



## ***Hokotehi Newsletter***

### ***Mihi Torekao (March) 2017***

#### ***Ta imi Moriori, tēnā kotou, hokomenetai me rongo***

Ka nui te mihi ki a kotou kā hūnau Moriori. Moe mai kā mate Moriori, moe mai takoto mai. Our deepest sympathies go out to all those who have lost loved ones in the last few months.

Our thoughts and best wishes go also to those who have welcomed in babies and the next generation.

#### **Rā hūnau ki a ko matua Bunty Preece!**

Alfred Preece Snr ('Bunty') celebrated his 95<sup>th</sup> birthday with family this month at his home in Owenga. Hokotehi joined with the island community in wishing Bunty a happy birthday and continuing good health.



#### **Celebrating our Rangata Mātua**

In December last year Kōpinga was honoured our island rangata mātua at a celebratory lunch.



#### **Marae Para Kore and Māra Kai**

Kōpinga is going to be a zerowaste marae and we started our programme at the science wānanga this March. We are supported and inspired by the team at Raglan's xtremewaste and the nationwide Para Kore marae waste free movement. <http://parakore.maori.nz/>

Changes are being made in reducing waste from freight and packaging, as well as looking at ways we process and store food (no more

cling-wrap!). The Para Kore status is also going to be aided by establishing a māra kai at the marae, with food composting and worm farm elements. The māra has been supported by a TPK grant for sustainable marae development.

The change to Para Kore will also see changes in the ways that the marae supports groups staying at the marae. If you are staying at Kōpinga on a self-catering basis we will be asking you to take any imported waste items, such as disposable drink bottles, home with you – so best to reduce your freight and leave them in NZ.

In line with our emerging language plan we will convert the Para Kore signage and posters giving guidance on waste management to re Mori.

### **Tommy Solomon Statue Commemoration**

In January about 30 members came over to Rēkohu to commemorate 30 years since the unveiling of the Tommy Solomon statue at Manukau.

The week-long commemoration included opportunities for young Mori to experience island life and connect with ancestral landscapes and concluded with a public ceremony, tree planting at Manukau and hākari at Kōpinga.



### **Change Over for DOC Manager on Rēkohu**

In January the DOC Operations Manager, Connie Norgate, was farewelled at Kōpinga. Connie has been on the island for three years and in that short time made a significant contribution to conservation initiatives on the island. Connie was presented with a carved taonga Rongomoana in recognition of her hard work and our aroha for her. This taonga was



carved by Owen Mapp from one of the niho returned by DOC in February 2016. Connie has taken up a post in Hawkes Bay and we wish her and her partner Dan all the best and hope to see them back on the island at some stage (for a holiday).

Connie's replacement, Dave Carlton, and his family were welcomed in to the marae and to the island at the same ceremony. Dave brings expertise in biosecurity and pest management to his conservation portfolio and we are looking forward to working with him during his tenure on Rēkohu.



### Ioranga Pūtaiao – Giving Back

We have just concluded a science wānanga at Kōpinga. Over 30 scientists from various professions volunteered their time and expertise to assist with discussions on freshwater quality, customary fisheries, pest eradication, re-vegetation and tchiekitanga.

We spent time with Te One and Kaingaroa schools looking at water quality in streams and lakes. We plan to pick up the same programme with Pitt Island school too.



Preliminary feedback from attendees indicates that water quality in island waterways is still good enough to support species diversity and abundance but trends towards decline will be inevitable unless we work on eradication of pests such as swan, possums, rats and cats and also replant around our waterways.

Huge thanks to our schools, DOC, our cooks, our pou kuia (Aunty Kath and Aunty Elaine), and all participants.

### Waka Hourua Arrival

In early March we welcomed the waka hourua, Ngāhiraka Mai Tawhiti, from Napier. This will be the first visit from this waka, which came in recognition of the support given to one of our members, Kushla Allen, when she joined the waka on its voyage to Rapanui several years ago.

The voyage through the colder southern waters will also provide the young crew opportunities to test their celestial navigation skills.



The crew stayed at Kōpinga for a week and took part in the loranga Pūtaiao wānanga. We hope that the waka arrival will become a regular event and look forward to their return in March 2018. This will be an event where we invite expressions of interest from members in NZ.

### Member Hui

Treaty Negotiation Member hui are planned for April. Please come along to one of these meetings to hear from your negotiating Trustees and share your views on the settlement process:

**Dunedin:** Sat 1 April Otago Museum, Kākāpō Room. 2-4pm

**Christchurch:** Sun 2 April 12-1.30 Hintons Function Centre, Wairakei Rd (lunch included)

**Wellington:** Mon April 3 5.30-6.30pm Brentwood Hotel, Kilbirnie

**Napier:** Tues 4 April. The Crown Hotel, Cnr Bridge St & Hardinge Rd, Ahuriri 5.30pm

### 2017 Election Date and call for trustee nominations

HMT is calling for nominations for Trustees for the upcoming election. Election date is 1 August 2017. Positions are sought for South Island (2 Trustees), North Island (1 Trustee), and Rēkohu (1 Trustee).

