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Abstract

This thesis seeks to re-construct the biographies of two relatively obscure, yet fascinating and controversial players in the history of Aotearoa New Zealand. Both historical figures were initiators and leaders of neighbouring settlements: the rangatira, Te Hemara Tauhia (1815 – 1891), in his role as chief of the Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo hapū of the Ngāti Whātua iwi, re-occupying ancestral lands after living in captivity with Ngāpuhi, and the former Austrian captain, Martin Krippner (1817 – 1894), organiser of an Austrian-Bohemian settlement made possible under the Auckland Provincial Government land grant scheme. Despite their efforts for each community, both men were accused by their own people of misusing their positions for personal gains. Te Hemara Tauhia was blamed for selling off tribal lands to cover personal debts. Martin Krippner was never forgiven for promising his Bohemian compatriots a ‘land of milk and honey’ while leading them to near starvation and struggle within dense New Zealand bush, and subsequently into war in the Waikato where Krippner was commissioned captain in the Waikato Militia.

Focussing on three main objectives, this cross-cultural dual biography provides an original contribution to historical scholarship: Firstly, it looks behind the myths that have been created around Te Hemara Tauhia and Martin Krippner; it thoroughly examines what both men did and how social, economic and political circumstances influenced their motivations and choices at that particular time. Secondly, placing Tauhia’s and Krippner’s biographies side-by-side provides a novel view of a range of historical phenomena from both Tangata Whenua (indigenous peoples) and European settlers (Pākehā) perspectives. Looking at the same events from different angles and perspectives, a cross-cultural, dual biography can act like a prismatic tool, revealing the complexity of a shared history. The third aim of this research encompasses my intention to contribute to and to participate in a dialogue between ethnic groups in Aotearoa New Zealand, especially between Māori and Pākehā, in order to challenge stereotypes and generalisations based on lack of knowledge of historical and cultural contexts.
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Notes

Places Names in Bohemia/Czech Republic

During the nineteenth century, towns, villages and rivers in the Bohemian region had both Czech and German names. Official documents issued in that period often only mention the German names. Today, after the expulsion of the German inhabitants of Bohemia after World War Two, only the Czech names are used. I will give the place names in both languages at first mention in the text; however, for reasons of readability and consistency, I will use the current Czech place name in the remainder of the text. The following is a list of geographical names in both Czech and German used throughout this thesis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Czech</th>
<th>German</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Čechy</td>
<td>Böhmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chotěšov</td>
<td>Chotieschau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kladruby</td>
<td>Kladrau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krtín</td>
<td>Guratin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litice</td>
<td>Littitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miřovice</td>
<td>Mirschowitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantov</td>
<td>Mantau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariánské Lázně</td>
<td>Marienbad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plzeň</td>
<td>Pilsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praha</td>
<td>Prag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stod</td>
<td>Staab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teplá</td>
<td>Tepl, also Tepel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Týnce</td>
<td>Teinitzl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ves Touškov</td>
<td>Tuschkau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Usage of Macrons in Te Reo Māori

Throughout this text, I have applied macrons to indicate long vowels in the Māori language, with the exception of personal names and direct quotations from documents, which during the nineteenth century were written without the use of macrons.

Direct Quotations

In direct quotations, spelling variations and mistakes are kept, especially in Krippner’s letters written in English.
1 Introduction

1.1 Motives and Objectives for Writing this Thesis

In June 1863, Martin Krippner, a former captain of the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army, led a group of 82 German speaking immigrants from Bohemia (today part of Czech Republic) to the mouth of the Puhoi River, about 40 kilometres north of Auckland. Here, the local rangatira, Te Hemara Tauhia, and members of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo hapū of the Ngāti Whātua iwi, awaited the Bohemian settlers and carried them in their waka (canoes) up the river to a clearing in the bush. Two nikau whare (palm huts) offered a first shelter for their new Pākehā neighbours. This was the beginning of the township of Puhoi. Every year, descendants of the Bohemian settlers still celebrate the arrival of their ancestors in New Zealand, and they have kept musical traditions, costumes and stories about their ancestors’ migration to the other side of the world alive.

Map 1 Puhoi in Aotearoa New Zealand
In 2013 I was invited by the Puhoi community to attend the 150th anniversary of the landing of the first Bohemian settlers at the Puhoi River. The descendants of the Bohemians staged a re-enactment of the landing, which was followed by a pōwhiri or ceremonial welcome led by two kaumātua (elders) of Ngāti Whātua, Herewaka Nick Rata and Richard Nahi.

![Image](image.jpg)

**Figure 1** Re-enactment of the arrival of Bohemian settlers at Puhoi

The festivities also involved speeches in which the Bohemian descendants, among them Treaty of Waitangi expert, Dame Claudia Orange, honoured Te Hemara Tauhia as a supporter and friend of the Bohemians. He and his hapū had saved the Bohemian settlers from starvation in their first struggling years in Puhoi, especially during the Waikato Land Wars, when many of the Bohemian men were serving in the Waikato Militia. But Martin Krippner, the initiator of the Puhoi-Bohemian settlement under the Auckland Provincial Government land grant scheme, was hardly mentioned by the speakers. It seemed as if the Puhoi community has never forgiven Krippner for promising a ‘land of milk and honey’ while leading his Bohemian compatriots to near starvation and struggle within

---

1 Photograph by Anne Eddy, featuring the late Herewaka Nick Rata and the late Gregory Wenzlick.
dense New Zealand bush, and into war in the Waikato where Krippner was commissioned Captain of the Third Company of the Third Waikato Regiment.

After the official part of the commemoration ceremonies, the two Ngāti Whātua kaumātua, Rata and Nahi, took me on a tour across the lands that used to belong to Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo. Today, most of the land is privately owned by Pākehā. Te Hemara Tauhia’s kāinga (settlement) at the Puhoi river mouth constitutes the Te Muri and Wenderholm Regional Parks. Nothing there serves as a reminder of the former rangatira who had led his hapū to re-occupy ancestral lands after living in captivity with Ngāpuhi from 1825 to about 1840. Rata and Nahi told me that if it were not for the Bohemians and their descendants being grateful for Te Hemara Tauhia’s help, most of the descendants of his hapū could not care less whether Tauhia was remembered or not: Tauhia is supposed to have sold almost all of the hapū’s land to the Crown and incoming Pākehā; some claim that he kept all the proceeds for himself.³

This thesis seeks to re-construct the biographies of these two fascinating and controversial contemporaries, Te Hemara Tauhia (1815–1891) and Martin Krippner (1817–1894). One of the main aims of this research is to look behind the myths that have been created around Tauhia and Krippner, and to thoroughly examine what factors led to their decisions and to the choices open to them and to their communities at that particular time. The second purpose of this study is to employ the life narratives of Tauhia and Krippner as an illuminating ‘prismatic tool’ looking at an historical period from both Tangata Whenua (indigenous) and European settler (Pākehā) perspectives. Both men were minor players in the history of Aotearoa New Zealand, being known locally rather than nationally. Martin Krippner was considered historically significant enough to have a separate entry in the Dictionary of New Zealand Biography, whereas Te Hemara Tauhia is only mentioned in passing.⁴ However, placing Tauhia’s and Krippner’s biographies side-by-side provides a novel view of a range of historical phenomena

---

³ Conversational interviews with Herewaka Nick Rata and Richard Nahi, 29 June 2013.
in both nineteenth-century Aotearoa New Zealand as well as in territories belonging at that time to the Habsburg Empire and the German Confederation.

The thesis also illustrates cross-cultural encounters from the novel perspective of Pākehā who were not British. It reveals the (sometimes surprising) inter-relationships between spatially, politically and culturally distant places, linking Musket-War-torn Aotearoa, post-Napoleonic Austria, the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, the suppression of Europe’s 1848 revolutions, Austria’s wars against Italy and Prussia and the 1860s Land Wars in the Waikato. This cross-cultural dual biography contributes to a recent historiographical emphasis on writing ‘de-centred histories’, which, according to historian Natalie Zemon Davies, includes recapturing the voices and visions of relatively obscure people and narrating ‘local stories and cultural crossings within a global world.’ The thesis likewise follows Peter Gibbons’ call for researching and conceiving history in Aotearoa New Zealand from a ‘world history perspective’.

The major third aim of this research encompasses my intention to contribute to and to participate in a dialogue between ethnic groups in Aotearoa New Zealand, especially between Māori and Pākehā, in order to challenge stereotypes and generalisations based on lack of information and understanding of historical and cultural contexts. Such a purpose or function in writing cross-cultural biographies can be summarized with Richard Holmes’ argument that biography ‘might teach us simply to understand other people better, and hence, through “the other”, ourselves.’

