Rēweti Kōhere’s Model Village

THE TE AUTÉ COLLEGE STUDENTS’ ASSOCIATION (TACSA) has always had an important place within New Zealand history, seen as it is as the stepping stone for prominent Māori parliamentarians such as Sir Āpirana Ngata, Sir Peter Buck (Te Rangihīroa) and Sir Maui Pōmare. The association was formed in 1897 from a nucleus of old-boys from Te Aute College, the leading Anglican secondary school for boys. It sought to improve Māori society socially, materially and spiritually. At a time when many were predicting the demise of the Māori race,¹ the association’s aim was to ‘seek some organising principles through which the Māori race will survive’.²

A founding member of TACSA, Rēweti Tūhorouta Kōhere, is historically less well-known than Ngata, Buck and Pomare, but in the first decade of the nineteenth century he was one of the most prolific commentators in the Māori language on Māori issues.³ In 1902 Kōhere published an article entitled ‘Te Kainga Tauira’ (The Model Village) in the Māori-language newspaper, Te Pipiwharauroa, in which he projected his vision of how Māori society could be restructured for the better. This article first provides some background on TACSA and how it fits into New Zealand historiography. Second, through discussion of Kōhere’s vision, I seek to position Kōhere as a leading intellectual within TACSA, perhaps only behind Āpirana Ngata, and show that the moral and spiritual aims of the association were as vitally important to its members as material advancement.

In his article on the model village, Kōhere identified the problems of tinana and wairua (body and soul) that he saw afflicting contemporary Māori society, then offered a holistic vision which encapsulated the movement’s reformist, acculturative programme. Although his vision was initially designed as a theoretical piece of work, he published the article in direct response to political developments. In 1900 the Liberal government had passed legislation which established elected, semi-autonomous Māori councils in various districts. Kōhere was disappointed at the lack of success of some of the association’s candidates, and no doubt wished to influence those Māori who had been elected.

Up to the 1970s most New Zealand histories depicted TACSA in a wholly positive light. That Māori had survived as a distinct ethnic group whilst seeming to be adapting to the modern urban environment appeared to vindicate the group’s programme. The credit generally went to the three parliamentarians — Ngata, Buck and Pōmare — whom John Condliffe and Willis Airey, for example, suggest ‘all made great contributions to this Maori revival’.⁴ Historians also praised them for their ability to work within existing tribal structures in order to achieve their aims and for adapting selected modern practices into Māori communities.⁵

As the effects of post-war urbanization became more apparent, and as Māori struggled to maintain their culture and language in the cities and
towns, academics began to question the motives of TACSA in wanting Māori to substitute modern customs for some tikanga Māori. In 1965, R.J. Martin stated that the movement was: ‘principally characterized by its wholesale adoption of Pakeha culture and its readiness to scrap the surviving elements of its own. To [TACSA] Maori society was degraded, demoralized, irreligious, beset with antiquated, depressing and pernicious customs. Their task . . . was to reconstruct this society to make the race clean, industrious, sober, and virtuous.’ Subsequent writers have repeated this quotation uncritically, or reiterated the sentiments, portraying the association as an assimilatory lobby group consciously destroying what was left of Māori culture. Raeburn Lange’s *May the People Live* discusses the positive first steps the association undertook to improve Māori health, as part of Pōmare’s wider reforms which ultimately assisted the Māori demographic revival. Less well explored is the movement’s less fashionable religious and moral concerns, which this article investigates.

Like earlier writers, recent historians tend to give precedence to the work of Buck and Pōmare within TACSA, and in particular Ngata. As the travelling secretary, and therefore the face of the movement to Māori communities, Ngata was indeed the ‘star performer’. Whereas Pōmare and Buck continue to be tainted with the stigma of assimilation, Ngata’s political longevity and maturity allowed him to be rehabilitated. The ‘old’ Ngata fits better into the anti-assimilatory historiography than the ‘young’ Ngata. Ranginui Walker, while deprecating Pōmare’s continued promotion of Pākehā values, blamed TACSA’s Pākehā mentors for the movement’s assimilatory tendencies. Although he described the movement’s leaders as having been ‘subordinated by the Pākehā’, he suggested that they eventually sloughed off these influences and he credited Ngata, the movement’s most prominent leader, with initiating the Māori cultural renaissance at the start of the twentieth century.