### UPDATE ON TREATY SETTLEMENT NEGOTIATIONS

If any member has any queries regarding the settlement process you are invited to make contact with the office by calling 0800 (MORIORI) 6674674 or writing to the Moriori Negotiating Team, P.O. Box 188, Waitangi, Rēkohu (Chatham Islands).

Your negotiating team has been in discussions with the Crown and Ngāti Mutunga since March 2016. We have had alternate meetings between Rēkohu and Wellington every month. At every meeting your negotiators have presented historical and cultural reports on various aspects of the claim including wāhi tchap' (sacred areas), Te Whānga Lagoon, Cultural Redress, Burial customs, Population Modelling, Rangihau (Pitt Island), etc. The Crown has stated that these reports are among the highest standard they seen in any settlement negotiations. Attached are extracts from the population modelling report which was prepared for the purpose of demonstrating the impact of the failure of the Crown to intervene to stop slavery for a period of 21 years after they were lawfully obliged to do so. In summary, had the Crown stopped slavery in 1842, the Moriori population today

would be between 15-20,000 people. Instead our population is conservatively estimated to be 3,500 people. Tribal population is one of the criteria which the Crown uses to set the monetary quantum of the settlement. Our argument has been that the Crown cannot use our small population against us by awarding a small quantum given that the Crown breached its Treaty duty to Moriori by failing to outlaw slavery and resulting deaths after 1842. There are other factors that the Crown must take into account in setting quantum including the amount of land lost, how it was lost and the inhumane conditions that our Moriori ancestors were subjected to between 1842 and 1863 when slavery was eventually abolished.

In June last year the Crown wrote to Moriori advising that they required us to negotiate with Ngāti Mutunga regarding overlapping claims on Rēkohu and Rangihau (Pitt Island). This included Te Whānga, customary fisheries, and areas of cultural interest. In good faith and to enable negotiations to progress more smoothly, we agreed to enter discussions with negotiations with Ngāti Mutunga. Over the past 9 months we have made a lot of progress on overlapping claims with agreement being reached on issues such as commercial properties on Rēkohu (a small number), customary fisheries, management of Te Whānga, and whalebone. This represents significant progress from both Moriori and Mutunga considering where we both at 12 months ago. However, there remains major disagreement over wāhi tchap' (tapu) areas that remain in Crown ownership. Moriori have produced a large amount of historical, cultural, scientific and archaeological evidence demonstrating that the vast majority of these areas are a combination of Moriori urupā, living places and other places of cultural significance. This is by virtue of the fact that Moriori have lived in these places for upwards of 800 years and buried their dead all over the Island and especially in the sand dunes around the coasts of Rēkohu and Rangihau. We have requested that these sites be either set aside as reserves to be managed by Moriori or returned to our ownership.

Ngāti Mutunga are claiming interests in many of these same areas but to date have failed to disclose any credible evidence indicating just

what those interests are. The historical record and available evidence shows that after Ngāti Tama and Ngāti Mutunga arrived on Rēkohu in 1835, they buried their dead in discrete cemeteries and not in the sand dunes. They have proposed that all wāhi tchap' be managed jointly by both Moriori and Mutunga. Following consultations, we have held with members on both Rēkohu/Rangihau and Aotearoa, it is clear that our people do not want joint management over our own wāhi tchap'. Your negotiators agree wholeheartedly with that stance. We have indicated to Ngāti Mutunga negotiators that while we respect their urupā and wāhi tapu areas (such as the urupā at Okawa) we have no interest or right to claim to be kaitiaki over those places.

We have asked that the Crown do what is right and acknowledge that Moriori are the rightful tchieki (traditional guardians) of these areas. If this is not possible we have proposed that an independent court or tribunal be set up to investigate the respective claims of both Moriori and Mutunga so the matter can be finally laid to rest. Having said that, we also acknowledge that there are a lot of wāhi tchap' located on privately owned land and that we will need to work with landowners to ensure protection of these areas wherever possible.

The Waitangi Tribunal in its 2001 'Rēkohu Report' found that Moriori should have received at least 50% of the land awarded on Rēkohu/Rangihau in 1870 instead of the 2% we actually received. They also found that Moriori customary rights were still intact as at 1840, 1842 and 1870. The return of Crown land to Moriori on both Rēkohu and Rangihau is therefore of importance to us. This will help re-establish a tribal land base for present future generations to benefit. However, the Crown has little land available to return on Rēkohu. Just recently we have been advised by the Crown that the small amount of land we thought was available has shrunk even further! On Rangihau they have about 1500 hectares of grazing and conservation lands. We have indicated to the Crown which of these lands that we are seeking to have returned. We have also been to Rangihau to meet with the community there to discuss our intentions and have told them that whatever decision the Crown makes our intentions are to work with



the community on Pitt Island to best manage these lands.