1.2 Previously Published Biographical Accounts of Te Hemara Tauhia and Martin Krippner

The first history of Puhoi was published in 1923, compiled by an Irish Roman Catholic priest, Father Daniel Vincent Silk, who had arrived in Puhoi a year

---

before his book’s publication.\(^8\) His work *A History of Puhoi: An Historical Narrative of the People of Puhoi. Dedicated to the Pioneers Living and Dead* includes valuable first-hand accounts by early Bohemian settlers. However, Silk’s chapters about the history of the German-speaking peoples of Bohemia are based on folklore as told by the Puhoi settlers, not on empirical evidence, so the work is more valuable as a primary source rather than as a serious interpretive account of Bohemia’s history.

The second chapter in Silk’s book provides a brief biography of Martin Krippner, for which Silk was criticised for its many inaccuracies in an open letter to the press in 1923 by Krippner’s daughter, Mary Pulham.\(^9\) Pulham, who lived only a few miles away from Puhoi, obviously had not been interviewed by Silk during his research. Silk listed all the good deeds Krippner had done for the Puhoi community, for example, as an interpreter, post- and schoolmaster, and as organiser of the charcoal burning, fungus collecting, and road building enterprises, which provided the community with much needed income. At the same time, Silk criticises Krippner’s generosity:

> He erred on the side of generosity which proved his besetting fault all through his life. He could never afford to be generous as we shall see later; yet, he gave and continued to give until his death, but, unfortunately, what he gave was not his to give.\(^10\)

Silk also blamed Krippner for choosing unfertile land for the Bohemian settlement in New Zealand; Silk implied that Krippner accepted payment from the New Zealand government for recruiting Bohemian immigrants, and he emphasised Krippner’s staying ‘away from the path of righteousness’: Martin Krippner, a Catholic, had married a non-Catholic English woman, his children were brought up in the Anglican faith, and he is buried at the Warkworth Anglican Church Cemetery.\(^11\)

---


\(^10\) Silk, p. 12.

\(^11\) Silk, pp. 12, 38.
Ten years after the publication of Silk’s book, Ruth Schmidt conducted interviews with the last remaining original Puhoi pioneers – among them Krippner’s daughter, Mary Pulham – for her University of New Zealand master’s thesis *The Settlement of Puhoi: An Incident in the Overseas Expansion of Central Europe.* Schmidt’s study provides a much more evidence-based overview of the socio-economic and ethnic background of the Puhoi Bohemian settlers than Silk’s account. She also identified the main reason for the resentment Father Silk and likely many Puhoi residents felt towards the founder of their settlement: Martin Krippner became a Freemason, for which he was probably excommunicated by the Catholic Church. The Puhoi settlers, for whom the Catholic faith was paramount for the community’s survival, might have regarded Krippner’s Freemason membership as betrayal.

Because Schmidt’s findings were not disseminated until the Puhoi Historical Society edited and published her thesis in 2007, Silk’s book became the key source for all subsequent publications about Puhoi and its Bohemian settlers. Thus, Silk’s portrait of Krippner was continuously reproduced, and it must have influenced currently accepted and shared views of Martin Krippner. The history of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo, the Tangata Whenua of the Puhoi region, was ignored by Silk and discussed in a limited and flawed manner by Schmidt. However, both authors mentioned the gratitude the Bohemian settlers felt towards Te Hemara Tauhia and his hapū for helping them during their first years in Puhoi.

---

13 Schmidt, p. 45.
14 *The Official Puhoi 150th Celebrations Collection* (Puhoi: 150th Planning Committee, 2013), p. 16; Warkworth, Rodney Lodge No 1711, Register of Rodney Lodge No 1711, Roll of Members 3 May 1877 to present.
16 Silk, p. 26; Schmidt, p. 17.
A comprehensive historical overview of the Mahurangi-Puhoi region that includes both Māori and Pākehā history is presented in Ronald Locker’s *Jade River: A History of the Mahurangi* published in 2001.\(^{17}\) Locker also includes a detailed biographical account of ‘The Last Chief of Mahurangi’, as he calls Te Hemara Tauhia.\(^{18}\) Locker examines correspondence between Tauhia and New Zealand Government officials, Native Land Court records, nineteenth-century newspaper articles, as well as published and unpublished reminiscences of Māori and Pākehā residents living in the Mahurangi–Puhoi region. However, Locker does not always identify his sources, and many of his statements, for example, that Tauhia signed the Treaty of Waitangi, are incorrect.\(^{19}\) Based on stories about Te Hemara Tauhia being a regular patron at Pākehā pubs, Locker concludes that Tauhia sold his hapū’s land in order to buy ‘more waipiro’ (alcohol).\(^{20}\)

The theme of Te Hemara Tauhia selling his hapū’s land to cover personal expenses was adopted by the historian and current Minister of Tertiary Education, Skills and Employment, Paul Goldsmith, in his book *The Rise and Fall of Te Hemara Tauhia* published in 2003.\(^{21}\) Goldsmith begins his book with an invented dialogue, presenting Tauhia as a ‘harmless, old fool’, ‘a penniless, old drunk’ who has no children and has lost all his land and friends.\(^{22}\) Goldsmith provides a more detailed history of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo than Locker did, by drawing on Barry Rigby’s *The Crown, Maori, and Mahurangi: 1840–1881: A Historical Report Commissioned by the Waitangi Tribunal*, R C J Stone’s regional history *From Tamaki-Makau-Rau to Auckland* (2001), and by referring to Te Hemara Tauhia’s accounts at Native Land Court hearings.\(^{23}\) However, the book contains many inaccuracies, for example, in regards to Ngāti Rongo’s whakapapa

\(^{17}\) Locker.

\(^{18}\) ‘The Last Chief of the Mahurangi and his Tribe’ is the heading of the biographical chapter about Te Hemara Tauhia, see Locker, pp. 77-96.

\(^{19}\) Locker, p. 78.

\(^{20}\) Locker, p. 87.


\(^{22}\) Goldsmith, *The Rise and Fall of Te Hemara Tauhia*, p. 9.

(genealogy) and Krippner’s service in the Colonial Forces, and its narrative is written in demeaning language and with an unacknowledged bias.24

The Rise and Fall of Te Hemara Tauhia was commissioned by Alan Gibbs, a well-known businessman and current owner of the property on which Te Hemara Tauhia’s grave is located.25 In the introduction to his book, Goldsmith acknowledges the ‘valuable comments’ of Jay Goodenbour, Carter Holt Harvey Chief Operating Officer from 1996 to 2001, and Michael Bassett, historian and member of the Waitangi Tribunal panel that heard the claims of Ngāti Rongo and other hapū of Ngāti Whātua o Kaipara.26 Three years after the book’s publication, Bassett incorporated Goldsmith’s argument that local hapū lost their lands because of Te Hemara Tauhia’s personal greed in the ‘Minority Opinion’ attached to the Kaipara Report of the Waitangi Tribunal.27 Richard Boast, legal historian, also quotes Goldsmith’s findings in his study of Crown Māori land policy, Buying the Land, Selling the Land: Governments and Maori Land in the North Island 1865–1921 (2008), using Te Hemara Tauhia as an example of a rangatira who manipulated the Native Land Court processes and ‘sold the land recklessly and simply squandered the money.’28

Three weeks before the Puhoi 150th anniversary celebrations, the two Ngāti Whātua kaumātua, Herewaka Nick Rata and Richard Nahi, witnessed the final reading of the Ngāti Whātua o Kaipara Claims Settlement Bill in Parliament in Wellington. With the passing of the Bill on 6 June 2013, the Crown acknowledged and apologised for breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi that led to the virtual landlessness of Ngāti Whātua o Kaipara; the Bill also included cultural,

24 Herewaka Nick Rata and Richard Nahi pointed out Goldsmith’s errors during a conversational interview on 29 June 2013; Goldsmith, The Rise and Fall of Te Hemara Tauhia, pp. 50, 100-01.
26 Goldsmith, The Rise and Fall of Te Hemara Tauhia, p. 11; Waitangi Tribunal, The Kaipara Report (Wellington: Legislation Direct, 2006), p. 365; in 1991 the NZ government sold the license for tree felling at Woodhill Forest (former Ngāti Whātua land) to Carter Holt Harvey; however, Woodhill Forest was returned to Ngāti Whātua o Kaipara as part of the financial and commercial redress according to the Ngāti Whātua o Kaipara Claims Settlement Bill of 2013, see Margaret Kawharu, Woodhill: Twice a Remedy, Ngā Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara, updated 2014, <http://www.woodhillforest.co.nz/twice-a-remedy/> [accessed 18 September 2016].
Despite the redress being only a token gesture, the people of Ngāti Whātua o Kaipara regard this settlement of historical Treaty of Waitangi claims as a basis for future co-operation and partnership with the Crown. However, as it became apparent in conversational interviews with Rata, Nahi and other members of Ngāti Whātua o Kaipara, resentments prevail towards some of their tūpuna (ancestors) – among them Te Hemara Tauhia – whose actions during the nineteenth-century they perceive as contributing to the loss of tribal land. To what extent the works of Goldsmith, Bassett and Boast have influenced the currently shared view of Te Hemara Tauhia as a selfish rangatira, an image that contradicts the opinion held by the Bohemian settlers and their descendants, is difficult to ascertain. It is one of the objectives of this thesis to examine whether Te Hemara Tauhia and Martin Krippner acted as portrayed by Silk, Locker and Goldsmith, or whether the authors’ own interests and aims led to distorted biographical accounts of the two protagonists.