While it is true that assimilatory forces were encroaching upon Māori society, the response of TACSA’s young Māori members can best be described as ‘adaptive acculturation’: that is, for better or worse, they made conscious decisions about which Pākehā and Māori tikanga (codes) they thought Māori should practise, rather than promote across-the-board assimilation. At the association’s fourth conference in 1899, the Inspector of Native Schools, James Pope, asked ‘Is there any part of Māori tikanga that it would be right to cherish as a taonga in the future?’ The answer was, ‘Yes, there are many parts, but they must be chosen carefully.’ As Ngata told Māori in 1899, ‘Do not shut out Pākehā tikanga or Government tikanga, but look at them carefully, then pick the ones that are appropriate.’

TACSA eschewed political autonomy as an unrealistic option for Māori, preferring Māori to ‘keep afloat on the tide of European civilisation’, that is, to engage with, and survive, the modernity with which colonization had confronted them. At a time when many Māori did not speak English well, the association considered that Māori should learn English in order to survive in the modern world, little realizing the risk this would ultimately pose to the Māori language. They wanted Māori to move from communal land ownership to individualized blocks in order to make their land productive and
counter Pākehā demands for Māori ‘waste’ land to be sold off to more efficient Pākehā settlers. In a time of poor Māori health, they decried tohunga (Māori healers) whom they saw as harmful charlatans. The movement aimed at the higher ideals of Western civilization without rejecting everything in Māori culture. It certainly did not want Māori to become like ‘the low class Pākehā, an old enemy of the clergymen in other climes, [who] had undermined the teachings of the noble men who had given up all to raise the heathen Māori’. The association saw Māori society as being separate from the more numerous and politically powerful Pākehā society, and as such they wanted to keep a distinct Māori identity, and cultural practices, so long as these did not retard material advancement.

Historians’ preoccupation with the three Māori knights reflects the importance of the racial interface to New Zealand historiography. It was because Ngata, Buck and Pōmare became parliamentarians, that is, close to the source of political power in New Zealand, that they are deemed to have historical significance. Their involvement in TACSA is therefore relegated to a formative background for their subsequent real work. However, this is to overlook the fact that the principally rural Māori society at the turn of the twentieth century was largely separate — physically, culturally and linguistically — from that of Pākehā, and contained strands of political activity, some of which barely interacted with the Pākehā world. TACSA’s very existence as a Māori movement was predicated on the desire for Māori to survive as a separate ethnic entity, and not to be completely absorbed within Pākehā society. Their initial interaction was with Māori communities and the pan-Māori autonomy movement Te Kotahitanga o te Tiriti o Waitangi, which they hoped to eventually usurp.

Rēweti Kōhere, of Ngāti Porou, studied at Te Aute College in his teenage years. According to his autobiography, he was eager to ‘seek knowledge — the knowledge of the white man’. His mentor was Te Aute’s long-serving headmaster John Thornton, a former mission teacher in India, a man possessed of Victorian rectitude, evangelical, a teetotaller, who, according to Kōhere, ‘had one aim in life and that was to conduct his life as a model to boys under his care’.

Historians have often seen the spiritual aspect of TACSA as either irrelevant or as further evidence of assimilation. John Stenhouse has suggested that late twentieth-century historiography has tended to marginalize Victorian Christian morality, or constitute it as a ‘religious “Other”’ to the ‘tolerant, modern, enlightened, liberal New Zealanders’ of the present. Te Aute was a school based on Christian morality, and prone to occasional ‘religious revivals’. It was out of one such revival that ‘bands of students, among them Kōhere, tramped the country, preaching the Gospel and social reform’. Samuel Williams, Archdeacon of Hawke’s Bay, not only financially supported their efforts, but often joined them in prayer before they ventured out. It was from the academic and religious background provided by Te Aute that Kōhere, Ngata and other old boys formed first the Association for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Maori Race in 1894, and then the Te Aute College Students’ Association in 1897.

In 1895 Kōhere attended Canterbury College to study for a BA. He left without a degree, successful in all his subjects except the compulsory mathematics.
In 1899 he started work in Gisborne as a teacher at the Anglican Church’s training facility for Māori clergy, Te Raukahikatea College. He was also appointed as the ‘second editor’ to the monthly newspaper, *Te Pipiwharauroa* (The Shining Cuckoo). Reverend Frederick Bennett had established this newspaper (initially entitled *He Kupu Whakamarama*) in Nelson in 1898 for the Anglican Māori Church, the largest Māori denomination then and now. The paper was distributed widely and, like most Māori publications at that time, reading and lending to groups would have given it a larger readership than indicated by the subscription lists. Bennett stressed that the newspaper was to be spiritual in nature, that is, to discuss scriptural and church matters, but he allowed Kōhere to produce several supplements containing local and international news. On assuming the primary editorial role later in the year, Kōhere expanded its range, much of which he wrote himself under his own name or his pen name ‘Tipiwhenua’. He combined his teaching and editorial roles until accepting the position of vicar in 1908 to the poor Māori parish of Te Araroa on the East Cape.