The position that the Ngāti Mutunga negotiators have adopted in regards to return of land is that they are opposed in principle to Moriori receiving any land from the Crown – unless that same land is offered to them at the same time. No credible explanation has been provided to justify this position. We think that this position is extremely unreasonable given that Ngāti Mutunga received 97.3% of all the land in 1870 on Rēkohu and 100% of the land on Rangihau as well as title to most of the larger offshore Islands. Much of this land was subsequently either sold or leased to Pākehā farmers or the Crown. It also goes against the findings of the Waitangi Tribunal who ruled the “The main relief by far is due to Moriori.” (Wai 64, page 285).

The Minister of Treaty Negotiations, Hon. Christopher Finlayson, has indicated that a Crown offer to settle our historical claims will be made in late March. This offer will include commercial redress (a handful of properties on Rēkohu), cultural redress (return of land and wāhi tchāp’), Quantum (monetary offer), Crown apology. The historical account will also be part of the settlement which is being drafted jointly between Moriori and the Crown.

If this offer is acceptable to your negotiators this will constitute an Agreement in Principle (AIP) whereupon there will be a series of consultation hui with members to discuss and vote on the offer. A postal vote will also be undertaken.

#### **EXTRACTS FROM MORIORI POPULATION MODELLING REPORT**

Below are key extracts from a report prepared by Dr. Richard Meade with support from Bruce Stirling and members of your negotiating team. This report was independently reviewed and verified by Emeritus Professor Ian Pool, who is the top demographer in New Zealand and recognised worldwide for his expertise in population studies. Excerpts from his report are also set out below.

#### **Estimates of the Surviving 2013 Moriori Population, and Deficit in that Population due to the Moriori People’s Post-1842 Enslavement (“Missing Voices”)**



*Ta tiro atu to kanohi ki tairawhiti ana tera  
whiti ta ra kite ataata ka hinga ki muri kia ko  
(Turn your face to the sun and the shadows  
fall behind you)*

Report prepared for the Office of Treaty  
Settlements,  
on behalf of Hokotehi Moriori Trust, by:

**Dr Richard Meade**

Principal Economist, Cognitus Advisory  
Services Limited

**Bruce Stirling**

Research Director, HistoryWorks Ltd

**Susan Thorpe**

Claim Manager, Hokotehi Moriori Trust

**Grace Le Gros**

Negotiator, Hokotehi Moriori Trust

**Maui Solomon**

Chairman, Hokotehi Moriori Trust

**15 November 2016**

#### **Introduction and Summary**

##### **1.1 Report Context**

This report has been prepared in the context of the Treaty settlement negotiations being conducted between Hokotehi Moriori Trust (HMT) on behalf of the Moriori people, and the Office of Treaty Settlements (OTS) on behalf of the Crown. In developing the Crown’s quantum offer to HMT, OTS requires evidence as to the Moriori population as at the most recent *Census*, which in this case was conducted in 2013. That *Census* records a total Moriori population of 738 adults and children, which appears to be unreliably low given:

1. Excluding children under 18 years old, the HMT register already includes 763 adults;
2. Identifying as Moriori involves multiple stigmas that deter such identification, since:
  - (a) It requires identification as a “slave people”, which is particularly looked down upon in Maori society;
  - (b) The New Zealand education system has in the past perpetuated the notion – continuing in popular perception – that the Moriori people are “inferior”;<sup>1</sup>
  - (c) Moriori people often encounter the notion that they are “extinct” – i.e. they no longer exist due to having been killed and eaten by Maori;
  - (d) Members of the HMT negotiating group can recount personal experiences as both adults and as children of being told to deny their Moriori identity (e.g. by school teachers);
  - (e) HMT members have encountered Maori who regard Moriori as a Pakeha myth invented to justify Europeans taking Maori land; and
  - (f) Many eligible Moriori may prefer to ignore or deny their Moriori identity simply due to its tragic associations;
3. In order to survive following the severe loss of both population and land in the 19th century, many Moriori left Rekohu creating a diaspora that by 1874 already constituted around 40% of their number. That diaspora integrated with other imi, and as a consequence choose to identify with those other imi, and are often unaware of their Moriori ancestry;
4. HMT is in the process of documenting details of large families in Northland and Hawke’s Bay who have Moriori

ancestors, but the majority of whose members do not (as yet) identify as Moriori. Early indications are that those non-identifying families could easily number in the thousands; and

5. For most of the past century Moriori have been effectively censored from official records. For example, in earlier censuses focus was on “full-blooded” Maori, resulting in under-counts of Moriori who – for their very survival – had to leave Rekohu and inter-marry into other imi to a relatively high degree. Such factors incline Moriori to identify with their “host” imi, further increasing their “invisibility”.

Figure 1 provides some evidence on the likely magnitude of under-identification by Moriori, as a consequence of some or all of the above factors. The figure shows that Moriori Census counts over 1991 to 2013 have grown at a far higher rate than for imi overall. This strongly indicates Moriori identification in the Census is starting from an especially low base relative to imi identification for Maori in general (since the difference in growth is too great to be attributed to population increase).

Figure 1: Relative Growth in Census Affiliations 1991-2013: Moriori vs All Imi

As will be made clear in this report, the Moriori people have suffered an unprecedented population loss when compared with other imi in New Zealand. As found by the Waitangi Tribunal (the Tribunal) and made clear in its report on the Moriori historical claims, Wai 64, this loss was in part attributable to post-Treaty acts or omissions of the Crown. As shown in this report, these resulted in a population “collapse” that was unique in New Zealand’s post-Treaty history. It would therefore be inappropriate for OTS to simply base the Crown’s quantum offer to Moriori on the surviving Moriori population.