1.3 Cross-Cultural Dual Biography as History

Biography, the presentation of past life, crosses boundaries between the genres of literature, history and science. Such an ‘interdisciplinary endeavour’, as the historian Valerie Raleigh Yow describes biographical study in *Recording Oral History* (2015), causes an ongoing debate about the relationship between the genre of life writing and the discipline of history. During the last two decades, biography has become more and more accepted as a valuable form of history. What led to the recent ‘biographical turn’, or re-turn, in the area of historical research is discussed, for example, in Barbara Caine’s *Biography and History* (2010) and in the special issue of the Journal of Interdisciplinary History,

---

32 A noticeable ‘biographical turn’ in the humanities and social sciences is discussed, for example, in Simone Laessig, ‘Toward a Biographical Turn? Biography in Modern Historiography – Modern Historiography in Biography’, *GHI Bulletin*, 35 (Fall 2004), 147-55.
Biography and History: Inextricably Interwoven (2010). While examining the role that biography plays in historiography, both these publications provide a comprehensive analysis of approaches and methodologies of contemporary life writing; both these works thereby are valuable sources for defining the theoretical and methodological framework of this thesis.

Caine observes that a number of historians question the suitability of biography as history because of biography’s focus on the life of an individual as a higher priority over wider historical processes. In his essay Medieval Biography, Michael Prestwich investigates sceptical views on biography as history, those which hold perspectives that ‘history is about much more than the lives of individuals. It is about the study of political, social, economic, and intellectual movements that are much more than the sum of those involved in them.’ A concern with the private relationships of a subject, an analysis of his or her formative years, and the chronological limits of the individual’s life would not be able to yield answers to broad and probing questions pertaining to multi-faceted social, economic and political developments. So goes the argument against biography. However, over the last three or four decades, scholarship in the social sciences has moved away from structuralist approaches, which focused on the impact and inter-dependency of environmental, demographic, economic and political structures on social groups; thus, the relationship between the individual and society, neglected for a generation, regained prominence in social analysis.

Bernhard Fetz, editor of a collection of essays reflecting on theories of biography, refers to the American-German literary theorist Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht and the French historian Jacques Le Goff as both observing a return of the ‘written off’ subject and a ‘phenomenal rebirth’ of the genre biography.

34 Caine, p. 19.
36 Prestwich, p. 326.
Stefan Zahlmann, a presenter at the German Historical Institute conference in Washington in 2004, together with Susan Ware and Lucy Riall, contributors to Biography and History: Inextricably Interwoven, and Caine, author of Biography and History, cited above, all concur that with the rise of ‘new histories’ in the 1970s, including woman’s history and post-colonial history, heralded a new approach to biography with a focus on re-constructing lives of lesser known individuals belonging to social groups who had no voice in the traditions of earlier historiographies.\textsuperscript{39} Such biographies of obscure individuals, in turn, ‘reveal facets of that world which are not available in other ways.’\textsuperscript{40}

Ware claims that ‘one of the most important contributions of women’s history to the craft of biography has been its emphasis on how personal lives intersect with public accomplishments.’\textsuperscript{41} Biography’s new focus on lesser known subjects, the recognition that the personal is political, and a shift in emphasis to the dialectical relationship between the individual and society, has led to an increasingly acceptance of biography as a ‘prism of history’, a phrase used by the historian Barbara Tuchmann to emphasise the analytical potential of biography. According to Tuchmann, biography ‘encompasses the universal in the particular. It is a focus that allows the writer to narrow his [sic] field to manageable dimensions, and the reader to more easily comprehend the subject.’\textsuperscript{42}

Although sceptical of biography’s help in understanding long-term processes of historical transformation, Ian Kershaw, a biographer of Hitler, suggests that a ‘biographical perspective should be used as a window to examine more complex problems in a very specific and unique way, rather than in the classical sense of writing about the lives of prominent individuals.’\textsuperscript{43} To illustrate the interdependence between the individual’s agency and the societal context of opportunity and constraint, both Caine and Kershaw quote Karl Marx’s famous

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{40} Caine, pp. 2-3.
\textsuperscript{41} Ware, p. 428.
\textsuperscript{43} Cited in Laessig, p. 148.
\end{flushright}
remark about the individual’s choice and history: ‘Men make their own history, but they do not make it as they please. They do not make it under self-selected circumstances, but under circumstances existing already, given and transmitted from the past.’

Based on an understanding of biography as a ‘prism of history’, or as a tool that ‘illuminates a life as a point of entry that then connects to larger social and economic processes’, this study re-constructs and investigates the lives of Te Hemara Tauhia and Martin Krippner within the wider context of nineteenth-century Aotearoa New Zealand and Habsburg Austria. This thesis aims to show how these two individuals respectively experienced and negotiated legal and social institutions and large-scale social, economic and political developments. Thus, this dual biography combines microscopic case studies, similar to the genre of microhistory, with a macrohistorical focus. In a similar way, the sociologist Paul Spoonley identifies the objective of his biography of Ranginui Walker: ‘While this is the story of one person, it is equally the story of Māori – or at least a particular generation – and of a nation and a country.’


---


If a biography of one individual has the capacity to shed light on an epoch, a dual, cross-cultural biography of two individuals, who live in the same historical period but come from different ethnic backgrounds, must surely have the potential to illuminate an even broader social and political context for that period. Jeffrey Paparoa Holman’s dual, cross-cultural biography *Best of Both Worlds: The Story of Elsdon Best and Tutakangahau* (2010) reconstructs the relationship between the Pākehā ethnographer and the Tūhoe Rangatira of Maungapōhatu. Holman classifies it as a ‘Māori-Pākehā story where you cannot truly have one side without the other, as it remains to this day.’

The advantages and pitfalls of dual and collective biographies were discussed at the conference of the German Historical Institute in Washington in 2004 by Roger Chickering and Peter Longerich, and are also addressed by Stanley Wolpert in *Biography and History: Inextricably Interwoven*. It is an advantage, claims Wolpert, that biographers who re-construct the lives of more than one individual are less tempted to ‘exaggerate the importance or virtues of a single person’, and thus avoid hagiography or the risk of growing too attached to their subjects. Longerich expresses ethical concerns as to ‘whether it is appropriate to connect biographies of perpetrators [of crimes] directly with biographies of victims’ – concerns that have parallels that need also to be addressed in a dual biography of a colonizer and an indigenous leader. Chickering sees a contradiction in the terms ‘dual’ or ‘collective’, and ‘biography’; he points to the risk that the richness and complexity of the individual life would become obscured in a dual or collective biography. This refers to the problem in dual biography that the two subjects might be portrayed as ‘representatives’, as ‘typical’ for a whole group. Such a generalisation is not intended in my study.

While Te Hemara Tauhi’a’s and Martin Krippner’s life narratives each provide a lens to look at historical phenomena from a Māori and a Pākehā perspective, the
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50 Wolpert, *Tilak and Gokhale*, p. xii.
unique and exceptional nature of their lives is not overlooked. They are not portrayed as ‘typical Māori’ or ‘typical Austrian-Bohemian’. In his book, *A Living Man from Africa: Jan Tzatzoe, Xhosa Chief and Missionary, and the Making of Nineteenth-Century South Africa*, Roger Levine identifies the underlying tension between the exceptional and representative nature of subjects in biographical treatments in general. While he wishes to portray the fascinating and extraordinary life of the Xhosa chief Jan Tzatzoe, Levine states that his subject ‘also points towards other African intermediaries and leaders who faced similar dilemmas of resistance and assimilation, of incorporating new religious and political structures, of mediating between competing powers.’ Indeed, while reading Levine’s impressive narrative of Jan Tzatzoe’s life, set in the South African and worldwide context of the nineteenth century, I was constantly reminded of parallels in the life of Wiremu Tamihana, the Māori ‘King maker’ and peace negotiator. Thus, Levine’s biography of Jan Tzatzoe, as well as Evelyn Stoke’s *Wiremu Tamihana: Rangatira* (2002), each provide helpful insights for the task of re-constructing the life of the rangatira Te Hemara Tauhia, who similarly acted as an intermediary and culture broker in the Mahurangi-Puhoi region.