It was as editor of a church paper, and as an active member of TACSA, that Kōhere published his ‘Model Village’ article in 1902. However, he first conceptualized his paradigm of a model village while still a university student, and delivered it as a paper at the second TACSA conference in Gisborne in December 1897. He may have delivered his speech in English, as an English text entitled ‘A Model Pa’ appeared in the Conference Report, but it was as a Māori text in *Te Pipiwharauroa*, much enlarged and serialized over three editions, that he disseminated it to a larger Māori audience four years later. It is the content of this second text, and the political context of its appearance, that is discussed below.

The concept of Māori separating themselves in model villages based on Christian principles was not new. In the early days of conversion, Māori converts had sometimes established Christian villages away from those of their heathen relatives. For example, in 1838 Wiremu Tamihana Tarapīpipi built a Christian village at Te Tāpiri based on the 10 commandments. Early in the 1840s, according to the settler William Fox, the CMS missionary Octavius Hadfield had established at Ōtaki ‘a model community of natives on the separate system’. The syncretic Māori prophet movements also sometimes spawned their own model villages. When Kōhere was formulating his vision, the model village of the prophets Te Whiti o Rongomai and Tohu Kākahi at Parihaka had existed for at least 30 years. Peter Buck gave a paper at the second TACSA conference on what he had observed at Parihaka. He praised the modern and clean appearance of the village, but castigated it for its vices: billiard halls, gambling, sexual immorality and grog shops. Worse still for Buck, Te Whiti’s religion had not improved the moral condition of its followers, who appeared to ‘treat religion as an abstraction or a science to be studied, but whose teachings are by no means to be practiced’. In 1877 the South Island prophet Te Maihāroa led his followers inland to form a settlement at Te Ao Mārama until evicted by police to Waitaki several years later. Twentieth-century prophets also had their own religious villages. In 1907 Rua Kēnana led his Iharaira (Israelites) to Maungapōhatu in the remote Urewera district to insulate them
from the corrosive effects of Pākehā colonialism. In the early 1920s hundreds of mōrehu (survivors) flocked to the farm of God’s māngai (mouthpiece), T.W. Rātana, to form the settlement of Rātana Pā. These religious Māori villages, discrete geographical units, were separated, like the children of Israel, from the profane and unclean world beyond.

Kōhere’s model Christian village, however, was not intended to remove a core of believers from a prevailing alien wickedness. Most Māori at this time still lived in small settlements apart from Pākehā, with largely communal lifestyles, not totally reliant on a cash economy. Kōhere was suggesting ways in which reformers could assist all Māori to cope with a situation of poverty and alienation. He did not see the reformed Māori village as a permanent model for Māori development, stating that ‘the days are coming when we will not see a single Māori village in New Zealand, and we won’t be telling our people, consider this and do that’. Future generations, he believed, would have sufficient temporal and spiritual knowledge to transcend the limitations of the Māori village, but that day was yet to come. The ‘young’ Ngata had also earlier foretold how Māori would one day be living more individualized lives, although through the formation of separate family farms: ‘With the individualisation of land titles must come the dissolution of the common village life, and the growth of independent effort. Then we will have the family as the real unit of tribal life, and know and enjoy privacy in our homes.’ Kōhere saw his model village as one step in the transition to a more modern, individualized style of life, based on the nuclear family, while still retaining a tribal identity.

