Speaking out in defence of history

PROFESSOR Tom Brooking of Otago University, says: "The past was always important to the Maori but they never lost their perception of the future and always realised that change was part of the human condition."

It is hard to deny the truth of his observation.

When compared to the fate of other indigenous peoples — most notably the Australian Aborigines — Maori history is distinguished by a remarkable ability to meet the challenge of European contact head on, to adapt, and to survive.

After Tariana Turia's speech to the Psychological Society's conference in Hamilton, in which she coined the phrase "post-colonial traumatic stress disorder", it has become a matter of some urgency for New Zealanders of all races to speak out in defence of their history.

Mrs Turia, a convinced Maori nationalist, must not be allowed to get away with

From the Left

Chris
Trotter

her reactionary revisionist account of the "fatal impact" of European culture on Maori society. It is time for some plain speaking.

The first thing to note is that the Maori response to the arrival of Europeans was overwhelmingly positive.

The pragmatic leaders of the numerous hapu in contact with the sealers and whaters of pre-colonial times were quick to take advantage of the Europeans' superior technology, and rapidly adapted their economic behaviour to secure a permanent supply of European goods.

Nor were they slow to adapt their agriculture to the beneficial arrival of pig and potato.

Far from seeing themselves as the victims of the Europeans, Maoris confidently anticipated a future in which the newcomers and their advanced technology could be peacefully exploited by a materially strengthened and politically dominant indigenous order.

change, the leaders of the various hapu established a thriving trade not only in flax, timber, and ship provisions, but also in sexual services and the shrunken heads of prisoners of war.

Indigenous warfare was itself transformed by the irreversible connections forged between Maoris and their European trading partners.

The Ngapuhi chieftain, Hongi Hika, in particular, launched a series of devastating assaults on neighbouring tribes — the possession of British and American muskets giving his war parties an over-

whelming military advantage. Mrs Turia may speak about the "holocaust" that followed European colonisation, but history records that it was Hika who practised what amounted to genocidal warfare against Ngati Paoa, Ngati Maru and Ngati Whatua.

(Nowhere in the history of Maori-European military conflict are more than 1000 casualties recorded from a single engagement.)

In fact, the only indisputable "holocaust" to blight New Zealand history was the mass enslavement and murder of the Moriori people of the Chatham Islands by Te Atiawa during the 1830s and 40s.

The signing of the Treaty of Waitangi and the systematic colonisation of New Zealand which followed, post-dated by many decades the Maori people's initial encounters with, and rapid adaptation to, the industrial civilisation of the European states.

By the 1860s and 70s, the

concept of a pristine indigenous culture suddenly confronted by an aggressive colonial power was already a historical nonsense.

"Aotearoa" had ceased to exist the moment the first Maori chieftain recognised the utility of the first iron axe, and the military potential of the first musket.

When Governor Grey's troops invaded the Waikato in 1863, New Zealand was already one nation, which is why Professor James Belich sometimes describes the military confrontations between a number of Maori tribes and the British Army (almost always fighting alongside Maori allies) as the New Zealand Civil War - fought (like the contemporaneous war between the American states) to establish the indivisibility of national sovereignty - a sovereignty which, in New Zealand's case, had been peacefully transferred to the British Crown, by Maoris, nearly a quarter of a century before.