As a consequence, it is necessary to gauge not just the extent of the current surviving Moriori population. It is also necessary to gauge the extent to which there is a deficit in that current population – what Moriori term their “missing

<sup>1</sup> Waitangi Tribunal (2001) – hereafter referred to as Wai 64 – p. 19.

voices” – as a consequence of the Crown’s post-Treaty acts or omissions.

## **1.2 Report Purpose**

To assist OTS in preparing its quantum offer to Moriori, this report addresses two principal questions relevant to assessing the population “base factor”:

1. What is the estimated surviving Moriori population as at 2013; and
2. How much greater would the surviving population have been in 2013 had the Moriori people not suffered as severe a population decline as it did due to its enslavement over 1842-63?

The date of 2013 has been chosen to align with the most recent Census, enabling OTS to form a view as to Moriori’s population size relative to that of other imi. In some cases data is provided as at 2016, where it has not been possible to provide retrospective counts.

The period 1842-63 was chosen since it was in this period that the Moriori people suffered under unprecedentedly severe enslavement, and this coincided with Moriori enjoying the rights and privileges of British subjects under Article III of the Treaty. From 1842 Moriori had been brought under the protection of the 1833 empire-wide prohibition of slavery, as well as the Crown’s active duty to protect Moriori under the Treaty.

The end date of the 1842-63 period coincides with the proclamation of general manumission referred to in Wai 64 (p. 82). This date remains disputed, with later dates (or no such date at all for the proclamation) being possibilities. Census data suggests that the Moriori population continued to decline after 1863, so choosing this date is the most conservative possible assumption, serving to reduce the extent of population loss that can be attributed to post-Treaty acts or omissions by the Crown.

A consequence of addressing the second principal question is that it is possible to estimate how much of the Moriori population loss over 1842-63 was attributable to post-Treaty acts or omissions by the Crown, as opposed to other causes. In other words, addressing the second principal question enables estimation of the extent to which the

Crown was culpable for Moriori population loss over this period.

## **1.3 Approach**

### **1.3.1 Independent Review by Professor Pool**

HMT is committed to this research being robust and authoritative. To this end, and with OTS’ support, it approached Emeritus Professor Ian Pool of the National Institute of Demographic and Economic Analysis at the University of Waikato to seek his assistance in answering the two principal questions set out above. Professor Pool was not available to undertake the work directly, as he is retired. However, on the basis that the analysis was conducted by HMT’s professional historian, Mr Bruce Stirling, and economic advisor, Dr Richard Meade – with the assistance of HMT where necessary – Dr Pool was happy to assist on the following terms:

1. The primary historical research and analysis was to be undertaken by HMT’s advisors; and
2. He was to provide HMT an independent report on the analysis once it was complete, commenting on the reasonableness of methodologies and assumptions used, and the conclusions of the analysis.

To facilitate the primary historical research and analysis, Professor Pool proposed that he participate in a workshop with HMT negotiators and advisors. The purpose of that workshop was to inform Professor Pool of the details of the Moriori population changes over time. It was also an opportunity for him to provide guidance as to appropriate data sources and methodologies for the analysis. That workshop was held over two days in Wellington, on 18-19 October. Prior to and following that workshop HMT’s advisors have been in communication with Professor Pool, to seek his guidance and comment on additional matters relating to the analysis.

Professor Pool’s independent appraisal of this report is available to OTS as a separate document.

### **1.3.2 Definition of Moriori**

Further to the discussion above, it is inadequate to define Moriori in terms of



people who are “full-blooded” Moriori, or who self-identify as Moriori:

1. More so than other imi, Moriori had to inter-marry in order to survive, making them less likely than other imi to have “full-blooded” members. Notably, for the period 1842-63, some Moriori wives/women were subjected to sexual slavery by their enslavers,<sup>2</sup> who otherwise enforced sterility upon Moriori men and women by forbidding them to marry. This too reduces the relative number of “pure-blooded” Moriori;<sup>3</sup>
2. Due to multiple stigmas attaching to Moriori identification, many Maori who could identify as Moriori choose not to do so; and
3. Due to the Moriori people almost becoming extinct and having to inter-marry (mainly on mainland New Zealand) for survival, Moriori either prefer to identify with their more populous “host” imi, or are simply unaware of their Moriori ancestry and do not even realise they could identify as Moriori.

To address this, we instead define Moriori as those people who can trace a Moriori ancestor. The purpose of our analysis is to identify those who could identify as Moriori, rather than those who proactively identify as Moriori despite the stigmatisation of doing so. Hence those who do identify as Moriori – i.e. in the Census, or by registering with HMT – represent a fraction of those who could be Moriori. For the reasons discussed above, that fraction will be materially greater than for other imi. Indeed, since we are also interested in how many more potential Moriori there would be now but for the Crown’s post-Treaty acts or omissions, there are many potential Moriori who never even had the opportunity to live. So the potential Moriori population – absent post-1842 enslavement – should be materially greater than the surviving population. As the Tribunal states:<sup>4</sup>

“For the lack of such a step, many died, generations were never born, and the Crown’s last indigenous subjects in this country remained subjected to unspeakable cruelty.”