### 1.4 Theoretical Perspectives and Methodological Overview

The concept of ‘biography as prism of history’ is based on an understanding of the interdependent relationship between the individual and society as discussed, for example, by Karl Marx, George Simmel and Jean-Paul Sartre. The individual’s social actions cannot be analysed in themselves; they need to be considered in the context of actions of other individuals and within the structures of society. Lewis Coser summarises Simmel’s dialectical approach: ‘The individual is determined at

---

54 Levine, p. 2.
the same time as he is determining. He is acted upon at the same time as he is self-actuating. Sartre calls the individual a ‘universal singular’, and in order to study the individual’s life it requires a method that examines the individual and human history at the same time.

Such mutual interdependence between individual and society is also reflected in Erikson’s concept of identity. The individual forms a sense of self in interaction with other individuals and social groups. ‘The growing child must derive a vitalizing sense of reality from the awareness that his individual way of mastering experience (his ego synthesis) is a successful variant of a group identity and is in accord with its space-time and life plan.’ The lives of individuals must therefore be interpreted within their social, economic, political and geographical context, taking categories such as family, class, gender, ethnicity, religion, race or sexuality into account. Erikson states: ‘Only psychoanalysis and social science together can eventually chart the life cycle interwoven throughout with the history of the community.’ A biography that analyses how an individual experiences and reacts to impacts from her or his environment, in turn, has the capacity to comment back on influencing social, cultural, economic and political structures. According to Erikson, identity development is a life-long process in reaction to changing influences from society. Such a broad concept of identity that acknowledges incoherencies and ruptures in the life of the individual, as well as different cultural influences arising from different societies, is crucial for writing this cross-cultural, dual biography. To reflect such a fluidity of identity, I will follow a ‘strictly chronological method’, as advocated by Mark Kinkead-Weeke and Barbara Tuchmann. Tuchmann suggests:

Events do not happen in categories – economic, intellectual, military – they happen in sequence. When they are arranged in sequence as strictly as

---

57 Coser, p. 184.  
60 Erikson, p. 18.  
possible down to month, week, and even day, cause and effect that may have been previously obscure, will often become clear, like secret ink.\(^62\)

A chronological approach also has the advantage that the reader of the biography can watch ‘the life unfold rather than having its significance anticipated.’\(^63\) However, the main advantage of applying a chronological approach, as Kinkead-Weekes points out, is ‘to resist the urge, so powerful in biographers, to structure a life too early and too simply into some overall pattern and explanation.’\(^64\)

When introducing his own autobiography, Mark Twain stated: ‘Biographies are but the clothes and buttons of the man – the biography of the man himself cannot be written.’\(^65\) It is impossible for the biographer to enter the subject’s mind and to fully understand the true thoughts and motivations of the person who lived in the past. All that biographers can offer is their interpretation of how they have understood the acts and words of the biography’s subject. Interpretation requires empathy and sociological imagination. Drawing on their own life experiences and training, biographers need to imagine what they would feel if living inside their subject’s skin.\(^66\) To avoid anachronism, they also need to imagine, as far as their knowledge and understanding permits, from within the parameters of that ‘other country’ which is the past. But, of course, the biographers’ interpretation is influenced by the social, intellectual, economic and political environment of their own lives. For example, an historian’s interpretation of the social context of nineteenth-century Bohemia is almost certainly influenced by historical events such as the World Wars One and Two and the subsequent expulsion of the German-Bohemians from the Czech Republic. Similarly, the recent signings of Deeds of Settlements between the Crown and Iwi in Aotearoa New Zealand that recognise the moral and utilitarian value of acknowledgement and compensation for breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi reflect liberal viewpoints that became highly influential from the late twentieth century.

In her essay on writing women’s biographies, Ware suggests: ‘Biographers must accept that there is no such thing as a definitive biography and that their subjects

\(^{62}\) Tuchmann, p. 144.  
\(^{63}\) Kinkead-Weekes, p. 251.  
\(^{64}\) Kinkead-Weekes, p. 238.  
will always be open to multiple interpretations.\textsuperscript{67} However, the biographer, like the historian and the ethnographer, must be aware of the danger of distorting life narratives by unconsciously importing biased and anachronistic views and concepts.\textsuperscript{68} Thus, the methods applied to carry out the research for this cross-cultural, dual biography follow a relativistic, self-reflective, holistic and interdisciplinary approach based on an appreciation of the dialectical relationship between individual and society.

Is it ethically justifiable, and am I, as a non-Māori and non-Bohemian, suitable to carry out this cross-cultural research on Te Hemara Tauhia’s and Martin Krippner’s biographies? Both Tauhia and Krippner lived public lives as leaders: respectively, as rangatira of a hapū, and as an officer in two armies. They had an impact on the lives of others, far beyond their family circles, and therefore the public or ‘we, with the biographer as our representative, have the right to make sense of those lives, to their innermost nature’.\textsuperscript{69} Angela Ballara argues that all historical research is cross-cultural, since the culture of the past is different to the culture of the present.\textsuperscript{70} Likewise, as argued by Linda Tuhiwai Smith, to be able to carry out cross-cultural research, the scholar needs to be equipped with adequate linguistic knowledge, and also have an understanding of non-verbal communications and social interactions relevant to the particular human groups that belong to a particular historical era.\textsuperscript{71} My past studies in Sociology, Psychology, New Zealand History and Cultural Anthropology, my knowledge of German, English, and Māori language and tikanga, and my experience of over fifteen years working as a linguistic mediator in New Zealand’s courts and hospitals have equipped me with the necessary skills and cultural sensitivities. The formal ethical approval for this research was granted by the Human Research Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences on 20 May 2013.\textsuperscript{72}

\textsuperscript{67} Ware, p. 434; see also Justin Kaplan, ‘The Naked Self and Other Problems’, in Telling Lives: The Biographer’s Art, ed. by Marc Pachter (Washington: New Republic Books, 1979), pp. 36-55.
\textsuperscript{68} West, p. 7.
\textsuperscript{72} See Appendix II of this thesis.
1.5 Primary Sources: A Description and Analysis of the Method

If the biography centres on the lives of less-known, obscure individuals, the biographer is often faced with the problem of too little self-revealing evidence. Therefore, the biographer needs to seek and investigate less direct evidence, for example, narratives of contemporaries and family members of the subjects, reminiscences by persons who did not know the biography’s subject personally, newspaper articles, official correspondences, and court or military records regarding the subject. In her work *The Return of Martin Guerre*, Natalie Zemon Davis has demonstrated a method of re-constructing a life narrative based on context and imagination:

> When I could not find my individual man or woman (...) then I did my best through other sources from the period and place to discover the world they would have seen and the reactions they might have had. What I offer you here is in part my invention, but held tightly in check by the voices of the past.73

If intimate, self-revealing materials are scant or unavailable, then referring to literary sources such as plays, song lyrics, poems or stories can shed light on popular perceptions, values and opinions current at that particular time, which might have influenced and inspired the subject, or reflected their feelings, values and emotions. Literary sources, as Zemon Davis claims, can ‘show us what sentiments and reactions authors considered plausible for a given period.’74

No personal, self-revealing documents by Te Hemara Tauhia and Martin Krippner have survived. However, Tauhia’s interpreted and transcribed voice can be heard in the records of the Native Land Courts and in official reports of public meetings such as the Kohimarama Conference (1860) and Orakei Parliament (1879). These rich sources need to be analysed while taking the purpose of the Native Land Court hearings and the distortions arising through the process of interpreting into account. I re-visited and re-examined primary sources that Locker and Goldsmith...

74 Zemon Davis, *The Return of Martin Guerre*, p. 1; Caine, p. 11.
refer to, and I located previously ignored primary and archival sources; all of these suggest fresh insights and support deeper understanding of Te Hemara Tauhia’s actions.