Kōhere’s article began by describing the spatial nature of his model Māori village. He suggested that it should be sited on a hill, as in days of old, near a spring or river, citing James Pope’s Te Ora mo te Maori, originally an English-language health guide for Māori students, but also published in Māori for Māori adults. Kōhere was specific about how the village should look. Buildings should include a hall and a church used for Sunday services. He suggested that the villagers could also use the church for daily communal morning and evening prayers, thus reflecting religious behaviour which, although derived from missionary influence, had become part of nineteenth-century Māori village life. He still appreciated important aspects of Māori culture, suggesting that villagers also erect a whare whakairo (carved house) for tribal meetings, thus retaining the indigenous focal point of the village. Kōhere, who had gained an appreciation of neat lawns and gardens while at Te Aute College, wanted the model Māori village to appear inviting. He suggested that the village inhabitants should plant trees, with women making the village both productive and beautiful with vegetable and flower gardens. His concerns were both aesthetic and moral: ‘In my trips to some villages, from the lonely and filthy appearance, from the large number of pigs grunting on one side, from the crowd of dogs yapping at you, there is nothing to hold the restless spirit of the Māori at home, and I know that’s the reason people really want to go and sit in the pub: it’s more pleasant than their own homes’. In line with TACSA’s health policies, Kōhere proposed that the village should establish a komiti responsible for drainage and sanitation. Māori health, which had deteriorated since (and because of) colonization, was a
major issue. Some contemporaries blamed Māori shifting to lower ground to be closer to their cultivations and to swamps, where they harvested flax, for the health problems. Regardless of the cause, a recent plague scare meant existing Māori houses were considered unhygienic and thus a risk. At this time many Māori families lived in simple one-roomed thatched dwellings with earth floors similar to the traditional whare. Most rural Māori suffered from poverty and Kōhere knew that the standards of Māori housing could not quickly be improved to those of town-dwelling Pākehā, suggesting that houses should be constructed with simple split palings and divided into rooms with a chimney. In his autobiography his only discussion of his model village referred to housing: ‘In the [conference] paper I visualized a model native settlement, the houses of which were built with split palings. I had seen some homes built with split palings and I thought them a great improvement on the thatched whares. A few years later I saw those very homes being replaced by modern houses and I do not think you could now find a paling home in any East Coast settlement other than in camps.’ The division of houses into rooms had long been a concern of missionaries who believed that sleeping communally was not only unhealthy but also led to fornication. Kōhere stated that boys and girls of the Anglican Māori boarding schools, Te Aute, St Stephens and Hukarere, dreaded going home where they were exposed to temptations and separated from ‘things that strengthen their spirit’. These sentiments were echoed in the report of the first TACSA conference: ‘In the discussion that followed, some of the old boys told how at home they felt a drowsiness come over them like some narcotic, which numbed their faculties and power of resistance, and caused the evil passions to grow until they could not be controlled’. The villages, Kōhere suggested, should invite them in and ‘not be as a burial ground for them and their noble thoughts’.

Many of Kōhere’s prescriptions related to the social aspects of Māori life and contained a strong moral underpinning. He had great faith that with education and religion a moral progression would occur from one generation to the next. Therefore much of his article centred on child rearing and young people. In a number of articles in Te Pipiwharauroa, Kōhere stressed the benefits of schooling. Perhaps mindful that some Māori communities, such as Te Whiti and Tohu’s Parihaka, had shunned Pākehā education, he stated in his Model Village article that ‘we should thank the Government for building schools where Māori want them, and we should thank very much the people who run the Māori schools, who really want the Māori people to advance’. However, most of his advice on children concerned what happened within the home rather than at school. Women, he considered, were not valued in Māori society and from infancy girls were not adequately taught or guided and subsequently fell into sin. Māori parents were at fault in not directing their children properly: ‘According to how Māori think, all parents need to do to show their love for their children is to give them everything they want, and let the children do as their hearts desire. When the children become adults, the parents are amazed at how stubborn and hard hearted their children are.’

Kōhere did not discuss corporal punishment, a practice that had most likely been part of his boarding-school experiences, but instead advocated good role
models. In particular, men needed to set a good example in their work ethic and not be content to merely grow potatoes and kumara. In his model village men worked every day and would seek work elsewhere, even on Pākehā farms, if none was available at home. The value of hard work was that it left little energy for men to drift off to the pub. Kōhere also criticized men who slept or drank while their wives did all the work in the field. His idealized society was heavily gendered: field work was men’s work, while women stayed at home to toil in the house and garden.\footnote{33}

Kōhere also considered that the village needed to keep young people amused to keep them out of trouble. As befitting a product of a boarding school imbued with notions of ‘muscular Christianity’, he advocated that the model village establish sports clubs for young people and he dismissed the suggestion he considered prevalent among older Māori that the enjoyment of sport might divert youngsters from their faith: \footnote{69} ‘If we take, we must give. We cannot hold a person from going to the pub if there is no other activity to hold him. What better thing is there on days without work than people of the village gathering, young people playing and the older people watching, or two schools meeting to compete at sports: rugby, cricket, hockey and other sports the young like to play.’\footnote{70}

