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Abstract / Résumé

This paper is a case study in British colonial social relations as they are expressed in the Aborigines Report (Anon., 1838). The report was commissioned by the British government, and it is a valuable snapshot of the negative effects of colonialism on Aboriginal people. The author argues that these negative effects still persist because the key colonial players are still motivated by the interests of their predecessors of a century ago. Additionally, the author examines how "good intentions" by the colonizer can fail to deliver social justice.

Cet article est une étude de cas portant sur les relations sociales des colonies britanniques telles que décrites dans le rapport Aborigines Report (Anon., 1838). Ce rapport, commandé par le gouvernement britannique, est un excellent instantané des effets néfastes du colonialisme sur les peuples autochtones. L'auteur démontre que ces effets néfastes persistent toujours parce que les acteurs coloniaux principaux demeurent encore motivés par les mêmes intérêts que ceux de leurs prédécesseurs. L'auteur démontre également comment les soit-disant bonnes intentions du colonisateur ne se traduisent pas nécessairement en justice sociale.

Accounts of the mistreatment of Aborigines by British colonists, during the early 19th Century, angered humanitarians and missionaries and ultimately motivated the British House of Commons to order an inquiry. On February 9, 1836, the British House of Commons ordered that a select committee be appointed to review the state of affairs with respect to the treatment of Aboriginal people by British subjects throughout the Empire. Thomas Fowell Buxton chaired the committee. He was a key actor in the humanitarian movement, a Member of Parliament, and a driving force behind the report of the Aborigines Committee (Adams, 1977:92). The committee was instructed to propose measures that would: 1) secure to Aborigines the due observance of justice, and the protection of their rights; 2) promote the spread of civilization among them; and 3) lead them to the peaceful and voluntary reception of Christianity (Anon., 1836:ii). The Select Committee published an interim report in 1836 (Anon., 1836), and a final report was presented to the British House of Commons in 1837 (Anon., 1838).

The main purpose of this paper is to refresh the modern collective memory about the social injustice described in the Aborigines Report, and to concurrently evaluate the economic, political and ideological forces that shaped colonial social relations. This case study sets a benchmark with which to evaluate the progress of social justice, from a modernity perspective (Bauman, 1991), in relation to the Aboriginal peoples of Canada. The report provides a valuable snapshot of the effects of colonialism on Aboriginal people. The thesis of this paper is: ultimately, economic motives overshadowed the humanitarian ideology that influenced colonial policy in the decade after 1831. Eric Wolf's political economy approach, described in his book Europe and the People Without History (1982), provides the analytical framework. Wolf (1982:5) views history as "a manifold of social and cultural purposes at work in their own time and place." Wolf warns against representations of nations, societies or cultures as internally homogenous and externally distinctive. He prefers to view society "as a nexus of economic, political, and ideological relationships connected to other nexuses" (Wolf, 1982:6; 9). Forces characterized by the mode of production, or "the key relationships through which social labour is brought to bear upon nature" guide the social alignments of groups within a society. The capitalist mode of production was predominant in the early 19th Century. Wolf's model is appropriate because the scope of the report includes the entire Empire and the report reveals expansionist motives, which are political, ideological and economic in nature (Wolf, 1982:6). For example, the report opens with "The situation of Great Britain brings her beyond any other power into communication with the uncivilized nations of earth. We
are in contact with them in so many parts of the globe” (Anon., 1838:1). Social relations between actors in Britain, the colonies and frontier settlements will be examined because they defined their alignments based on their best interests (Wolf, 1982:385-386). Political, ideological and economic connections within the British Empire helped form the relations. Reasons for the existence of social relations between the key actors such as the British Colonial Office, British missionary societies, humanitarians, traders, settlers and Aboriginal people are examined. Actors are referred to by name, where possible, to emphasize the human nature of relations and history.

**Setting the Stage: “The Lawless Frontier”**

Bodley (1988:63) describes the *Aborigines Report* as an impressive document where a very obvious pattern emerged: unregulated frontier expansion was creating a “calamity” for Native people. Britain was a leader in the industrial revolution and it was emerging as the “workshop of the world.” The movement of manufacturers, people, and money overseas was occurring on an unprecedented scale: “The economic impulse was to find markets and outlets for the new manufacturing potential...” (Hyam, 1993:21; 86). Humanitarian ideological influence on colonial policy peaked in 1837 with the release of the *Aborigines Report*. When the Aborigines inquiry was ordered, Queen Victoria had just ascended the throne; Viscount Melbourne was Prime Minister and Lord Glenelg was Secretary for War and Colonies (Woodward, 1962:662). Approximately one-sixth of the globe's inhabitants were under Britain's imperial rule and its political and economic relations were expanding (Motte, 1840:2). Additionally, one-half of the globe was still controlled by tribes (Bodley, 1988:61). The Whig government headed by Earl Grey had abolished slavery throughout the Empire in 1833, and discontinued colonizing New South Wales, Australia, with convicts in 1840 (Judd, 1970:9; 32). One of the main features of this period was the populating by Europeans of large territories. Emigration from Britain increased dramatically during the “hungry forties.” Hundreds of thousands of “our best and thriftiest sons of toil” (Briggs, 1869:4) poured off the mother country’s shores for the United States, Canada, New Zealand and Australia (Judd, 1970:22; Motte, 1840:2). Approximately six million people emigrated from Britain during the period 1831-1871 (Judd, 1970:9). Wolf (1982:316) characterizes the early 19th Century with a shift away from the use of slaves in the “British orbit” towards the use of free labour “under the rising hegemony of industrial capitalism.” In 1837, colonies such as Canada, Australia, and New Zealand had yet to receive the millions of emigrants from Britain and other European countries. The Aboriginal peoples of these...
lands had not suffered the Empire’s full thrust of colonial hegemony. And yet, it will become evident that the *Aborigines Report* clearly revealed that the negative effects of colonization on Aboriginal people were already well known in the early 19th Century.

A number of tragedies transpired at the hands of British colonists towards Aboriginal people leading up to 1837. The *Aborigines Report’s* survey of the world “examines the actual state of our relations with uncivilized nations” (Anon., 1838:2), which concentrates on the “lawless frontiers” of the Empire. The testimony of the Quaker, James Backhouse, suggests, in the report, that English law should not only apply to the colonies but also to the British settlements on the lawless frontier. He states that “I think the jurisdiction of English law over British subjects ought not be limited to territory; but that every British subject committing a breach of British law in a country in which no regularly organized government exists, to which he can be amenable, ought to be liable to be prosecuted” (Anon., 1836:680). The following survey of the state of affairs in Canada, Australia and New Zealand is based on the report’s findings and establishes the *raison d’etre* for the inquiry.