The Stuart family archive of personal documents and writings by descendants of Martin Krippner holds, for example, copies of birth, marriage and death certificates of family members going back to the seventeenth century. Among the documents are also copies of Krippner’s letters of application for the position of German Immigration Agent for the New Zealand government, written between 1871 and 1873, and unpublished reminiscences by Martin Krippner’s son, who, at the age of seventeen, left New Zealand to live and work in Germany. Extensive research in New Zealand, German, Czech and Austrian archives, and careful scrutiny of the databases of digitalised nineteenth-century newspapers revealed a wealth of information that enabled me to trace Martin Krippner’s path of life, and to re-construct the social, economic and political context of his and the Puhoi-Bohemian’s migration and settlement in New Zealand.

I have also conducted conversational interviews with descendants of the protagonists’ families and contemporaries in order to find out what is remembered today about Te Hemara Tauhia or Martin Krippner. Such informal conversations, which Jack D. Douglas and Norman Denzin call ‘creative interviewing’, give both interviewee and interviewer an opportunity to share information and respond to questions arising from both interview partners during the interview.75 This process of information sharing links to one of the main objectives of my research: an attempt to look at a particular historical period from both Māori and Pākehā points of view in order to create bridges over the rifts and chasms arising from lack of information and understanding of particular historical and cultural contexts.

1.6 Secondary Sources: An Overview

General histories of New Zealand and histories focusing on Māori and Pākehā encounters, for example, Anne Salmond’s *Two Worlds: First Meetings between*


For detailed information about the history of Ngāti Whātua I refer to Paora Tuhaere’s An Historical Narrative Concerning the Conquest of Kaipara and Tamaki by Ngati Whatua (1923), Barry Rigby’s The Crown, Maori, and Mahurangi: 1840 - 1881: A Historical Report Commissioned by the Waitangi Tribunal (1998), The Kaipara Report (2006) published by the Waitangi Tribunal, and Margaret Kawharu’s Pre-European History: Ngati Whatua (2015).77 Angela Ballara’s Iwi: The Dynamics of Māori Tribal Organisation from c. 1769 to c. 1945 (1998) and Taua: 'Musket Wars', 'Land Wars' or Tikanga? Warfare in Māori Society in the Early Nineteenth Century (2003) as well as Ormund Wilson’s Kororāreka & Other Essays (1990) are among the works that inform other aspects of Iwi histories in the North Island. In addition, the Ministry for Culture and Heritage’s publication, Māori Peoples of New Zealand: Ngā Iwi o Aotearoa, a comprehensive overview of the Tangata Whenua of Aotearoa, and available both in print and on-line, provides a rich source for researching Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo’s history.78


Detailed accounts of New Zealand’s society in the mid-nineteenth century as provided in Paul Moon’s *The Edges of Empires* (2009) and Vincent O’Malley’s *Beyond the Imperial Frontier: The Contest for Colonial New Zealand* (2014), serve as macrohistorical framework for analysing Tauhia’s decisions and actions in this particular period.79 James Belich’s *The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict* (1986), and Ross Hamilton’s unpublished Master’s thesis *Military Vision and Economic Reality: The Failure of the Military Settlement Scheme in the Waikato 1863-1880* (1968), offer a basis for my analysis of Krippner’s involvement in the Waikato Land Wars.80

As part of my analysis of the social, economic and political context, I also draw on a range of cross-cultural historical accounts of experiences of non-British Pākehā settlers in nineteenth century Aotearoa New Zealand: for example, Senka Božić-Vrbančić’s *Tarara – Croats and Maori in New Zealand: Memory, Belonging, Identity* (2008), and some essays in *The German Connection: New Zealand and German-Speaking Europe in the Nineteenth Century* (1993).81 Based on my understanding of biography as ‘prism of history’, I also make extensive use of existing biographies of Māori and Pākehā individuals of the nineteenth and twentieth century as a valuable source for reconstructing and understanding the temporal and spatial context of this study.82 Biographies of missionaries who Te
Hemara Tauhia encountered in his early life, offer insights for the situation in which Te Hemara Tauhia formed his Christian belief. Therefore, this study investigates biographies like Quinn’s *Samuel Marsden: Altar Ego* (2008), Ryburn’s *Te Hemara: James Hamlin 1803-1865: Friend of the Maori* (1979), as well as James Hamlin’s *Diary of James Hamlin: dated April 13, 1830.*

The literature about the history of the Habsburg Empire and the Bohemian provinces is vast and rapidly growing. This brief overview can give only an indication of what broad areas of Austrian and Bohemian historiography were consulted in the course of my research. This thesis draws on general historical overviews like Carlile A. Macartney’s *The Habsburg Empire, 1790-1918* (1968), and *Bohemia in History* (1998), edited by Mikulas Teich. Works such as Istvan Deak’s *Beyond Nationalism: A Social and Political History of the Habsburg Officer Corps, 1848-1918* (1990) inform my understanding of Krippner’s unusual career within the Austrian Imperial Army, in which he, the son of a village blacksmith, rose to the rank of Captain without ever going into battle. This thesis also draws on findings of Stefan Dumont’s unpublished Master’s thesis *Soldaten und Mainzerinnen in der Festung Mainz 1816-1866* (2010), which examines aspects of life at the Fortress of the German Confederation in Mainz where Martin Krippner was stationed from 1842 until he migrated to New Zealand in 1859.

---


1.7 Structure of the Thesis

Out of the puzzle of diverse pieces of acquired information I construct two parallel narratives, which correlate with periods of both men’s lives corresponding approximately with decades. I follow a strictly chronological method in line with the theories of Kinkead-Weekes and Tuchmann, a most suitable approach, I also argue, for showing the interruptions, contradictions, fluidity and complexity of Tauhia’s and Krippner’s lives.87 The two parallel and separate narratives are intercepted by concluding and introductory paragraphs at the end and beginning of each chapter, providing overviews and summaries of important themes and findings.

Chapter 2 includes Tauhia’s and Krippner’s origins and childhoods, investigating the family relationships and the regional natural and social environment that Tauhia, son of rangatira lineage, and Krippner, son of a peasant blacksmith, each were born into. The chapter covers the time period from when Tauhia’s and Krippner’s first mentioned ancestors lived, through to when each boy had to leave his familiar environments, at the age of about nine or ten (i.e. 1600s to 1826). The two life-narratives unfold front-stage to the backdrop of the Kaipara – Mahurangi region in Aotearoa New Zealand and to the Kingdom of Bohemia, then part of the Austrian Empire. Particular emphasis is placed on what caused Tauhia and his hapū to live as prisoners of war in the Bay of Islands, and how the system of serfdom affected Krippner’s family in multi-ethnic Bohemia.

Chapter 3 investigates Tauhia’s and Krippner’s formative years from 1826 to 1840. Both of them received unexpected educations: Tauhia among Ngāpuhi military leaders and Pākehā missionaries; Krippner among Premonstratensian monks and at the Faculty of Law at Prague University. The chapter focuses on these protagonists’ interactions across social and cultural boundaries and their exposure to thinking and behaviour that was challenging current norms and the officially accepted rules of the time.

Chapter 4 reconstructs Tauhia’s and Krippner’s experiences during the 1840s. The chapter examines how key political events, such as the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 and the European revolutions of 1848, affected the young men’s lives. What enabled Tauhia and his hapū to return to ancestral lands at the Puhoi River? Why did he adopt the Christian faith and what were his motives for collaborating with representatives of the British Crown? Krippner, after serving in the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army as quartermaster sergeant for six years, was promoted to second lieutenant during the 1848 Revolution. Did this promotion change his life significantly?

Chapter 5 covers Tauhia’s and Krippner’s decisions and actions during the 1850s. Tauhia’s life-narrative shows how the prospect of infrastructural development and economic growth in New Zealand through European settlement, as promised by Crown officials and missionaries, encouraged Tauhia and his hapū to alienate parts of their land. Krippner’s narrative investigates what caused Krippner and a first group from his Bohemian home village to migrate to New Zealand, which in the mid-nineteenth century was an unusual destination for German-speaking emigrants. This chapter also seeks to investigate how Krippner managed to leave the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army during the time of the Austro-Sardinian War in 1859.

Chapter 6 introduces structural changes from two parallel accounts to a more tightly interwoven narrative in a context where Tauhia’s and Krippner’s lives are affected by the same or similar events and local responses in the North Island of New Zealand during the 1860s. Questions asked in this chapter are, for example: what made the establishment of a German-Bohemian settlement in New Zealand possible, and who influenced the choice of the settlement’s location at the upper Puhoi River on land that Tauhia and his hapū had sold to the Crown? Similarly, after setting up his farm near Puhoi River, what made Krippner accept a commission as a captain in the Waikato Militia in 1863, and how did Tauhia respond to the outbreak of the Taranaki War in 1860 and the Waikato Land Wars in 1863?