While Kōhere conceded that horse racing might be acceptable if purged of the associated gambling and drinking,\footnote{71} he could not agree to European-style dancing, even when dances were organized to raise funds for the church. He had seen, he claimed, the evil that came from dancing: ‘From dancing, the girl loses her sense of shame, the thing that holds her from falling into sin.’\footnote{72}

Instead, women should be well trained in household tasks: ‘Proficient women could teach other women how to look after their houses, cook food, look after invalids, sew and other good work. A man will really appreciate his daughter if his child knows how to cook and sew, whether she knows English or not: the father may not know the English language but he knows the sweetness of freshly cooked bread, or of soup when he is lying sick. From what I have seen, there are few girls who know how to cook or to care for the house.’\footnote{73}

Boys, on the other hand, could have clubs: ‘Entertainment nights should be held for them. Sometimes we should give them interesting talks, such as the journey of Nansen to the [North] Pole, and show pictures of his journey.’\footnote{74}

Missionaries and government officials had always been concerned with the tangihanga (Māori funeral) customs, which were deemed wasteful in terms of the days spent mourning and the huge amounts of food and money expended in over-liberal hospitality. Rather than dispense with the tangihanga in favour of a Pākehā-style funeral, Kōhere suggested modifying the custom, without rejecting it completely: ‘A large crowd should not come to the tangi. Rather the people of the Model Village should write letters to the relatives of the deceased with their words of condolence, with the letter [asking] for one or two people to attend to carry [the grief home].’\footnote{75}

This acknowledged the custom of kawe mate where a family might take a picture or photograph of the deceased to distant villages to be grieved over, while dispensing with the ‘waste’ of the traditional funeral. Kōhere was also concerned that tangihanga and other Māori meetings should only take a single day, otherwise both sexes would have to sleep communally in the meeting house, and the young might end up dancing.\footnote{76}
Kōhere’s was not a lone voice among TACSA members in calling for the moral regeneration of Māori society. For example, at the first TACSA conference, Reverend Herbert Williams delivered a paper on ‘Courtship and Marriage Among the Maori’ in which he suggested an extended, presumably celibate, engagement period to allow prospective couples to get to know each other better, and for love to prevail over the custom of arranged marriages as the method for selecting a partner. 78 Āpirana Ngata was far blunter in his paper, ‘Sexual Immorality Amongst the Maori’. He complained of the ‘looseness of sexual relations’, suggesting that Māori, who still possessed much of their ‘savage’ nature, were unable to curb their lust. He also considered that Māori parents were too open in their discussions of sexual matters, so children never learnt the sinfulness of illicit sexual relations. Rhetorically he asked ‘Is the organism so rotten it cannot be rebuilt?’ Ngata considered that education and the Gospel would aid the regeneration, and employment would provide an ‘outlet for exuberant and irrepressible animal spirits’. Similarly, ‘dissolution of our communistic system’, that is, the individualization of Māori land title, would result in families living apart from each other, with fewer opportunities for illicit sex. 79 At the movement’s second conference topics included ‘Evils Rampant Amongst the Maories’, ‘The Evils of Drink Amongst the Maories’, ‘Cleanliness’, as well as papers focused on education and employment. 80

TACSA wanted Māori not only to survive, but also to flourish in a changing world. As a founding member, Kōhere used Te Pipiwharauroa to advance the movement’s programme, despite its primary goal of promoting church matters to Māori. He published letters from Ngata, in particular on his peregrinations around various Māori settlements as the association’s travelling secretary. 81 Kōhere also printed accounts of the association’s conferences and meetings, 82 and short biographical notes on various members (including himself) who were now using their educations for the advancement of Māori. 83 His ‘Model Village’ article clearly reflected the aims of the association for material advancement, hand in hand with social and moral regeneration.

Most importantly, however, Kōhere, the seminary teacher, believed that all these social improvements would go bad without religion ‘as the salt’. The Anglican Māori Church had always considered that Māori holding religious office should act as exemplars for correct behaviour. 84 Kōhere was no exception.