**Canada (Upper and Lower)**

The report's review of relations in Canada begins “In the colony of New Foundland it may therefore be stated that we have exterminated the natives” (Anon., 1838:4). The report describes the combined effort of the English and Micmac culminating in the shooting of the last two Beothuk tribe members in 1823. A footnote in the *Aborigines Report* suggests that White settlers thought it a “meritorious” or “religious” act to kill an Indian (Anon., 1838:4). A Chippeway Chief gave evidence, which was confirmed by a Wesleyan Missionary, that “We were once very numerous, and owned all Upper Canada, and lived by hunting and fishing; but the white men, who came to trade with us taught our fathers to drink fire-waters, which has made our people poor and sick, and has killed many tribes, till we have become very small” (Anon., 1838:4).

The report goes on to describe the “wretched condition” of other tribes in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, the degenerated condition of the Iroquois, and the reduction of the Cree population by approximately 8,000 people in 30-40 years (Anon., 1838:4-6). A shortage of game, alcohol, and small pox was cited as some of the reasons for the “waste of Indian” life. (Anon., 1838:6). The Hudson’s Bay Company's trade “has a tendency to become injurious to these people, by encouraging them in improvident habits, which frequently bring large parties of them to utter destitution and death by starvation” (Anon., 1838:6). The Company chairman, Mr. Pelly,
was interviewed by the Select Committee and he assured them that "the present directors are well disposed to promote the welfare of the Indians" (Anon., 1838:6). There is no mention in the report of the Indians in Western Canada, probably because explorers such as Alexander Mackenzie had just reached northern British Columbia. The Select Committee probably did not have access to information on northern British Columbia, and Britain did not officially include this area as part of its survey of the Empire in 1837 (Judd, 1970:10).

While the Indians in Upper and Lower Canada were feeling the full effects of contact, the Aboriginal people of northern British Columbia, such as the Tsimshian, were just beginning to feel the effects of colonialism. Rapid population growth in the mid-19th Century Upper Canada revived interest in westward expansion towards the pacific coast. The population of British Columbia grew from negligible to 70,000 by 1870 (Hyam, 1993:42). Aboriginal people in eastern Canada were in the shock phase while they were probably in what Bodley (1988:31; 61) describes as the contact phases of the development process in western Canada. While contact in eastern Canada occurred over three hundred years prior, the Hudson's Bay Company had just made contact with the Tsimshian people in 1826 and established Fort Simpson in 1832. The Tsimshian chiefs enjoyed economic dominance during the first half of the 19th Century. However the Tsimshians were beginning to experience effects of contact, such as small pox that was "decimating the population" (McDonald, 1993:42). Marsden (1987:129) describes economic relations in 1832 as follows:

Legeex [chief] forged an alliance with Dr. Kennedy of the Hudson's Bay Co. by marrying his daughter to him, and, then encouraged him to move that fort to Lax gwel' ams [Port Simpson] within Tsimshian territory. The Nisga' were very angry with the Hudson's Bay Co. when this occurred and they attacked the Hudson's Bay workers as they dismantled the Nass river Fort.

Fisher (1986:42) concludes the company had a considerable interest in keeping much of the Indian way of life intact. Radical change would jeopardize their trading relationship by impairing the ability of the Indians to trade furs. Thus, there were only minor cultural intrusions initially.

Australia

The British referred to Australia as New Holland in the early 19th Century. The report describes the Aborigines as being the "most degraded of the human race" in their original condition prior to European contact. Even
though the *Aborigines Report* is a humanitarian work, it still draws clear lines between the civilized society of Europe and the “degraded” uncivilized Aborigines. Evidence given by Bishop Broughton, in Sydney, expresses the condition of the Aborigine as follows “I may even proceed farther, so far as to express my fears that our settlement in their country has even deteriorated a condition of existence, than which, before our interference, nothing more miserable could easily be conceived” (Anon., 1838:9).

An interesting example of connections between Britain and its colonies is described in the report, and in addition it also identifies a social relation between the State and Church. The report mentions that in 1825 “His Majesty issued instructions to the Governor [New South Wales] to the effect that they [Aborigines] should be protected... and that measures should be taken for their conversion to the Christian faith, and their advancement in civilization. An allowance has been made to the Church Missionary Society in their behalf” (Anon., 1838:10). The report also shows evidence of a letter written in 1831 by Archdeacon Broughton, of the Church Missionary Society, to Mr. Darling, Governor of New South Wales. Broughton acknowledges the receipt of 500 £ [pounds] from the colonial government “for the support of a mission amongst the native inhabitants” (Anon., 1836:21-22). The British State was aware that settlers, such as stock-keepers and cedar-cutters, were killing Aborigines, and of the diminishing populations in settled areas. The State responded by providing funds to the Church Missionary Society in the colony to ameliorate the effects of colonial contact, as it pressed forth with colonization and the search for wealth.

The report notes the “extinction” of Aborigines on Van Diemen’s Land, now known as Tasmania by saying “not a single native remains upon Van Diemen’s Land.” The Select Committee seems to sympathize with the Governor of the day who said that “The whole of the aboriginal inhabitants of Van Diemen’s Land (excepting four persons) are now domiciliated, with their own consent, on Flinder’s Island” (Anon., 1838:12). The colonial government justified the “apprehension of the race” by pointing out that the race would become extinct anyway because the “whites will individually or in small bodies take violent steps against the Aborigines” (Anon., 1838:12).

**New Zealand**

At the time of the *Aborigines Report*, New Zealand had not been elevated to a crown colony of the Empire, and the Maoris of New Zealand were in the contact stage of the development process.

The colonization of New Zealand in the 1830's and the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 brought New Zealand into the British Empire and began the process of transforming it from a
Maori country to a predominantly European one (Adams, 1977:9).

The Aborigines Report discusses New Zealand under the broad category of "Islands of the Pacific." The report blames the "glaring atrocities" on "Our runaway convicts" who "are the 'pests' of savage as well as of civilized society; so are our runaway sailors; and the crews of our whaling vessels, and of the traders of New South Wales" (Anon., 1838:13-14). The missionary, Rev. J. Williams, gives detailed evidence of "mischief" caused by the "pests." He suggests that the greatest damage resulting from European contact was "detrimental from a moral and civil point of view" (Anon., 1838:15).