### 1.3.3 Focus on 1842-63

It is necessary to account for the impacts of Moriori enslavement on the surviving 2013 Moriori population. This is because the Moriori population suffered extreme decline – what, following conventional practice in Oceanic demography, can be termed a “collapse” rather than mere “decline” – during the period of slaughter and enslavement beginning in 1835.<sup>5</sup> That collapse necessarily affects the number of Moriori surviving today. It also necessarily affects how many Moriori there might be today if that enslavement had not occurred.

The Tribunal in Wai 64 finds the Crown culpable for allowing the enslavement of Moriori to persist beyond 1842 when the Treaty was extended to Rekohu. A consequence of that extension was the granting to Moriori of the rights and privileges of British subjects under Article III. Those rights included the right to be free of slavery, which in 1833 had been banned in the British Empire. Hence, to the extent that the Moriori population continued to decline after 1842 – and that decline could not be attributed to other causes – the Crown is culpable for that decline.

The Tribunal also refers to a proclamation of general manumission on Rekohu.<sup>6</sup> It records that slavery did not immediately cease as a consequence, and in fact notes that this date is disputed (without seeing need to make a determination on the question), with later dates being possible. Taking the earlier 1863 date is conservative, in that it limits the period over which the Crown might be said to be culpable for Moriori population losses.

This report takes a conservative approach to defining both the start of the Crown’s culpability for enslavement-related losses, and the end of that culpability. Thus we take 1842

---

<sup>2</sup> Wai 64, pp 45 and 80.

<sup>3</sup> Wai 64, pp 4 and 63.

<sup>4</sup> Wai 64, p. 90.

<sup>5</sup> Wai 64 documents this history. A brief summary is provided in Section 2.

<sup>6</sup> Wai 64, p. 82.

as the starting point, rather than 1835 when the slaughter and enslavement of Moriori commenced. This is despite the Tribunal recording that the British Resident Busby predicted in 1835 that the invasion of Rekohu by a large number of Taranaki imi armed with muskets and carried on a British vessel would cause Moriori considerable harm. Furthermore, even though slavery did not end abruptly in 1863, we take that as the end of the period over which the Crown is culpable for Moriori population loss than can be attributed to enslavement rather than other (non-culpable) causes.

Taking an earlier start date for this period would result in a considerably greater estimate of how many Moriori should be alive today had enslavement not occurred. This is because there was a large loss of Moriori life soon after Rekohu was invaded. Likewise, taking a later end date for this period would extend the period over which the Crown is culpable for enslavement-related loss of life. That would increase the Moriori population loss attributable to post-Treaty Crown acts or omissions. Hence our focus on just 1842-63 is both consistent with the Tribunal's findings and evidence, and conservative.

### 1.3.4 Impact of the 1870 Native Land Court Awards

In 1870 the Native Land Court awarded Moriori a little over 2% of their traditional lands, with the remainder being awarded to their former enslavers.<sup>7</sup> Despite the Moriori population having collapsed as a consequence of enslavement, so little land was insufficient to sustain the surviving Moriori population. A consequence of this is that – absent any assistance from the Crown to restore the Moriori people after decades of “unspeakable cruelty” – many Moriori had to leave Rekohu simply to survive. As stated by the Tribunal:<sup>8</sup>

“We think that the exclusion of most Moriori from owning land must have been a major factor in the movement of Moriori to the

mainland from the late nineteenth century.”

Thus the Native Land Court awards gave impetus to a growing Moriori diaspora on mainland New Zealand.

### 1.3.5 Methodologies

We have relied on two principal methodologies for estimating the surviving 2013 population:

1. *Register-based* – we build up a more complete picture of the surviving population using details of adults on the HMT tribal register and children recorded against those registrations, making allowances for both non-recorded children, and eligible Moriori people who have not chosen to register for whatever reason; and
2. *Growth-based* – or more completely, “differential demographic growth-based” – this is statistically-based in that it draws on the known historical Moriori population, and historical growth rates applicable to populations in parts of New Zealand to which the Moriori diaspora emigrated following the 1870 Native Land Court awards.

Both approaches are “bottom up” in that they build a picture of the surviving 2013 Moriori population using elementary population building blocks. They are independent approaches, however, as the Register-based methodology works only with contemporary data, while the Growth-based approach works with mainly historical data.

To test the empirical analysis, a further independent estimate was made, employing a biometric technique used conventionally in population biology and in mathematical demography.<sup>9</sup>

Finally, to estimate the deficit in the 2013 Moriori population due to post-1842 enslavement, we apply a version of the Growth-based statistical modelling. Specifically, such modelling was required to compute the expected Moriori population as

<sup>7</sup> Wai 64, Section 7.

<sup>8</sup> Wai 64, p. 162.