If the minister is a real Christian, urged on by the love of God and men, supported by the chiefs of the village, in my opinion our Model Village would not just stand in spirit. … The minister of the Village should be a model minister. His heart would have been truly converted to God, his body and all his works given over to Christ, not just a person who preaches because he has been to College or because he is being paid. Everything about the minister would be an example: his physical appearance, his house, his children and his wife. 85

While Kōhere expected the minister to be the spiritual leader, organizing young people into a choir and Sunday school, he still believed that each person within the village was responsible for their own spiritual welfare. While there was nothing wrong with the daily communal prayers as in the past, the best prayers,
he said, were those with one’s own family in one’s own home. Some people were good at reciting from a prayer book, but needed to learn how to pray in their own words in their own rooms.\textsuperscript{86}

Kōhere was an orthodox evangelical Anglican. The model village’s minister came complete with wife and children indicating the Protestant nature of his vision. In his other writings, Kōhere contributed to religious division. While not above making snide asides about the Catholic Church,\textsuperscript{87} his most constant attacks were against Mormonism, which had gained ground on the East Coast in the late nineteenth century. He suggested to his readers that Mormon missionaries were targeting Māori because they considered them more gullible than Pākehā,\textsuperscript{88} asking ‘what is the reason there are 30 Mormon preachers for just 39,000 Māori, and only two for 700,000 Pākehā?’\textsuperscript{89} He also pointed out the ‘errors’ of Mormon theology, including constant references to the evil of polygamy.\textsuperscript{90}

Kōhere’s evangelicalism allowed for an active God who intervened in human activity, but he employed a rational approach to Māori beliefs in ghosts and witchcraft, asserting that they were just not credible.\textsuperscript{91} Kōhere stated in his autobiography that ‘when I became editor of Te Pipiwharauroa I at once attacked, with much zeal, tohungaism in all its various forms . . . I was uncompromising in that attitude’.\textsuperscript{92} On one occasion he even challenged several tohunga to kill him with sorcery: ‘What we suggest is that Ramari and Taitoko be told to bewitch us this very year and tell us the nature of the illness, lest we die of fever, TB or influenza[?] this year and you falsely say that it was Ramari who bewitched me, therefore explain the nature of the illness and the length of time for me to die in.’\textsuperscript{93} However, in his article on the model village Kōhere chose not to include his more divisive religious rhetoric, perhaps to avoid discussions that might divert attention from his other messages of change.

Kōhere, like Ngata, appreciated the creative aspects of Māori culture, although this element was not accentuated in his article. At the fourth TACSA conference members discussed tikanga Māori:

In the speeches following Pope’s talk, [members] discussed the retention of some Māori customs. Thornton said that the mana of the chiefs should be kept as this was the sign of a chiefly warrior race. [They] argued over the haka taparāhi, the haka in which people make their appearance hideous, that that was the custom of a savage race, not of a Christian people. Some supported the haka, saying, let’s improve it, and take out the bad bits. To Tipiwhenua the poi was the haka that should be kept; it was a beautiful dance of which people never got tired, and the boys weren’t fondling the waists of young women, and getting evil thoughts. Rēweti Kōhere said that Māori names and the Māori language, which the Pākehā said was one of the loveliest languages in the world, should be kept, and people should stop replacing Māori words with English ones, as in when some people say ‘Kia rūkauta’ (Look out) rather than ‘Kia tūpato’ (Be careful).\textsuperscript{94

Kōhere had a fondness for the beauty of poi.\textsuperscript{95} He was well aware that some Anglican clergy disliked the haka as un-Christian, but he appeared to have been in favour of the practice, and reported haka performances at hui without any negative comments.\textsuperscript{96} The haka fitted in well with the jingoistic mood created
by the Boer War. Some Māori contributed to war fund-raising and celebrations with popular cultural performances, including haka. Köhere himself led a Ngāti Porou haka in honour of General Roberts at the Gisborne Town Hall in 1900. When reporting that the British Parliament had broken into song to celebrate the relief of Ladysmith, Köhere considered ‘that if the elders of our Māori customs, they would have stomped out a haka peruperu’. Köhere appreciated tikanga Māori, wrote in te reo Māori, and operated largely in a Māori world: he was a zealous reformer but hardly an all-inclusive assimilationist.

It is possible that the association actually contemplated transforming an existing village into Köhere’s model. On 14 March 1899, Ngata wrote to Köhere saying that he was ‘looking for a beautiful place to site your “Model Village”’ and suggested Te Kaha, Te Kawakawa (Te Araroa), Kākāriki and Taumata-o-Mihi as possible locations. The closest that TACSA may have got to creating a model village was when over 5000 Māori assembled in Rotorua as part of a welcome for the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall in 1901, where Pōmare, in particular, was active in promoting health and sanitation at the temporary Māori village.