Adams (1977) provides an interesting insight on the relations between the Colonial Office, the Church Missionary Society in New Zealand, and the Select Committee. Adams relates the decision to expand the British Empire to include New Zealand was undertaken with extreme reluctance. It therefore becomes necessary to examine the various pressures—whether from the imperial frontier or from within the metropolitan power, whether international or domestic, whether economic, humanitarian, strategic or political—which persuaded the Colonial Office to authorize an act of imperial expansion (Adams, 1977:11).

Adams outlines two key attitudes of the Colonial Office, which probably applied to all of the colonies. Britain had a duty to protect subjects settled in New Zealand. Additionally, Britain was also beginning to recognize its duty to protect Maoris from crimes and exploitation because of the increasing humanitarian concern for the fate of Aboriginal peoples (Adams, 1977:13).

The Protestant missionaries were the first established British subjects in New Zealand, followed by flax and timber traders, and then by settlers. The New Zealand Church Missionary Society was pressing the Colonial Office on two issues. First, they felt that France was poised to expand into New Zealand, which revealed not only their anti-Catholic, anti-French prejudice, but also their secular role as ambassadors of the British Empire and advocates of its expansion (Adams, 1977:81). Secondly, Dandison Coates, secretary of the society, was concerned about the poor treatment of Maoris and especially about the Elizabeth outrage (Adams, 1977:90). The report included the following testimony regarding the Elizabeth outrage given in a letter addressed to Dandison Coates from Rev. S. Marsden:

The Captain then took hold of the chief's hand in a friendly manner, and conducted him and his two daughters into the cabin; showed him the muskets, how they were arranged
around the sides of the cabin. When all was prepared for securing the chief, the cabin door was locked, and the chief was laid hold on, and his feet were tied fast; at the same time, a hook with a cord to it was struck through the skin of his throat under the side of his jaw, and the line fastened to some part of the cabin; in this state of torture he was kept for some days (Anon., 1836:483).

The Captain of the *Elizabeth* was aiding the Maori Chief Koroporo to kill the rival Chief Moweeterranne, as a result of a deal he made for "a quantity of flax" (Anon., 1836:483).

Adams identifies a connection between Coates and James Stephens, the Permanent Under-Secretary, Colonial Office. Stephens, who was also a member of the Church Missionary Society, encouraged Coates to give evidence on the *Elizabeth* outrage to Glenelg. Coates was frustrated by Glenelg's response, and therefore persuaded Thomas Fowell Buxton to expose the affair in the *Aborigines Report*. The report's survey of the "lawless frontier" is juxtaposed against its succeeding section of "Fair Dealings" with Aborigines.

**Analysis of Social Relations in the Report**

The report examined the "Effects of Fair Dealing, combined with Christian Instruction, on Aborigines" (Anon., 1838:33). The object of this section was to review accounts from the colonies of "Fair dealings" undertaken by Church and State representatives with Aborigines, as opposed to the "desolating effects of the association of unprincipled Europeans with nations in a ruder state" (Anon., 1838:33). The committee suggests "we find proof that every tribe of mankind is accessible to this remedial process... so that the main features of the case before us being the ravages caused by Europeans, enough has been incidentally disclosed to show that those nations which have been exposed to our contamination might, during the same period, have been led forward to religion and civilization" (Anon, 1838:33). Essentially the committee set out to show that the introduction of Christianity to the "savage heathen" was necessary to counterbalance the injustices inflicted upon the Aborigines by non-missionaries. Following the "Fair Dealings" section, the reports concludes with responses of the secretaries of the three missionary societies, suggestions for future regulation, and finally with special comments regarding the limited discussion of North America in the report. The ensuing analysis of these sections of the report is presented in a discussion of the key actors' social relations, with a particular focus on Church-State relations. These actors, who are responsible for creating the interwoven pattern of connections between the colo-
nnies and Britain are: missionaries, the Colonial Office, humanitarians, settlers, traders, Aboriginal people and the Select Committee.

Clearly, the Select Committee relied heavily on the evidence presented by the three missionary societies, as opposed to Aboriginal peoples, which the Victorian government came to suspect (Hyam, 1993:86). The committee agreed with the missionaries view that non-missionary Europeans were responsible for the immoral conduct (Anon., 1838:55-56). The evidence of Mr. Thomas Hodgkin M.D. was relied upon heavily, and when the committee asked for his source of information he answered as follows:

The members of the Society of Friends have corresponded with their brethren in America on this very important subject, and their documents in especial manner have been interesting to me. I have had a few opportunities to correspond with North American Indians myself (Anon., 1836:454).

The Select Committee saw the missionaries as “successful mediators between the natives and those who have injured them” and as teachers of useful trades (Anon., 1838:45). They educated and trained new labourers. The Select Committee expressed its conviction “that there is but one effectual means of staying the evils we have occasioned, and of imparting the blessings of civilization, and that is, the propagation of Christianity, together with the preservation, for the time to come, of the civil rights of natives” (Anon., 1838:33). Missionaries in the colonies wrote letters and reports to their missionary society in Britain. The connections established between colonial missionaries and the Mother Country’s government, through Stephens and Buxton, had an “effect on English public opinion at home” (Woodward, 1962:369).

The “Fair Dealings” section of the report described the successful conversion of Aborigines from their heathen state. The Bishop of Quebec and a number of other clergy gave evidence of the effect of fair dealing and of Christian instruction upon heathens. The testimony of Rev. J. Evans regarding the Chippeways is a good example of the content of the section.

They were all drunkards with one exception, not drunkards in a limited sense, but the most abandoned and unblushing sots imaginable; they were never sober when they could procure anything to intoxicate them; they were idle to the extreme, never attending to any business except hunting (Anon., 1838:37).