<sup>9</sup> Specifically, we use a form of Gompertz modelling, linked to logistic growth methodologies. See Perz (2004, p. 260).

at 1874 – the last date at which we have reliable contemporary population counts – had enslavement ended in 1842. The surviving population under enslavement was subtracted from the expected population had enslavement ended in 1842. That difference estimates the deficit in 1874 population as a consequence of enslavement.

The ratio of that deficit to the surviving 1874 population shows the number of Moriori “missing voices” per surviving Moriori at that date. As explained later, that ratio remains applicable in 2013, so can be used to estimate the deficit in the 2013 Moriori population due to post-1842 enslavement. Key to this exercise was estimating the Moriori population as at both 1842 and 1874. This involved a combination of historical research as to contemporary population counts, as well as statistical modelling to estimate populations in years for which no reliable contemporary counts were available.

## **1.4 Summary of Findings**

### **1.4.1 Surviving 2013 Moriori Population**

*Our analysis suggests that the surviving 2013 Moriori Population was at the very least 3,000.* Additional independent analysis suggests this figure could be as high as 3,500, implying that the estimate of 3,000 is likely to be conservative. This 3,000 figure compares with known adult registrations, and unique children recorded on those registrations, totalling 1,572. Given the likely powerful effect on registrations of the stigmas associated with Moriori identification – as well as simple ignorance of Moriori ancestry – this further suggests the 3,000 estimate is conservative. It is likely to be extremely conservative given the limited extent to which this figure counts large families (especially in Northland and Hawke’s Bay (Wairoa)) with known Moriori ancestry.

### **1.4.2 Deficit in 2013 Moriori Population due to Post-1842 Enslavement (“Missing Voices”)**

We estimate that for every surviving Moriori person, a further 2.6 Moriori people would be alive if not for the Moriori people’s post-1842 enslavement. Put another way, the total 2013 Moriori population would have been 3.6 times our estimated surviving 2013 population if that enslavement had ceased in 1842.

*More precisely, we estimate that the total number of Moriori people in 2013 would have been around 10,000 if enslavement had ended in 1842.* This implies a deficit in the 2013 Moriori population due to post-1842 enslavement of around 7,000. Specifically, we estimate the surviving population to be 28% of the population that would have been had enslavement ended in 1842. This implies that the Moriori people’s “missing voices” amount to 72% of that population.

Our additional Biometrics-based analysis suggests this figure could be as high as 12,500, implying that the estimate of 10,000 is likely to be conservative.

### **1.4.3 Moriori 1842-63 Population Loss compared with Other Major Population Losses**

We estimate the Moriori population to have been 602 in 1842, and 141 at 1862. This implies a 77% population loss over this period. However, if enslavement had ceased in 1842, and the Moriori population simply followed the growth path of the general Maori population (which declined markedly over this period), it could have been expected to have declined by 28%, to 435. The difference of 294 between 435 and 141 – or 49% of the 1842 Moriori population – represents the *exceptional* population loss suffered by Moriori over 1842-63, over and above the loss that might have occurred aside from enslavement. Hence, the Moriori population fell by 49% – i.e. roughly by half – as a consequence of enslavement over 1842-63. Put another way, of the 77% of the Moriori population that was lost over 1842-63, almost two thirds of that loss (i.e.  $64\% = 49/77$ ) can be attributed to the Crown’s failure to intervene in 1842 to end Moriori enslavement. That loss was on top of the 63% population loss already occurring over 1835-42 as a consequence of the slaughter, brutalisation and harsh enslavement suffered by Moriori in that period.

We show that the population losses suffered by other imi as a consequence of Crown Treaty breaches far exceeded those suffered by New Zealand in the First World War, as well as in the 1918 influenza epidemic. However, the exceptional Moriori population loss over 1842-63 eclipses both sets of comparators.



Moreover, the population losses suffered by Moriori rank among the worst societal “collapses” that afflicted other Pacific peoples following European contact. The key difference is that those collapses came about largely as a consequence of diseases. The Moriori population collapse was substantially a consequence of enslavement, over and above population losses caused by disease.

*[Excerpts from Report by Professor Ian Pool]*

**COMMENTS ON REPORT BY HOKOTEHI MORIORI TRUST (HMT) IN SUPPORT OF SETTLEMENT NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE OFFICE OF TREATY SETTLEMENT (OTS)**

**By:** Ian Pool, CNZM, PhD, FRSNZ

**Date:** 14<sup>th</sup> November 2016

**II. COMMENTS ON HMT REPORT**

**1. Overview**

*I am happy to endorse this report and the HMT’s conclusions. The claimants and their consultants have completed a very difficult task in a way that I can only commend as rigorous given the problems they faced with the data at their disposal. Their findings make sound demographic sense, and I find that they fit with what we know about indigenous minority populations faced with the impacts of colonisation. Additionally, of course, beyond the normally reported negative effects of colonisation, Moriori had to face the terrible impacts of enslavement. As this report convincingly argues, many of these impacts occurred after the Crown controlled Rēkohu, and in defiance of the 1833 Empire-wide statute abolishing slavery.*