When Köhere left Te Rau in 1908 to take up the minister’s position at Te Kawakawa he found he had to compromise his ideals in order to fit in with the reality of living as a rural Māori parson. He does not appear to have converted the local Māori community to his ideas, perhaps handicapped by an insufficient stipend, personal jealousies and an unsuccessful battle for many years on a claim to ancestral lands through the Native Land Court. As can be seen in his autobiography written just before his death, Köhere mellowed considerably as he grew older, although Bill Pearson suggested that the autobiography ‘has a tone of proud resignation’. Ngāti Porou society was changing through economic forces. It began to engage more with farming and the money economy, especially once Ngata, as Minister of Native Affairs, was able to arrange government loans for agricultural development. Köhere’s article on the model village was critical of Māori society at the turn of the century, but he offered a vision of what might be possible at that time without the advantage of hindsight. He neatly summarized TACSA’s programme in a holistic way that Māori would easily understand, even if he was unable, as a village minister, to realize the vision himself.

Köhere’s original paper of 1897 was the only conference paper to be reproduced in Te Pipiwharauroa, although in Māori and as an expanded text. The underlying message was unchanged, but the article’s appearance four years later was due directly to political developments. In 1900, after input from TACSA and the two rival Māori autonomy movements, the Kīngitanga and Te Kotahitanga o te Tiriti o Waitangi, the New Zealand Parliament passed the Māori Councils Act. The Act created large territorial councils in Māori areas with the power to create by-laws relating to sanitation and health, animal control, public spaces, water supply, tohunga, alcohol and gambling. The councils were also to gather statistics for the government, promote education, ‘suppress injurious customs’ and determine ‘rights, duties, and liabilities . . . in relation to all social and domestic matters’. In short, councils were responsible
for the ‘health and welfare and moral well-being of the Māori inhabitants of the District’. The councils would appoint marae committees which would administer the by-laws in each Māori village. TACSA naturally saw the new councils as powerful instruments for reforming Māori society, and at their fifth conference drew up a set of draft by-laws for the councils, once elected, to consider. Te Pīpiwharauroa published a few of these model by-laws, relating mainly to housing, soon after the council elections in 1901. Köhere’s article must also be seen as a guide or encouragement to the new organization.

For some Māori, such councils and komiti marae were official recognition of pre-existing tribal political structures. For the government, the councils were a conduit for the extension of European civilization and government control into Māori communities, as well as for the improvement of health and sanitation. With Māori focusing attention on their own regions, the new political environment also had the added benefit for the government of diverting Māori away from the pan-tribal Kotahitanga ki te Tiriti o Waitangi, which had been seeking a more unified and comprehensive autonomy. For the more youthful TACSA, the demise of the Kotahitanga, dominated by older chiefs, would provide a vacuum that the reformers could fill, as envisaged in their use of the old proverb ‘the old net lies in a heap, the new net goes fishing’. The relationship between the old Kotahitanga and new ‘Kotahitanga’ (TACSA called itself ‘Kotahitanga o Te Aute’ in Māori) was problematic, with some older chiefs considering the younger men a threat to their aims. At the fifth TACSA conference in December 1900 Ngata spoke ‘on the difference between the Te Aute’s Kotahitanga [TACSA] and the Kotahitanga of the Treaty of Waitangi — one was an old man, the other was a child. Te Aute’s was still ascending while Waitangi’s was going down, and now they had met in the middle. “We should put ourselves at the feet of the chiefs, but not be trampled under.”

Unlike the older Kotahitanga, TACSA did not favour pursuing land grievances and issues of political autonomy. Instead, Māori should embrace social reform for Māori within the wider Pākehā system, and the young Te Aute men considered themselves the best equipped to drive this. Ngata, in an article where he utilized the ‘fishing’ metaphor, wrote: ‘The new net goes fishing. Friends, look at these rivers, where are the fish to be netted? The eel, the inanga, the lamprey, the mullet, the kahawai — some survivors remain, just like the [Māori] people. The rivers are full of Pākehā fish, so we should use his tools to fish. How will we catch one of these strange fish? All we need to do is look for one of the Pākehā’s rods, get it, know how to use it, then we will get the fish from the waters flowing by.”

Naturally, TACSA members stood for the new councils, with Ngata sending a letter to his Ngāti Porou tribe suggesting for whom they should vote. Köhere was against such public endorsement of individuals, merely advising his readers to ‘vote for men on whom no great stain is seen, men whose thoughts are not turned by the tinkle of coins or the rustle of banknotes, men with noble thoughts able to suppress their desires, who do not have a jealous or hateful heart’. TACSA members were aware, particularly during their earlier incarnation as the Association for the Amelioration of the Māori Race, that their elders had been ‘taken aback at the unwonted spectacle of
raw youths constituting themselves as judges and dictators’ over Māori settlements. When drawing up the draft by-laws, Köhere was cautious of upsetting traditional power structures, advising ‘first let the laws be easy, they are new customs: in time, strengthen them’.