The Reverends would describe how the Indians would change their disposition to be “sober, teachable, honest and industrious” once they had embraced Christianity (Anon., 1838:38).
The Colonial Office was, at the very least symbolically, a key actor in colonial social relations. Martin (1995:117) imparts a critical eye onto the role of the mid-Victorian era Colonial Office. He suggests that imperial historian's view of the Colonial Office, as a "ruthlessly long-sighted policy machine" may be an oversimplification of how British colonial policy unfolded. The impression Martin leaves is that the Colonial Office was a figurehead, and real policy making occurred in more quasi-official environs. But not necessarily so in relation to the humanitarian issues during the decade after 1831. Martin (1995:120) may be correct in his view of the office's influence in shaping policy relating to confederation. It is more likely that the influence of the Colonial Office probably waxed and waned depending on the actors in play and the issues at hand. Certainly the office played a role in matters relating to humanitarian issues in the colony during the 1830s.

Two well-known humanitarians ran the Colonial Office: Lord Glenelg as colonial secretary 1835 to 1839 and James Stephen as permanent under-secretary from 1836. Public interest was indicated by the foundation of the British and Foreign Aborigines Protection Society. The report of Fowell Buxton's select committee on Aborigines (1837) seemed to provide a possible policy document. An age which found ethical considerations hard to refute, and which was extremely ignorant of the empire, was one peculiarly susceptible to persuasion by argument from moral principles, although humanitarians were adept at promising material benefits too (Hyam, 1993:83).

Thomas Fowell Buxton praised Lord Glenelg for his "anxiety to do justice to the Negroes, Caffres, Hottentots, and Indians" (Adams, 1977:131). Glenelg's Under Secretary, Sir James Stephens was a member of the Church Missionary Society. Woodward (1962:369) quotes Stephens as saying he could feel "thankful for the many opportunities [offered to him of] mitigating the cruel wrongs inflicted [by his countrymen] on so great a portion of the human race." Thus, there were strong humanitarian connections to the Colonial Office, which impacted imperial policy for that particular period.

E.G Wakefield, a British capitalist reformer, proposed his theory of "systematic colonization" in 1829 that also influenced Colonial Office policy. Wakefield's central proposition was concerned with the steady growth of the colonies and he suggested

...that if the full revenue income from land sales—based on a sufficient price—was devoted to immigration then there would be an exact balance between the land which was about to be
occupied, the capital necessary to develop it and the labour required to work it (Farrell, 1990:73).

The capitalist reformers such as Wakefield were very influential in the setting up of colonies such as New South Wales in 1834, and consequently on the demographic connections resulting from immigration. Wakefield was also a key figure in the New Zealand Association. The general aim of the association was to replace irregular colonization on an anarchical frontier with systematic colonization (Adams, 1977:94). Consequently, the association wanted to put a more formal structure in place to regulate the relations between labour and capital. The Aborigines Report provided opportune information regarding the extent of anarchy on the frontier. In 1837 Lord Glenelg decided to offer the New Zealand Association a charter to govern New Zealand. His decision was influenced by "a combination of circumstances, including... the coincidental arrival of grim and graphic description of the worsening frontier situation" (Adams, 1977:14). The offer subsequently lapsed, and "the admission of the necessity for intervention to protect Maoris and British subjects still stood" (Adams, 1977:14).

Humanitarians such as Thomas Fowell Buxton, Elizabeth Fry, and the Friends of the Suffering were active in Britain during the early 19th Century calling for abolishment of the slave trade, prison reform and protecting the Aborigines. Thomas Fowell Buxton, a former Quaker, wrote a book entitled The African Slave Trade and its Remedy in 1839, after completing his work as chair of the Select Committee. Elizabeth Fry, Buxton's sister-in-law, was a Quaker and she believed in reforming prisoners by means of personal instruction in Christian religion (Woodward, 1962:468). The Friends of the Suffering, or Religious Society of Friends, was one of the smaller Protestant denominations, referred to as Quakers, Friends or Friends Church. Quakerism manifested sensitivity to social needs (Anon., 1981:200). The Friends were particularly interested in the humane treatment of the North American Indian. The Aborigine Report makes special mention of the efforts of the Quaker, William Penn, and his commendable efforts in America. Prison reform and the abolishment of slavery were significant reforms made in the 19th Century, and therefore one could assume the humanitarian pressure groups had an effect on the government's policy decisions.

Settlers' interest to acquire land was not motivated by a desire to change Indian culture, unlike the missionaries' goal which "was the complete destruction of the traditional integrated Indian way of life... and they pushed it more aggressively than any other group of whites," (Fisher, 1986:145). The report did not discuss any negative effects of converting Aboriginal people to Christianity, because the Select Committee favored the missionaries' perspective. The settlers were portrayed as a mix of
convicts, estranged sailors, good Christian emigrants, and missionary families. Settlers were imported labour to aid in the expansion of mercantilism and capitalism. Wolf (1978:361) describes the flow of labour “from regions where people were under-employed, or displaced from agriculture or cottage industries, towards regions of heightened industrial or agricultural activity.” These new labourers responded in different ways depending on the structure of the labour market and the situation in which they found themselves. One can assume from the accounts in the Aborigines Report that the structures were less formal and highly dynamic on the expanding frontiers of the Empire. Therefore, some of the new labourers, such as the Australian convicts, took advantage of this loose structure to establish their niche, by displacing and terrorizing the Aborigines. The missionary societies were responsible for settling new areas; for instance Adams (1977:30) credits the Wesleyan Missionaries for settling the North Island of New Zealand. The settlers believed that they were from a highly civilized society being culturally and morally superior. The settlers justified their “individual and corporate actions to ‘improve’ the land and enlighten” the Aborigines (Schouls, 1992:15). Some settlers emigrated to improve their own economic condition and to assist with the Empire’s capitalist expansion, while others emigrated to introduce civilization and Christianity. In some cases an individual settler was working towards both goals. The goals and relations of economic and cultural improvement of the colonies were interwoven. In British Columbia, the gold miners were the advance guard. They came with a new set of attitudes, as compared to the fur traders. The settlers and Indians now entered an era of competing for resources and land. The settler came to the colonies to acquire land, which could no longer be acquired in Britain (Fisher, 1986:96; 103).

Traders such as the chairman of the Hudson’s Bay Company were being asked to justify their actions in the colonies by the Select Committee in Britain. The committee asked the expert witness, Mr. Richard King, if he could describe the effects of trade on North American Indians. His information seemed to be based on his personal observations on the causes of the negative effects suffered by the Cree Indians. He replied as follows:

The introduction of spirits might be ascribed as one cause, and trading or bartering of vast quantities of provisions might be considered another cause, and also the introduction of a contagious disease, which has, perhaps, done more injury, next to the use of ardent spirits, than anything else; I mean that of the venereal disease... That provision is bartered from the Indians, who can ill spare it; they used to lay up great quantity of provisions as a winter store, but now they are no longer, able
to do so, for the quantity required for the trade is so large that they can barely supply it (Anon., 1836:640).

