israel is characteristically ‘in the fray’. . . Conversely, the God of Israel is rarely permitted, in the rhetoric of Israel, to be safe and unvexed ‘above the fray’.” I find this call to be “on the way, and in the fray” helpful when I think of a narrative of belonging in relationship with Māori. I would like to ask Māori friends if they feel like I am “on the way and in the fray” with them. Are we as a denomination “on the way and in the fray” with Māori? “On the way and in the fray” acknowledges the risk involved in relationships. Perceived or fictitious Māori respond as Pākehā wish fulfilment and remain as non-persons. Alison Jones notes that the continued attempts to find synthesis between the thesis and its antithesis assume a redemptive solution is necessary, usually on the terms of Pākehā. What is needed is not a redemptive solution that homogenises the otherness.
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of Māori and Pākehā, but a commitment to engage in the struggle of otherness-in-relation. The otherness of Māori and Pākehā is not merely different, but incompatible. The true reality is found in Ranginui Walker’s use of Rewi Maniapoto’s phrase, a struggle without end. “All that becomes possible is a tension. Contradictory and irreconcilable realities sit in interminable tension with the other. And in the tension between contradictory realities is the ake ake ake, the endless struggle – to know, to read, to understand, to work with, to engage with, others.” This does not mean a battle to see who wins, but the intensification of relationship that comes from truly engaging the otherness of the other. A relational struggle is not a battle where we fight for winners and losers. Struggle is a positive term, where engagement is intensified, and we are transformed to become more like Christ.

On this year’s noho marae visit with Carey, one of the Māori students said, “I love this. I feel at home here. Like I don’t have to explain myself or apologise for being Māori.” They said that the awkward and sometimes uncomfortable experience of Pākehā going on to the marae is the same experience they had every week going to church. They made the point of asking, in your church, who has to adjust to fit in? If your answer is no one, they that space is designed for people like you. Privilege is like having the wind at your back when you are riding a bicycle; you do not realise you have it until you have to turn around a bike into the wind. To be belong in relationship with Māori means, as Mikaere has noted, that Pākehā will need to give up the control of decision making and entrust Māori to lead through their own personal agency. What might it look like to give power in our churches and organisations to Māori to lead us in a process towards greater gospel faithfulness which Pākehā don’t control? It may mean the ceasing of assumed forms of worship, traditions, practices, and rituals and the development of forms which are strange to Māori. Possibilities may emerge of developing new forms of church worship which do not negativise Pākehā, but normal for Māori. It is unlikely that the normativity of settled Pākehā worship practices carry much meaning for Māori. This will take a leap of faith in Māori by Pākehā or else Māori will, once again, be assimilated into the status quo. Within the church this leap of faith is not only trusting Māori to lead with their own personal agency, it is also a leap of faith in the God who called has us together into one body, in our rich variety, to be his people and display his reconciling purposes to all the world.

I’ve found it hard to respond to the many calls to celebrate and move into the future this year. It’s not because I’m simply a Grinch about history. Of course I want to celebrate the coming of the gospel to NZ, but I want to celebrate by remembering rightly rather than imagining. Because it’s in remembering rightly that I am faced with the truth. As I’ve tried to remember, I believe my first posture is not celebration but confession. I want to confess my sin; the sins of racism which I have committed and colluded in. I want to confess my sin, apologise and ask for forgiveness. I confess that I have participated in, colluded in, endorsed, spoken and perpetuated racism, and I want to say that I


am deeply sorry. I ask my Māori friends, can you please forgive me? I also ask God to forgive me. I need God’s help and your help to learn to become Pākehā for the sake of the gospel.

A few weeks ago, some of us met with David Moko in the meeting room at the Union offices. On the wall was this painting of the Pink and White Terraces; the location of this first Baptist Māori Mission. I’d been doing this research, so I was intrigued and went to have a closer look. It was donated from the estate of Ralph Page. Page was the first chairman of the Baptist Māori Mission board, led the scoping process over seven years and worked long and hard to see Baptist Māori Mission develop. I don’t think it’s a coincidence that the painting he left for NZBMS was of the pink and white terraces, the location of NZBMS’ first Baptist Māori Mission. We move into the future not by forgetfulness, but by memory.