*In sum, then, my view is that HMT has presented a methodologically sound, sober, if anything conservative, set of figures in its*

*negotiations with OTS. I accept the validity of their principal findings.*

*The Moriori history, as presented here, is one that all New Zealanders committed to justice and fairness will find thought-provoking. Moriori have suffered major negative demographic consequences. While elements of this story correlate with the effects of colonisation on all indigenous New Zealanders, the Moriori one is unique because it is extreme. The exceptionalism of the Moriori case is, in fact, something that emerges from every section of this report; all over New Zealand, at different times, Māori were treated unjustly and unfairly, but the failure of the Crown to intervene against the enslavement of the Moriori permitted a demographic “collapse”<sup>10</sup>, which had no equivalent in Aotearoa; this was clearly compounded further by the Crown when it took from the imi most of their capital assets (allocating most of Rēkohu to Ngāti Mutunga) and thus deprived Moriori of a path to material recuperation. In this regard, it is impossible to isolate the effects of land loss from the issues of population that are the core of the HMT report<sup>11</sup>. Finally, and less tangibly but no less significantly, Moriori suffered the indignity and real effects of cultural “collapse” because of stigmatisation and of a racial order that was unique in Aotearoa’s history.*

*The systematic, and even continuing, exposure of Moriori to a negative racial order, as is illustrated in the HMT Report, is unique in this country. It is something beyond the experience of other iwi, and more reminiscent of some of the worst of colonisation’s ravages on the demography of indigenous people, say in Tasmania or Florida. Raupatu was a stain on our history and the Native Land Court often acted grievously in its interpretations, as the Rees-Carroll Commission (1891) asserted so*

---

<sup>10</sup> The term used in Oceanic population studies, and elsewhere to distinguish trends from simple, and less severe, “declines”; eg see Patrick Kirch and Jean-Louis Rallu (eds) *The Growth and Collapse of Pacific Societies*, Univ of Hawaii Press, 2007, which contains essays by leading Oceanic experts.

<sup>11</sup> The strong interrelations between population and development, especially health-development

and land loss for Māori are documented in my book *Colonisation and Development, NZ, 1769-1900: The Seeds of Rangiātea*, Springer, 2015. Following on from the argument advanced there, the loss of most of Rēkohu in this way constituted more than an economic loss, but affected all aspects of Moriori development, both material and tangible (eg health) and cultural and intangible.

elegantly in their Parliamentary Report<sup>12</sup>. Unfortunately, the actions of the NLC were often too close to the real philosophy underlying the 1865 Native Lands Act, so clearly enunciated in 1870 by Henry Sewell, Minister of Justice, and of which the Moriori were prime victims<sup>13</sup>:

*“The object was twofold: to bring the great bulk of the lands... within the reach of colonisation. The other great object was the detribalisation of the Māoris – to destroy, if it were possible, the principle of communism, which ran through the whole of their institutions, upon which their social system was based, and which stood as a barrier in the way of all attempts to amalgamate the Māori race into our social and political system”.*

*On reading the HMT report in draft, I also became aware that the Moriori experience was very different from what we have seen elsewhere in Aotearoa. If I may be permitted a personal note, until I read Michael King’s seminal book<sup>14</sup>, and probably in common with most New Zealanders, I had no appreciation of the plight of the Moriori; but, my review of the detailed demographic data presented by HMT in their report has shown me that the situation was far worse than I had understood, even after reading King’s book.*

## **2. Prefatory Comments: Analytical Problems faced by the Claimants**

*In all my time working on Māori demography, whether academically or in applied circumstances, I have never encountered a case where the underlying analytical difficulties – over and above the substantive issues just raised – have been as problematic as those that the Moriori have faced in preparing this report. I am particularly impressed by the way that HMT has confronted this major problem, both with due diligence and scientific rigour.*

*Above all, the enslavement of Moriori, has had long term effects on how Moriori have been recorded as a population, most notably for those counts that would provide a figure on the*

*on the iwi’s real numerical size. Added to this, were interventions committed by Crown agencies of one sort and another aimed, so it seems, to expunge Moriori from the record, or to distort their image, as I noted above, or in the case of Native Land Court decisions to deprive them of their land. These have clearly had a major effect on Moriori ownership of capital (following Thomas Piketty, I define land as capital)<sup>15</sup>, and most poignantly for this set of comments, have resulted in major information gaps. This has to be put into the wider context of the racial, and racist, typologies employed over much of the period until very recently, as a result of which Moriori have suffered more than have other indigenous New Zealanders. This has created the context in which pro-active affiliation with imi has been socially stigmatising.*

*Essentially, to use the terminology of the pre-civil rights American southern states, most persons of Moriori lineage “passed” into the Pākehā or Māori populations. This has generated major problems for the HMT and this report. To add to this these lacunae persisted into the 21<sup>st</sup> century and affected the number of Moriori reported in official data, as HMT have demonstrated, to my satisfaction, in this report. In sum, because of their diligence the HMT researchers have provided compelling evidence not just of the effects of this on marked undercounts in the affiliation statistics, but have computed realistic estimates of the probable size of the Moriori population. My assessment is that these estimates probably lean towards being cautiously conservative, and certainly not inflated.*

*In all Māori historical demographic research, analysing trends is very difficult, not just because of the difficulties counting Māori, especially before the first modern-style census in 1926, which was still far from perfect. But, this has also occurred, even since, because of problems of question design and reporting. Often, as I have pointed out (eg in Te Iwi Māori, 1991, Chapter 2), a socially inept question (eg “degrees of Māori Blood”) was responded to realistically and honestly, but not exactly as the*

<sup>12</sup> *Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives*, 1891 G-1, Session II, see esp p.vii

<sup>13</sup> Cited *Official Year Book*, 1990: 414. The context makes it clear that Statistics NZ does not endorse Sewell’s views.