King’s testimony summarized a number of important effects such as the drain of winter supplies and the introduction of disease. Other evidence regarding traders focused on events such as the Elizabeth outrage where traders were committing crimes against the Aborigines. Experience with traders was highly varied. For example, Fisher (1986:42; 146) believes fur traders, as an acculturative agent, had a relatively minor impact, aside from the ones discussed above, on cultures such as the Tsimshian.

Aboriginal people provided little direct evidence to the Select Committee. There were a few accounts from “converted” Indians “embracing the gospel,” such as the Chippeway’s Chief Kahkewquonaby who was quoted to say:

To the question whether the Christian Chippeways have not made considerable advancement in Civilization?—The improvement the Christian Indians have made, has been the astonishment of all who knew them in their pagan state...Formerly they were in a wandering state, living in wigwams, and depending on the chase for subsistence (Anon., 1838:36).

Unsuccessful attempts at “preparing them for the truths of the Gospel” were discussed in the report. The Governor General of Canada asked a chief why several attempts were unsuccessful, and the Chief replied: “they could see nothing in civilized life sufficiently attractive to induce them to give up their former mode of living” (Anon., 1838:34). The Aboriginal people throughout the colonies all found themselves at different stages of the development process, exposed to different types of traders, and exposed to missionaries from various missionary societies. However, they all faced a consistent colonial policy designed to convert them “from heathen ignorance and immoral habits to Christian faith and practice.” The report does recognize, however, that “…the native inhabitants of any land have an incontestible right to their own soil: a plain and sacred right, however, which seems not to have been understood. Europeans have entered their borders uninvited” (Anon., 1838:3).

The report demonstrates that Aboriginal peoples throughout the Empire faced similar fates as a result of colonization. The extent and timing of these fates are, however, highly variable. The series of quotes from the report (Anon., 1838) below represent consistent factors which contributed to the Aboriginal peoples’ loss of autonomy and power.
• "The white men, who came to trade with us, taught us, taught our fathers, to drink fire-waters, which has made our people poor and sick" (pg. 4);
• "It is a curious fact, noticed in evidence, that some years ago the Indians practiced agriculture, and were able to bring corn to our settlements, then suffering from famine; but we, by driving them back and introducing the fur trade, have rendered them so completely a wandering people" (pg. 4);
• "The decrease of game, the habit of intoxication, and the European diseases" (pg. 5); and
• "Europeans have entered their borders uninvited, and, when there, have not only acted as if they were undoubted lords of the soil, but have punished the natives as aggressors... Many deeds of violence and murder" (pg. 3 and 9);

The Select Committee's concluding statement in the report provides a snapshot of the 19th Century desire to protect and civilize Aboriginal people. For example, the report describes the disastrous policy of "The oppression of Natives of barbarous countries is a practice which pleads no claim to indulgence" by the Empire (Anon., 1838:57). The report suggests that the extermination or banishment of Natives resulted in the loss of "profitable workmen, good customers, and good neighbors" (Anon., 1838:57). In other words, even at the epoch of humanitarianism in the 19th Century Britain's policy towards Aboriginal people was firmly based on the expansion of capitalism and the access to labour; "Virtue would be its own reward" (Hyam, 1993:83). The committee recognized the "desire to give encouragement to emigration, and to find a soil to which our surplus population may retreat." It proposed regulations "which shall apply to our own subjects and to independent tribes, to those emerging from barbarism, and to those in the rudest state of nature" (Anon., 1838:57). The committee cited a number of motives for the civilizing process: 1) ideological—there was "a moral obligation to impart [Christian] blessings we enjoy"; 2) colonial security — "savages were dangerous neighbours"; and 3) economic — savages were "unprofitable customes", and if they remained as degraded denizens of our colonies, they become a burden upon the State" (Anon., 1838:33). At the close of the report, the Select Committee asks the question "Can we suppose otherwise than that it is our office to carry civilization and humanity, peace and good government, and above all, the knowledge of the true God, to the uttermost ends of the earth?" (Anon., 1838:58). A desire to "expand" Christian ideology throughout the New World was a strong motive. Economic and ideological motivations for the key actors although they were
prima facie incompatible, however they shared the same desire—to expand into new markets.

The actors are many; their relations interwoven; economic, ideological, and political relations were structured to facilitate the expansion of the Empire. The actors were also connected throughout the Empire. Wolf suggests there are also ecological and demographic connections that describe the social mantle of the globe (Wolf, 1978:3). The Aborigines Report provided a useful snapshot of these connections that are summarized as follows:

- The devastating effects of the European small pox virus on Aboriginal peoples created an ecological connection between Europe and the colonies.
- The persecution of Quakers in England during the 17th Century forced them to migrate to North America. Consequently, a demographic connection was established, because the Quakers in the Americas were able to supply evidence to the Select Committee.
- The three missionary societies sent settlers to the Empire's frontier. Consequently, they established an important political connection with the Select Committee in Britain by providing first-hand accounts of the treatment of Aborigines by traders and settlers.
- The efforts of humanitarians and missionaries in Britain to abolish the slave trade, convict settlement of colonies, and Wakefield's land settlement policies created demographic connections between the Mother Country and the colonies. Emigration became the main source of labour for the colonies.
- The political pressure applied by humanitarian groups in Britain influenced Colonial Governors' decisions regarding the treatment of Aboriginal peoples.

Social Relations in the Post Aborigine Report (19th Century) Era

How were colonial social relations influenced by the report? What effect did the Aborigines Report have on the treatment of Aboriginal peoples? Did colonial administrators make any significant changes to their colonial policies? Emigration significantly increased subsequent to the Aborigines Report. Big Elk, circa 1850, warned the Omahas about the coming flood of emigration in the following statement:

There is a coming flood which will soon reach us, and I advise you to prepare for it. Soon the animals which Wakon'da has given us for sustenance will disappear beneath this flood to
return no more, and it will be very hard for you" (Milner, 1982:155).