Chapters 7 and 8 follow the structure of two parallel narratives, indicating the divergent paths followed by Tauhia and Krippner as they developed as leaders of their respective communities during the 1870s and 1880s, until their deaths in 1891 and 1894. Tauhia’s narrative sheds light on his involvement in the pan-tribal
movement Kotahitanga, which sought to establish a Māori parliament operating alongside Pākehā government. As a supporter of the Kotahitanga movement, Tauhia took a stand against further land sales; but why then did he continue to sell tribal lands, including the burial grounds of his ancestors? Krippner’s narrative investigates his application for the role of German emigration agent for New Zealand, and the impact of his wife on the Puhoi-Bohemian community’s responses to Krippner himself. The puzzle of why both Tauhia and Krippner were buried away from their settlements at Puhoi River, and the legacies they left behind, is specifically discussed in chapter 8.

This thesis attempts to reconstruct the life-narratives of the Te Hemara Tauhia and Martin Krippner embedded in the context of nineteenth-century Aotearoa New Zealand and the Austrian Empire. An analysis of the social, economic, cultural, political and ethnic structures in which they lived out their lives helps us to understand both men’s actions. In return, their actions bring light to hitherto unrecognised or otherwise forgotten aspects of the complex process of New Zealand’s colonisation, in which Tauhia and Krippner were both involved as significant agents as well as subjects. This cross-cultural dual biography attempts to give voice to the two ‘figures of legend or contempt’ and thereby turn ‘a legend into history’. 88

2 Foundations – Whakapapa and Childhood

Individuals are born into families living in a specific natural and social environment. Both family and environment impact the development of the individual. Family influences not only come from direct interactions with the living family members, but also from legacies left by ancestors. How far back families trace their ancestry, and what memories are passed on from generation to generation, depends on the importance of such knowledge for present and future generations. The same applies for the influences from the natural and social environment, which has been shaped and transformed over time. Not only present structures and relationships affect the individual’s development but also events of the past which are reflected in customs, songs and dances, architecture, visual arts, and stories of the region. This chapter investigates the family relationships and the regional natural and social environment Te Hemara Tauhia and Martin Krippner each were born into. Since the two men were only two years apart in age, two societies situated almost 18,000 kilometres apart come into focus in almost the same timeframe. The narratives in this chapter cover the time period from when Tauhia’s and Krippner’s first mentioned ancestors lived to when both boys must leave their familiar environments at the age of nine or ten.
2.1 Te Hemara Tauhia: Son of Rangatira Lineage

Te Hemara Tauhia belonged to the Te Kawerau and Ngāti Rongo hapū of the Ngāti Whātua iwi. At the time of his birth in 1815, Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo lived in the area stretching from the South Kaipara harbour to the Mahurangi coast, with various pā (fortresses), kāinga (settlements) and māra (cultivations) at the Kaipara harbour and at the Puhoi river mouth. The land between the two rivers, Puhoi and Waiwerawera, was a favoured location since the beginning of human settlement in Aotearoa New Zealand over thousand years ago. Its many natural resources, especially the shark fishing grounds along the Mahurangi coast and the hot springs at the Waiwerawera river mouth, have always attracted people to land and settle here. Coveted for its economic resources, the region became a site for on-going conflicts between the various groups. It was also important strategically: the two rivers, Puhoi and Waiwerawera, provided access to the hinterland with paths over land to the west coast to the Kaipara Harbour. The hilly terrain was covered with dense rainforest; berries, birds and timber were plentiful. Although the soil was not very fertile, the mild climate allowed for cultivation of fern root, kumara and taro.

---

2 Murdoch, p. 44; Margaret Kawharu, *Pre-European History: Ngati Whatua*.
3 Locker, pp. 21-22.
On the many occasions, when Te Hemara Tauhia appeared as claimant or witness at the Native Land Court, an institution set-up by the New Zealand government in 1865 in order to determine the ownership of Māori land, he traced his whakapapa back seven generations. He showed his direct descent from Maki, the founding ancestor of the Te Kawerau hapū. Such a line of descent substantiated Tauhia’s rangatira status and claim to ancestral lands.

2.1.1  Maki and Ngāwhetu – The Founding Ancestors

There are many histories regarding Maki, also known as Maki-nui, or Maki the Great. He lived in the beginning of the seventeenth century and was a rangatira from Kāwhia, descending from the Tainui and Tokomaru waka. At a Native Land Court hearing in 1880, Tauhia told Maki’s story as he had heard it by his relatives, and he would have presented it in a way to assist his respective claim:

---

See, for example, Native Land Court (NLC), Tungutu Hearing: 25 January 1866, Mahurangi Minute Book 1, pp.7-10.
Ngaiwi and Te Kawerau came from Hawaiki and settled about the Tamaki. Maki was the name of the chief of Ngaiwi. He came first to Tamaki, and afterwards went as far as Taranaki killing the different tribes. While he was at Taranaki, a child of Taihua’s was killed by the Waiohua. He returned to Tamaki. Taihua came to him there and brought some red feathers of the Kaka and told him that this was a sign of the child’s blood. After a year’s delay, he fought with the Waiohua at Otahuhu and defeated them killing Wha[ũ]whau their chief, the man who committed the murder. The Waiohua were destroyed and Maki and his people took possession of their land. Maki then came to live at Kaipara at a place [word illegible].

The histories of the Tainui people, recorded by Pei Te Hurinui Jones and Bruce Biggs, provide a more detailed and slightly different account of Maki’s origins. Maki, the son of Taonga-a-iwi, lived at Kāwhia and stayed sometimes with relatives at Taranaki. In the 1620s, together with his younger brother Mataahu, Maki was leading a group of Ngāti Awa people first to the Waikato district, and after some quarrels with the local people, to Tīrangi near Manurewa. Here, Maki was visited by the Ngāti Awa rangatira, Hauparoa, who had settled in the Kaipara region. He brought toheroa-shellfish and dried flounders, and he asked Maki to assist him fighting against his enemies of the Ngā Oho people at Kaipara. The food sparked Maki’s interest in this campaign, and he told Hauparoa he would consider it. Meanwhile, Maki and his people moved to live with the Wai-o-hua people under Whauwhau in the Manurewa district. While living there, another kinsman, Taihua, appeared and told Maki that his son had been killed at Rarotonga (Mount Smart) in the Tāmaki region. As a sign of proof, he brought with him a carved bowl decorated with feathers containing the murdered son’s heart and guts. To seek revenge for the murder of Taihua’s son, Maki attacked and killed Whauwhau and the Wai-o-hua people and took over their land.

---

7 Jones and Biggs, p. 272; Murdoch, p. 45.  
Later, Maki led expeditions north to assist Hauporoa fighting his enemies in the Kaipara, Waitakere and Mahurangi regions. Maki and his followers settled in the Kaipara region. They married local woman of the Ngā Oho and Ngāti Awa tribes. Maki had three wives. When reciting his whakapapa, Tauhia included links to Manuhiri and Maraeariki, two of Maki’s sons with his second wife Rotu. Maki’s only child with his third wife Paretutanganui was his youngest son Ngāwhetu. Ngāwhetu was to become the founding ancestor of Tauhia’s hapū Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo.

Running short of food, Maki tried to supply his people with kūmara from one of Hauparoa’s storages, which led to fighting between Maki’s and Hauparoa’s people. Maki defeated Hauparoa and conquered the area reaching from Tāmaki to Kaipara on the west coast. After winning renewed battles against the Wai-o-hua, who had sought support from related tribes of the Hauraki region, Maki conquered the area along the east coast north of Takapuna including the islands Tiritiri-matangi and Motu-tapu.