Ngata was elected chairman of the Horouta Māori Council and was appointed Organizing Inspector of Māori Councils in 1902, but other Te Aute members were less successful, probably because Māori trusted their older traditional leaders over these vocal reforming evangelists. Through the pages of Te Pipiwharauroa, Köhere criticized voters for electing elders rather than ‘the children of Te Aute’: ‘In our opinion, this is what is wrong with “Takitimu”. There were four young men of Te Aute, some of the leaders of Te Kotahitanga o Te Aute [TACSA], young men in whom is seen constancy of thought, all doing important work, all in the Takitumu district, but none of whom is on the marae council. The fault lies with the people.’ The elders elected to the councils, he claimed, would not suppress customs that those with Pākehā education could see were wrong. Many of the council members were followers of tohunga or were drunkards who would be slow to bring in by-laws to suppress the use of alcohol: ‘The consumption of alcohol is increasing on this coast [Te Tai Rāwhiti], and if one of the things our councils achieve is to suppress alcohol, then it would be a very important thing. Their selection would be justified, and they would leave their names as sacred inheritance to their descendants after them.’

The councils adopted various by-laws, some of which were quite intrusive. For example, Ngata’s Horouta Māori Council forbade billiard rooms within its district and gave its marae komiti the power to fine Māori up to £2 for drunkenness at a public meeting. In the Hokianga District a youth under the age of 15 could be fined 2s.6d. for smoking and all gambling was illegal except within licensed billiard rooms. All the councils appear to have given themselves the right to direct Māori to clean dirty houses.

It was in this new environment of councils and village komiti that Köhere decided to revisit his vision of a model village. While Ngata was influential, particularly in his own Horouta Māori Council, in other areas TACSA had become at best a lobby group within the council system. Köhere probably feared that the new councils would not fully embrace the Te Aute programme, and indeed a number decided not to enact all the draft by-laws, particularly those referring to tohunga.

Rēweti Köhere’s contribution as one of Te Aute’s leading intellectuals has been largely ignored by historians for a variety of reasons. First, many historians have approached Māori history from a Pākehā-centric viewpoint where the dealings of Ngata, Buck and Pōmare with state structures take precedence over the Te Aute interaction with the Māori world. Second, the secular reading of New Zealand history has tended to marginalize religiously focused world views such as that of the young idealists of TACSA. Third, in the last quarter of the twentieth century the efforts of the association were seen by many historians in an increasingly negative light, as giving aid to Pākehā efforts at assimilation rather than as creative attempts to advance the Māori people. Only Ngata has really been rehabilitated. Finally, despite his fluency
in English, Kōhere wrote principally in Māori, a language unfamiliar to most New Zealand historians.

In 1897 Kōhere delivered his original vision of the model village by condensing the movement’s principal policies in a single conference paper, most likely as a means of uplifting and encouraging his fellow reformers. With the introduction of Māori Councils in 1900, many Māori believed that they had obtained an opportunity to make meaningful changes within their communities. Kōhere was then editor of *Te Pipiwharauroa*, a church newspaper he utilized to promulgate the aims of TACSA. It is clear that he considered that the councils should be concerned with more than just health, sanitation and material matters. Kōhere also wanted a moral and spiritual renewal that would transform Māori society. In 1902 he revised and published his conference paper as an article in *Te Pipiwharauroa* in response to the establishment of the councils and TACSA’s marginal success in the elections. This article is indicative of the content of his writing, although it represents but a tiny portion of his output over nearly 10 years as the newspaper’s editor. Even after he became a rural clergyman in 1908, he continued to supply articles to *Te Pipiwharauroa*, and subsequent Anglican Māori language newspapers. Kōhere’s vision for a regenerated Māori tribal society emerged at a time when Māori society was more communal and less enmeshed within the Pākehā capitalist system, well before Māori urban migration and when Kōhere himself was living a more cloistered life within a theological college. The world view he projected thus reflected his youthful idealism and presented the TACSA programme in a fashion more religious and moral than some historians, and no doubt some contemporary Māori, were prepared to subscribe to. Nevertheless, Kōhere’s ideas and the extent of his output in the Māori language show him to have been one of TACSA’s leading intellectuals.
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