<sup>14</sup> Michael King *Moriori: A People Rediscovered*, Viking

<sup>15</sup> Thomas Piketty *Capital in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, Belknap, Cambridge MA: pp. 46-48, 213

question's framers had envisaged. This certainly extends to recent attempts to obtain data on iwi, when there was significant non-response to the iwi question by persons reporting Māori descent, and even the responses risked being a construct of prompting in the notes to respondents, and thus the coding process (eg associating regions with iwi affiliation)<sup>16</sup>. For the analyst, therefore, often the avowedly "quantitative" data based on counts, estimates, guesses and real censuses is validated only by circumstantial evidence. This is particularly acute for Moriori for the reasons I have just noted.

In the report prepared by HMT, I have been impressed that there has been a concerted effort to bring rigour to that supporting evidence. I would thus rate the supporting evidence, especially the whakapapa, as more – that is, significantly higher -- than merely circumstantial.

## Summary

The technical report being tabled by HMT in their negotiations with OTS is a sober, if somewhat conservative, history of the factors that have generated the Moriori population numbers of today.

- It is methodologically sound, wherever possible presenting alternative independent analyses. It draws on both quantitative and qualitative sources, notably hokopapa
- This mix of alternative data sources is particularly important when HMT document the social and ideational effects on present-day Moriori of what is a very sad history, and one about which all New Zealanders must feel a sense of shame. Moriori were unique in this regard, as unlike other indigenous New Zealanders, they faced two levels

of demonisation. (i) Both Māori and Moriori were subject to the normal prejudices accompanying colonisation and affecting perceptions and even policy relating to indigenous New Zealanders -- prejudices that, over many years, were backed by spurious science. These prejudices were translated into the governance of the country's natives, and also allowed Colonial, Dominion and post-1947 New Zealand governments to act at times in ways that were not in the best interests of their indigenous minority subjects. (ii) But beyond this more generic trend, Moriori suffered particular burdens of stigmatisation, both inter-personal, and even officially condoned and perpetrated in official organs.

- For the HMT Report this has placed particular constraints on assembling their arguments – how do you really measure stigmatisation and its effects except where a racial order brings in legislation such as apartheid? At a more applied level, as in this Report, how can you measure the way in which long-lasting, systematic stigmatisation might have an impact on key parameters for this report, notably establishing the size of the Moriori population in 2013?
- The HMT has used the recorded increase in the size of the Moriori imi over recent censuses – such growth would be biologically impossible -- to show how the shedding to date of the effects of stigma affect Moriori demography has inflated, and by implication will inflate, the Moriori imi that the HMT must service.

<sup>16</sup> Eg 1996 Census, Iwi, vol 1, Guide Notes (unpaged, following individual schedule), "...to help you answer Question 14", which is "Do you know the name of your iwi?" with response boxes "Iwi" and "Region", 13 iwi are listed for "**Te Waipounamu/Wharekauri (Rekohu)** (South Island/Chatham Island) **Iwi**", the longest for any

region. Only one of these is "Moriori", and another "Ngati Mutunga (Wharekauri)". At an opposite extreme, "Waikato/Te Rohe Pota" and "Te Tairāwhiti" each have only 4 listed, "Hawkes Bay/Wairarapa" only 5, 3 of which are "Ngati Kahungunu" (Wairoa, Heretaunga, Wairarapa)



- *The HMT has then turned to hokopapa to show the roots of such a “blow-out” might have come about. These are due to the reality that the number of persons who have hokopapa lineages exceeds those who report themselves to be Moriori, such reporting being suppressed because of stigmatisation.*
- *This affects historical data even more than contemporary, and in ways that vary unsystematically from period to period.*
- *Beyond this dimension, the HMT has successfully, in my view, confronted the general problem facing all analyses of the demographic history of indigenous New Zealanders – the quality of data.*
- *Turning then to quantitative results,*
  1. *The HMT has satisfactorily shown that a demographic “collapse” of the Moriori population occurred within the period in which the imi was under the governance of the Crown. This collapse greatly exceeded the decline seen among Māori populations, and was unique. It was even worse than some, possibly all, collapses recorded in the Pacific Islands.*
  2. *The HMT has satisfactorily shown that, by comparison with other indigenous New Zealand groups, this disproportionately “gutted out” the Moriori population – many became the so-called “missing voices”.*
  3. *The HMT has provided realistic estimates of the numbers of Moriori today.*

*Me rongō*