Some Briton's saw "the flower of our artisan labour and capital are fast drifting to a new country where, on their settling down, they become English haters" (Farrell, 1990:8). It is important to recognize that most of the negative effects of European contact on Aboriginal peoples, as described in the Aborigines Report, were well known before the large scale emigration to the colonies. The humanitarian influence declined after 1842, however, settlers, as alluded to previously, where never moved by the ideology in the first place. Strong central control, colonial cooperation, and a blessing from the Treasury were required, but unfortunately lacking, to implement humanitarianism throughout the colonies (Hyam, 1993:85).

Thomas Briggs (1869:3-8) provides his industrialist view on the political economy of the Empire in 1869. He begins by pointing out that 10,000 - 12,000 people were emigrating to the United States from Britain. He suggests that the American Homestead Law made settling in United States a more attractive destination, as compared to the colonies, because the price of land was less than land in colonies such as Australia. The United States had an advantage in accessing labour needs. Briggs blames Edward Gibbon Wakefield’s Land Law of 1834 that set the policy for colonial land sales. Briggs emphasized that an important element of the 19th Century political economy was attracting settlers, and importing labour, through attractive land prices so that capitalists in the colonies could have secure access to labour. This political economy dynamic in concert with the Church’s desire to spread the good word to the uncivilized peoples of the frontier was largely responsible for the coming “second wave” (Wolf, 1978:363) of emigration.

The Aborigines Protection Society was founded as a result of the report; the society was formed by five people from the fifteen member Select Committee (Adams, 1977:93).

The Aborigines Protection Society was founded in 1837 ‘to promote the interests of native races, especially those under British control, by providing correct information, by appealing to the Government and to Parliament when appeal is needed, and by bringing public opinion to exert its proper influence in advancing the cause of justice’...Publications of the Society of Friends, under the stimulus of the Aborigines Protection Society, carried reports of exploitation from the colonies... (Oats, 1985:11).

The Aborigines Protection Society used the Quaker’s emigrant infrastructure throughout the colonies to monitor the treatment of Aborigines and to
tactfully pressure the British Government as necessary. The Quakers emigrated to the United States in the 17th Century to escape religious persecution and established a large settlement centered on Philadelphia. Quakers emigrated to Australia, on the other hand, "to seek a better future for themselves and their families. The motivation was economic, not religious" (Oats, 1985:337). The Aborigines Protection Society and the Society of Friends concentrated their efforts on the humane treatment of North American Indians. For example the Aborigines Protection Society proposed a system of legislation in 1840 "...for securing protection of the aboriginal inhabitants of all countries colonized by Great Britain; extending to them political and social rights, ameliorating their condition, and promoting their civilization" (Motte, 1840:1). Their legislation included measures which addressed the "protection" of political and civil rights and "instruction and amelioration." The theme of their proposal was

To encourage and develop[e], not to damp or destroy their native ardour and energy; to direct, and not to weaken their physical character; to enlighten their minds by reason, and not to darken their understanding by deception or mystification; to help, and not to oppress, should be our object;—so as to cultivate and promote mutual dependence....[which] would infallibly lead them to be moral, intelligent, peaceful and happy,—attached friends and allies (Motte, 1840:6).

The theme is paternalistic and it rings a familiar tone of the Canadian 20th Century assimilation and integration policies. This familiarity will be discussed in the next part of the case study. The society proposed a system of legislation that was not accepted by the government.

The Aborigines Protection Society's next humanitarian effort was made in an appeal to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Henry LaBouchere, "...to the preservation of the natural rights of the Indians when the license of trade of the Hudson's Bay Company and the Charter of Vancouver's Island come before Her Majesty's Government for renewal; and, lastly, for the establishment of schools for their mental instruction and industrial training, and the appointment of teachers and ministers of religion" (Anon., 1856:7). In 1858, Sir E.B. Lytton asked the Governor of Vancouver Island, Sir James Douglas, to consider the "best and most humane means of dealing with the Native Indians" because the Aborigines Society was pressuring Her Majesty's Government (Anon., 1875:12).

Inglis (1993:192) provides an account of the Aborigines Protection Society pressuring the British Government regarding a massacre of Aborigines referred to as the Myall Creek incident. The Australian Governor, Sir George Gipps, did not succumb to appeals to grant clemency to seven
settlers who killed 28 Aborigines. The decision to hang the seven men was approved by London in 1838 because "the Aborigines Protection Society had lately aroused much concern at home about what the colonists of Australia were doing to the native inhabitants." The Society of Friends published a number of reports that describe the state of well being of Aborigines. For example they published a report entitled Address to Lord Russell on His Becoming Secretary for the Colonies... (Anon., 1840). The Society's 1844 report provides an extensive account of North American Indians, and it includes a valuable map of the location and population of Indian tribes throughout North America (Anon., 1844). Dorland (1927:285) describes the Quakers attention to the concerns of the Canadian Indians as being very limited because the "Roman Catholic and Anglican Churches were the first in this field."

On the other hand, the Quakers were very active in the United States. In 1869 President Grant employed the help of the Quakers as Indian agents in the present-day states of Nebraska, Kansas and Oklahoma because he was impressed with the Quakers' humane ideas. The Pawnees, Otos, and Omahas were administered by the Friends. Grant made his reform intentions known as President-elect. He "wanted to gather all the Indians on reservations and hoped to root out the gang of thieves and speculators who inhabited the Indian Bureau" (Milner, 1982:1). Milner characterizes the Quakers' administration as follows:

They brought good intentions to their work as Indian agents. They strove to assimilate the Indians under their care into white society, while, in general, they maintained their personal integrity. Yet at close examination of the Quaker administration of the Omaha, Pawnee, and Oto agencies record reveals a record of frustration and failure (1982:xi-xii).

Milner attributes the Quakers' lack of success to the broader consensus of the White humanitarian movement. The consensus "insisted on Indian assimilation to white ways and signaled intolerance for Indian culture, which at least for Friends, seemed in stark contrast to the popular image of William Penn" (Milner, 1982:199). Once again this theme of assimilation is addressed in this case study.

The missionary societies, the Quakers and the Aboriginal Protection Society acted as pressure groups on antipodean affairs and as government watchdogs (Adams, 1977:90). They also acted as mediators between settlers and Aboriginal People. It was expensive for the British Government to protect the settlers from the Aborigines, and the Aborigines from the settlers. Briggs comments that "we are taxing ourselves to the tune of millions for their [colonies] protection" (1869:6). The Aborigines Report
describes a strategy used by the Governors of Canada who “seem to have been brought to the conviction that religious instruction and the influence of the missionaries would be the most likely means of improving their condition, and, eventually, of relieving the Government from the expense of the Indian department” (Anon., 1838:35). The State and the Church had structured, to their mutual benefit, a social relation where the state concentrated on economic affairs while empowering the Church to look after the Indian affairs.