---

9 Kawharu, *Pre-European History: Ngati Whatua*.  
11 Jones and Biggs, p. 274.  
12 Graham, p. 221.
Based on Te Hemara Tauhia’s evidence given at Tungutu Hearing: 25 January 1866, p. 7-10.
Figure 3 Whakapapa showing kinship ties between Te Hemara Tauhia, Pomare I and Pomare II:

Based on Te Hemara Tauhia’s evidence given at NLC, Nokenoke Hearing: 25 January 1866.
Maki’s descendants were called Te Kawerau, the carrier of leaves. Stories differ about the origin of the hapū’s name. Tauhia gives the following account, which relates to the incident of stealing food from Hauparoa’s stores:

He [Maki] asked a person for some kumara, but the person would not give them to him. He then went in the bush and got some nikau, which he carried on his back and hence the name of ‘Te Kawerau’.\(^{15}\)

Other sources state that Te Kawerau was the name of a hapū who had split from the Ngā Oho. After Maki had defeated Te Kawerau, he took three local wives, and their descendants were called Te Kawerau-a-Maki.\(^{16}\)

By 1680, Ngāti Whātua, a confederation of tribes descending from the Mahuhu waka, had migrated south from Hokianga and occupied the region along the north shore of Kaipara Harbour, leading to battles between Te Kawerau and Ngāti Whātua.\(^{17}\) To secure peace between the two groups living in this region, Maki’s youngest son Ngāwhetu married Moerangaranga, the daughter of Rongo, a rangatira of the Ngāti Whātua, who also shared kinship ties with Ngāpuhi.\(^{18}\) After living for a while at the Kaipara harbour entrance, Ngāwhetu and his wife moved to the Puhoi River. Here on the east coast, Ngāti Pāoa, an iwi from the Hauraki region, who later settled in the Tāmaki region, regularly attacked the Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo people.\(^{19}\) An attempt to make peace between Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo and Ngāti Pāoa failed after the break-up of a marriage between the Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo woman Te Ngare and a Ngāti Pāoa rangatira. The story of this unsuccessful strategic marriage was later told by Mereri, a cousin of Te Hemara Tauhia, and it was recorded in writing by George Graham under the title *A Legend of Old Mahurangi*.\(^{20}\) Ngāwhetu and his wife Moerangaranga moved back to the Kaipara Harbour, while some of their children and grandchildren remained in the Puhoi region with kāinga at the Puhoi river mouth and along the Puhoi river valley. Their descendants maintained close ties to

---

\(^{15}\) Hauturu Hearing: 16 - 17 July 1880, p. 388.
\(^{16}\) Stone, *From Taamaki-Makau-Rau to Auckland*, p. 21.
\(^{17}\) Murdoch, p. 46; Kawharu, *Pre-European History: Ngati Whataua*.
\(^{18}\) Rongo is said to be one of the sons of Haumoewarangi, see Hauraki Paora, 'Ngati-Whatua Traditions: No. 1: Nga Korero o Mahanga', *The Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 20.2 (1911), 78-85.
\(^{19}\) Stone, *From Tamaki-Makau-Rau to Auckland*, p. 23.
both tribal groups and identified themselves as Te Kawerau and Ngāti Rongo, respecting the male and female line of descent. Through their ancestor Maki and his followers, kinship ties existed between Ngāti Whātua of the Kaipara region and Waikato tribes of Kāwhia. Based on that bond, hapū of these two iwi would later join together in battles, but also provide refuge and other forms of assistance for each other.

Ngāwhetu’s and Moerangaranga’s first born child, their daughter Tirawaikato, married Ripiro from Ngāti Whātua. Tirawaikato’s and Ripiro’s second born child, their son Whaiti Murupaenga, married Maiao from Ngāti Whātua. Whaiti’s and Maiao’s third born child, their daughter Ahiwera, was Te Hemara Tauhia’s great-grandmother. She married Tuaea from Ngāti Rongo. Ahiwera’s and Tuaea’s first born child was Urungatapu, Te Hemara Tauhia’s grandfather. Urungatapu’s teina, or younger brother, was Murupaenga, who would become known as one of the greatest warriors of his time. Urungatapu married Taipuku from Ngāti Whātua. Their daughter Te Anini was Te Hemara Tauhia’s mother. She married Te Kahotuanui, a direct descendant of Ngāwhetu’s youngest son Korotai. As a descendant from junior lines, he would have had the social status of a tūtū, or commoner. On most occasions, Tauhia recited his mother’s whakapapa; only during one Native Land Court hearing in 1880, he provided information about his father’s line of descent. Five years after Tauhia’s death, a witness stated in a succession hearing held at the Native Land Court, that Te Hemara Tauhia’s parents also belonged to the Te Uri o Hau hapū of Ngāti Whātua.

Pare, the second daughter of Ngāwhetu and Moerangaranga, was married to Te Waha, a Ngāpuhi rangatira. From this union stem kinship ties between Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo and Ngāti Manu of the Ngāpuhi iwi which will form the basis of the close relationship between Te Hemara Tauhia and Pomare II after the Battle Te Ika-a-Ranganui in 1825.

21 Murdoch, p. 46.
22 The following information is based on Te Hemara Tauhia’s whakapapa given by him at Native Land Court hearings, see for example Tungutu Hearing: 25 January 1866, p. 8.
23 Stone, From Tamaki-Makau-Rau to Auckland, p. 75.
26 NLC, Pouto No. 2: Succession Hearing: 22 July 1897, Kaipara Minute Book 6, p. 359.
2.1.2 Murupaenga – The Granduncle

Murupaenga, the teina (younger brother) of Te Hemara Tauhia’s grandfather, was known as one of the most important military leaders of the North Island at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Accounts of Murupaenga’s actions have been passed on and were recorded by Māori and Pākehā historians and lay-ethnologists. Assuming that Tauhia’s grandfather Urungatapu fought alongside his younger brother, and imagining that the two whānau of the brothers lived together as one community, it is possible to reconstruct events that Tauhia had witnessed, and places where Tauhia had lived during his childhood based on histories regarding his tupuna Murupaenga. Therefore, Murupaenga’s actions shall be included in more detail at this point in the narrative.

According to accounts of two battles, fought about 1806 between Pokaia of Ngāti Tautahi, a Ngāpuhi hapū, and Murupaenga and other Ngāti Whātua warriors, the residence of Murupaenga and his hapū was situated near Makarau on the eastern side of the Kaipara Harbour. It would have been here that Tauhia’s mother, Te Anini, grew up and later married Kahutuanui. Due to ongoing conflicts in the border region between groups of Ngāpuhi and Ngāti Whātua, Te Anini’s father, her uncle, and her husband would have been on regular taua or war expeditions.

Because kinship groups from the Waikato region had assisted Ngāti Whātua in their battles against Ngāpuhi, Murupaenga and his followers returned the favour by joining Te Rauangaanga from Kāwhia, the father of Potatau Te Wherowhero, the future first Māori King, in his battle against East Coast tribes. Thus, also around 1806, Tauhia’s tūpuna together with Te Kawau, the leading rangatira of Te Taoū, took part in the battle known as Te Hīnga-Kaka, ‘the fall of the bright plumaged parrots’, at Ngāroto, north of Te Awamutu. Murupaenga’s involvement in battles against many different hapū had created many allies and

---

29 Stephenson Percy Smith, Maori Wars of the Nineteenth Century: The Struggle of the Northern Against the Southern Maori Tribes Prior to the Colonisation of New Zealand in 1840, 2nd and enl. edn (Christchurch: Whitcombe and Tombs Limited, 1910), pp. 27-28; Angela Ballara, Tawa: ‘Musket Wars’, ‘Land Wars’ or Tikanga?, p. 183.
30 Jones and Biggs, p. 352.
31 Jones and Biggs, p. 354.
many enemies for his people. The resulting utu (here: revenge) obligations led to an on-going warfare and made the settlement of quarrels nearly impossible.32

After the Battle Te Hīnga-Kaka, Murupaenga and Te Kawaú went north to take part in the Battle at Moremonui against Ngāpuhi in 1807.33 This battle became known as Te Kai-a-te-Karoro, the seagull’s feast, named so because of the many warriors slain and left lying at the beach as fodder for the seagulls.34 Tauhia would have heard on many occasions how his grandfather, granduncle, and perhaps also his father, who may have taken part in that battle as a young warrior, heroically defeated the warriors of Ngāpuhi.

An account of this battle as told by Ngāpuhi rangatira was recorded by the Anglican minister Samuel Marsden who visited the Bay of Islands for the first time in 1814.35 Although the Ngāpuhi warriors already had muskets introduced by the Europeans, Murupaenga and his warriors defeated them by strategically attacking the warriors while they were occupied reloading their muskets. Apparently, only a few Ngāpuhi rangatira with fifteen surviving warriors returned home; the others were killed or taken as prisoners.36 Among the survivors was Hongi Hika whose father, sister and brother got killed during this battle; the Ngāti Manu rangatira Te Whareumu lost his father.37 Eighteen years later, Te Whareumu and Hongi Hika were to lead a successful war expedition to Kaipara seeking revenge for the deaths of their relatives.