Scholars such as Hyam (1993:96) and Fisher (1986:146) claim that British missionaries did not influence governments, were not politically minded, received no funding from government, and the State would only sometimes support their efforts. At the very least, there was a symbiotic relationship, as compared to being diametric in nature. Examples below indicate direct links in the colonial effort between the Church and State. The most obvious expression of the State-Church relationship occurred when President Grant employed the Quakers as Indian agents. The missionaries converted and educated the Indians, while the traders and settlers expanded their economic endeavors. The relation between the Church and the State was an important set of relations that defined social production. The Church was able to convert the heathens and at the same time facilitate colonization by dealing with Indian affairs. As Pandian (1990:1767) warns it would be misleading to “simplify and pigeonhole the interaction between church, colonialism, and aboriginal society into any essentialist explanation; but one has to treat these encounters as multi-layered, acquiring different character in different historical situations.” For example, the Quakers and William Penn were certainly at the nexus between the United States Government and the Indians, however the Quakers in Australia and Canada had little or no role in Indian affairs. In 1849 the Canadian State and Church began setting up a network of residential and industrial schools for Aboriginal children in order to solve the problem of Aboriginal independence and “savagery” (Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, 1996:14). Sir John A. MacDonald appointed Nicolas Flood Davin in 1879, in response to pressure from the Catholic and Methodist churches, to report on the working of industrial schools in the United States. Davin recommended the establishment of off-Reserve industrial schools in Canada which would “teach the arts, crafts, and industrial skills of a modern economy” (Anon, 1996:Vol 1., Ch. 9, Sec. 3). “Selfless Christian duty and self interested statecraft were the foundations of the residential school system. The edifice itself was erected in by a church/government partnership…” (Anon., 1996:Vol. 1, Ch. 10). The Royal Commission on Aboriginal peoples concluded there were three motives for the introduction of industrial/residential schools: 1) eco-
nomic motivation to invest in training Aboriginal people as labourers and contributors to national revenues; 2) political motives, as pointed out by the Church, to live up to constitutional obligations to provide education to Aboriginal people, and 3) ideological motives to enlighten the “Indian brethren” through their children on Christianity.

The main effect of the Aborigines Report may have been to reaffirm or strengthen the social relations between the British Colonial Office, Colonial Governments and the three missionary societies with respect to administering Aboriginal affairs in the colonies. The State and the Church both had an interest in civilizing the Aborigines, however they have different means to the same end. The State saw capitalism and force as a means, while the Church saw Christianity. For example, Reverend William Ellis’ testimony clearly links the civilized man to Christianity: “No man can become a Christian, in the true sense of the term, however savage he may have been before, without becoming a civilized man. Christianity produces civilization of the best and most durable kind” (Anon., 1836:540). The report clearly illustrated to the British Government that colonial settlers and traders held little regard for the rights, or even the lives of Aboriginal people. Humanitarians and the missionaries were pressuring the Government to legislate standards that protected Aborigines’ rights and established a process to educate and “civilize the degraded Natives.” The Government chose not to implement the system of legislation proposed by the Aborigines Protection Society in 1840. The British Government may have chosen a politically favorable strategy, in true government fashion, and tried to appease the missionary societies by adopting a paternalistic policy which formally recognized and empowered them as the “protectors” of Aborigines. This policy would have satisfied a number of the British Government’s interests and maintained some important social relations. First, this policy did not impede the progress of development and capitalist expansion that was of prime interest to colonial governments, imperial capitalists, traders and new labourers. Second, it turned the negative criticism of the missionaries and humanitarians away from the Government by empowering the critics, and therefore improving the relation between the Church and State. Third, the missionaries could pacify the Aborigines and at the same time protect the Aborigines from the settlers and traders that would in theory improve relations with the Aborigines. Fourth, the missionaries could train the Aborigines as labourers for the capitalist mode of production, such as agriculture. And finally, adopting the missionary protection policy would help restore Great Britain’s honour as a great and just nation. Its reputation had been tarnished by the accounts of immorality and murder described in the Aborigines Report. This scenario seems plausible because the interests of
both parties are met and social relations important to production are maintained.

Herman Merivale as permanent Under Secretary of the Colonial Office succeeded James Stephens, whom Woodward (1962:367) credits as being Mr. Mother Country, “the real director of colonial policy,” in the 1840s. In a series of lectures at Oxford University between 1837 and 1842 Merivale described his policy towards Aborigines as follows:

And, lastly, there should be no hesitation in acting on the broad principle that the natives must, for their own protection, be placed in a situation of acknowledged inferiority, and consequently of tutelage...There we may entrust them to the good offices of the missionary, and the 'protector' (Merivale, 1861:103-104).

In other words, Merivale felt that the Aborigine should be left in God's best hand as the Empire got on with its important business. Consequently, Aboriginal peoples felt the damaging effects of the missionaries' new social order, such as banning the potlatch system and forbidding Aboriginal children to speak their own language.

**Slow Change: A 20th Century Perspective**

Britain “ruled” millions of peoples through a “magic” sense of superiority that was created by focussing on the differences between the Natives and themselves (Hyam, 1993:303). Rev. J. Evans' short testimony in the “Fair Dealings” section of the report contains many of the stereotypes, such as the lazy drunk Indian, that have persisted up to the present day. This case study will conclude by looking at the persistent nature of the emphasis on differences, as represented in the *Aborigines Report*. Hyam (1993:303) provides a good discussion about the emphasis of differences.

Endless emphasis on the differences between 'natives' and themselves was one of the necessary props of the empire. They could only have ruled subject peoples, especially when hopelessly outnumbered, by honestly believing themselves to be racially superior, and the subject race to be biologically different. An extremely interesting example of the outward and visible form of emphasis on difference was the sun helmet. The British built up a superstition about their greater proneness to sunstroke because of their supposedly thinner skulls (and therefore larger brains).

“That was then, it does not happen now...” is a common response by Canadians when they learn of the effects of colonialism on Aboriginal
people. Bauman (1991:7), who adeptly deals with the sensitive topic of the Holocaust, encourages modern society to think of genocide as more than a “cancerous growth on an otherwise healthy body of civilized society.” Bauman’s (1991:8; 15) analysis of the holocaust is “crucial to our understanding of the modern bureaucratic mode of rationalization not only, and not primarily, because it reminds us just how formal and ethically blind is the bureaucratic pursuit of efficiency.” The bureaucracy and politician are the two components of Hyam and Martin’s (1975:161-62) concept of the “official mind.” Based on discussions, earlier in this paper on the Church-State social relations, the official mind concept is further expanded to mean: social relations, official and quasi-official, between key political, bureaucratic, and church actors which created or significantly influenced colonial policy either by design and/or circumstance. The 19th Century official mind’s arrogant rationalization for the boundary between the civilized European and the barbaric Aborigine focused on “natural” biological and ideological separations. Christian doctrine provided the State with factual reasons to explain its policies; the Church provided the natural boundary for the pre-modern State to rationalize the social production of moral indifference. However, as modernity introduced cultural leveling and a reluctance to legislate these types of boundaries, the Church’s role became less useful, in the 20th Century, to the official mind. Bauman (1991:58) discussed this transition to modernity below.

Modernity brought the leveling of differences; at least of their outward appearances, of the very stuff of which symbolic distances between segregated groups are made. With such differences missing, it was not enough to muse philosophically over the wisdom of reality as it was—something Christian doctrine had done before when it wished to make sense out of the factual Jewish separation. Differences had to be created now, or retained against the awesome eroding power of social and legal equality and cross-cultural exchange.

Thus, assimilation policies were introduced by the official mind. Curiously, Bauman suggests that modern societies are not willing to legislate boundaries between cultures; Canada remains an anomaly because the Indian Act is still in place.

Bauman (1991:8) encourages a critical eye on modern society (and consequently, on the “official mind”) because the bureaucracy which implemented the Holocaust seemed “normal” in the sense of being fully in keeping with everything we know about our civilization. For instance, there is a large federal bureaucracy which manages Indian affairs through the Indian Act.
From the passage of the first version of the Indian Act in 1876, amendments were brought forward almost every year in response to unanticipated problems being experienced by federal officials in implementing the civilization and assimilation policies to which they were committed. Many of these amendments eroded the protected status of Reserve lands. Others enabled Band governments to be brought under almost complete supervision and control. Yet others allowed almost every area of the daily life of Indians on Reserves to be regulated or controlled in one way or another (Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, 1996:Vol 1, Ch. 9, Sec. 9).

The 20th Century equivalent to the 19th Century civilization process is the assimilation process. Assimilation policies were rationalized by the official mind as a means to convince Aboriginal people not to be different (encouraging enfranchisement). Even today Aboriginal leaders, such as Ovide Mercredi, do not see any fundamental difference between the official mind's current policy and that of the 19th Century. He comments "Canada's constitutional values are still founded on the ideas that were prominent in the colonial era—power, greed, exclusivity and the rejection or denial of other cultures" (Mercredi, 1994:34). Bauman (1991:x) cautions modern society of "the self-healing of historical memory" because it is a neglect offensive to the victims of genocide, and dangerous to the society-at-large. The Aborigines Report provides an opportunity for modern Canada to refresh its collective memory, which in turn establishes a benchmark with which to evaluate the progress of social justice in the 20th Century. The logical evolution of this paper would be to examine, from a modernity perspective, the cast of characters in the 20th Century and their colonial-hangover motivations.

From a 20th Century perspective one might question the validity of the old adage "recognizing you have a problem is half the battle." As Bodley (1988:63) points out the World Bank did a review, 145 years after the Aborigines Report, and it also revealed to modern society the social injustice suffered by Aboriginal people. The Canadian Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples was given a mandate by government 155 years after the Select Committee to "help restore justice to the relationship between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people, and to propose practical solutions to stubborn problems." The commission's main conclusion was that the main policy direction pursued first by the colonial and then by the Canadian government was wrong because successive governments have tried to absorb Aboriginal people, through assimilation policies, into society, rather than recognizing them as nations within Canada (Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, 1996:ix-x). Even though the awareness had been
created through the *Aborigines Report* in 1837, all be it paternalistic in nature, there followed a history of social relations based on the self-interest of the Church and State. Change has been very slow. Ovide Mercredi (1994:230) refers to the lack of political commitment, which is "national disgrace," as the main reason for Canada's status-quo poor treatment of Aboriginal peoples.

The fundamental problem for the official mind and Aboriginal people has been in defining social relations that are "reciprocal and lasting" (Motte, 1840:6). History is littered with attempts by the official mind to form relations with Aboriginal people. For instance, the State empowered the Church to enter relations with Aboriginal people on behalf of the State. But, as of yet, reciprocal social relations have eluded definition. Three common themes in social relations between the official mind and Aboriginal people have persisted since their expression in the *Aborigines Report*. First, the White consensus is that civilizing and assimilating Indians is the best means towards imposing a reciprocal relation. Secondly, the State's baseline assumption is that capitalist expansion will continue regardless of its effects on Aboriginal peoples. Finally, the official mind, with good intentions, defines its role as "protector" of Aboriginal people by imposing relations through law or moral sanctity. Adams (1970:93) says "The *Aborigines Report* has been regarded by many historians as the highest expression of the nineteenth-century humanitarian idealism towards aboriginal peoples." Aboriginal people have not been permitted to participate as equals in determining social relations. The Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples has reviewed the 150-year intervening history since the *Aborigines Report*. Little has changed. The *Aborigines Report* was largely ignored as economic expansionist motivations overshadowed the humanitarian ideology (Hyam, 1993:85). Will a similar fate bestow the *Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples Final Report*? How does the modern official mind's policy contribute to the persistence social injustice for Canada's Aboriginal people?

Hindsight, has constructed the opportunity to study the 19th Century *Aborigines Report*, however, it will be a more complex endeavour to study socially-related humanity today, and to wonder if the interests of the past still motivate the actors of the day. There is no doubt that the interests that were the genesis of 19th Century colonial policy still live as ghosts.
Notes

1. Aborigines was a term used in the 19th century to describe Indigenous or Aboriginal peoples.

2. The *Elizabeth* outrage occurred in 1831 when the British captain of the *Elizabeth* transported a Maori party and abetted in the slaughter of another Maori tribe.


4. Note this publication has sixty pages of extracts that summarize the Aborigines Report, since the entire Report was not available, this version was used for the paper.
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