2.1.3 Battles, Peace, and a Strange Visitor

After the Battle at Moremonui, there were some years without major conflicts between the neighbouring tribes of Ngāti Whātua and Ngāpuhi. Murupaenga used that period of relative stability between 1810 and 1819 to join various war expeditions south to Taranaki.38 During this time, Tauhia’s parents Te Anini and

---

32 Ballara, Taua, p. 69.
33 S. P. Smith, Maori Wars, pp. 32-49.
34 Ballara, Murupaenga.
36 Marsden, p. 284.
37 Hongi Hika witnessed how his sister was raped and burned alive, and he vowed revenge, see Leslie G. Kelly, Fragments of Ngapuhi History: Moremu-nui, 1807; The Journal of the Polynesian Society, 47.188 (1938), 173-81 (pp. 178 - 79).
38 Ballara, Murupaenga.
Kahutuanui married, and their first child was born: Tauhia’s sister Kotare (Kingfisher), later known by her Christian name, Makareta.\textsuperscript{39} Tauhia, as he was called before adopting his baptismal name ‘Te Hemara’ in 1841, was their second child and first son.\textsuperscript{40} He must have been born around 1815. The year of birth is based on Tauhia’s evidence given at a Native Land Court hearing in 1876. Tauhia said that he was ten years old at the time of the Battle Te Ika-a-Ranganui, which took place in 1825, ‘I was a boy at the time of Ikaranganui (about 10). My father was in the fight. I was at the kainga.’\textsuperscript{41}

Tauhia also had a younger brother, Henare Winiata Te Kahu. During a Native Land Court hearing in 1866, Te Kahu explained: ‘I am a young man and cannot properly trace the line of ancestors from Te Maki.’\textsuperscript{42} Presumably, in accordance with custom, he was deferring the task of reciting whakapapa to his older brother, Te Hemara Tauhia.

In 1820, when Tauhia was five years old, the Anglican cleric and missionary Samuel Marsden came to visit the Kaipara region and stayed for an afternoon at Murupaenga’s village.\textsuperscript{43} Marsden’s journal contains some notes regarding Murupaenga, his whānau and kāinga. On his travels to the Kaipara, Marsden was accompanied by the Ngāti Whātua rangatira, Te Kawau.\textsuperscript{44} They stopped for a meal at the residence of Murupaenga’s son, Te Kahu, whom Marsden described as ‘a fine young man’ who had married just recently.\textsuperscript{45} Leaving Te Kahu’s residence, they came through valleys that Marsden described as rich and fertile; he was already picturing wheat and barley growing well in this region.\textsuperscript{46} Marsden mentioned that in one of the valleys a battle had just taken place two months previously. At Murupaenga’s village, Marsden was entertained with a feast and a lively discussion. Marsden leaves the following description of Murupaenga:

\begin{quote}
Moodeepanga [Murupaenga] is a man of very quick perceptions – his mind is alive to every observation. His complexion is very dark; his eyes fiery, keen, and penetrating; his body of a middle stature, but very strong
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{39} NLC, Waihakari Succession Hearing: 8 and 13 March 1877, Kaipara Minute Book 3, p. 217.
\textsuperscript{40} See chapter 3.1.
\textsuperscript{41} NLC, Maunganui Waipoua Claim: 27 January 1876, Kaipara Minute Book 3, p. 165.
\textsuperscript{42} NLC, Opaheke Hearing: 25 January 1866, Mahurangi Minute Book 1, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{43} Marsden, p. 289.
\textsuperscript{44} Kawharu, \textit{Pre-European History: Ngati Whataua}.
\textsuperscript{45} Marsden, p. 289.
\textsuperscript{46} Marsden, p. 290.
and active. He appears to be about fifty years old. From the expression in
his countenance and his manly deportment, he cannot fail in commanding
respect amongst his countrymen.47

According to Marsden, Murupaenga expressed a desire to end the on-going
fighting between the tribes. But because a Ngāpuhi war party just recently
attacked the villages in the Kaipara region, Murupaenga had to perform his duty
of protecting his people and fighting back. Marsden also wrote that Murupaenga
wished for ‘some regular government by which they could obtain protection to
their persons and properties.’48 Whether these were truly Murupaenga’s thoughts
or an invention by Marsden in order to justify his mission to ‘civilize’ the savage
people of New Zealand is impossible to ascertain. Marsden repeated his
observation that the chiefs wished for a government and that some would
welcome the British Government sending a man-of-war to New Zealand in his
treatise ‘Observations by the Revd. Samuel Marsden on the Authority Which the
Chiefs Possess in New Zealand’.49 Highly plausible, however, is Marsden’s note
about Murupaenga’s interest in Europeans settling among his people for the
mutual benefits of trade and easier access to muskets such as had privileged the
Ngāpuhi in the Bay of Islands.

Assuming that Murupaenga’s kāinga was also Tauhia’s home, the young boy
would have witnessed the feast in honour of Samuel Marsden. This might have
been the first time in his life that Tauhia had encountered a European; perhaps he
was among the children Marsden described as being ‘dreadfully terrified’ upon
seeing their first European.50 Even if Tauhia was not there in person, he definitely
would have heard stories about the visit of this fair-haired, stout yet muscular man
with an ‘open ruddy countenance’, as Marsden was described by John R. Elder,
the editor of the collection of Marsden’s letters and journals.51 Tauhia would have
also heard of the idea that perhaps one day these white skinned people referred to
as Pākehā would settle and trade among his people.

47 Marsden, p. 285.
48 Marsden, p. 290.
49 Marsden, p. 335.
50 Marsden, p. 283.
51 Marsden, p. 18.
When Tauhia was around six years old, Murupaenga led a taua from the Kaipara region to join the warriors of the Waikato and Ngāti Maniapoto hapū in an expedition called Amiowhenua, circling the entire island south of Kaipara and Tāmaki. The pūtake, or reason, for this expedition was to seek utu with non-kin, but mainly to explore the land in search for possible new living spaces, likely to be needed due to on-going conflicts with the Ngāpuhi groups. A few months after Murupaenga and his warriors started their expedition, the Ngāpuhi warrior Hongi Hika and his followers attacked Mauinaina pā at Tāmaki, raiding settlements on their way south along the Mahurangi coast where Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo had kāinga and māra.

While the warriors were away on the Amiowhenua expedition, the women, children and slaves had to take care of the māra. If they had to retreat into a pā for fear of enemy attacks, often their māra were neglected which resulted in shortage of food and hunger. A constant fear of enemy attacks would have become normal for Tauhia and his people. However, as long as the warriors of his hapū returned from battles successfully, Tauhia would not have questioned such a way of life. After war followed peace, often consolidated through inter-marriage between sons and daughters of leading rangatira of former enemy tribes. In order to understand the complex and interwoven kinship ties, Tauhia, as a descendant of chiefly lines, had been taught the whakapapa of his hapū. From early childhood on, he would have also received training in warfare, canoe skills, hunting and fishing.

After peace negotiations between Ngāpuhi and Waikato in 1823, strengthened through the marriage between the Waikato rangatira, Kati, a younger brother of Te Wherowhero, and Matire Toha, the daughter of the Ngāpuhi rangatira Rewa, the Tāmaki and Kaipara region saw a short period of stability and peace. During that time, Murupaenga was visiting the Ngāpuhi rangatira Pomare, with whom he was related through their shared ancestor Ngāwhetu. While staying at the Bay of Islands, Murupaenga likely felt obliged to join Pomare’s and Hongi Hika’s war.
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52 Stone, From Tamaki-Makau-Rau to Auckland, pp. 76-78; Ballara, Taua, pp. 321-22.
53 Seeking utu with non-kin was a common practise in case the tribe that had caused the demand for utu was either too powerful or kin; anyone non-kin and easier to defeat could therefore become the target and the utu obligation was fulfilled, see Ballara, Taua, p. 20.
54 Stone, From Tamaki-Makau-Rau to Auckland, p. 87.
55 Stone, From Tamaki-Makau-Rau to Auckland, p. 99.
expedition against Mokoia Island at Rotorua.\textsuperscript{57} It was not unusual for visitors to believe they were indebted to their hosts who were in the process of preparing a taua.\textsuperscript{58} Whether Tauhia’s father and grandfather were also part of that taua, is not known. Such support for Pomare’s campaign would explain why the lives of Tauhia and some members of his hapū were spared after being defeated at the next battle between Ngāti Whātua and Ngāpuhi.

2.1.4 Defeat at the Battle Te Ika-a-Ranganui

In February 1825, fighting between Ngāpuhi and Ngāti Whātua and their allies recommenced and culminated in the Battle Te Ika-a-Ranganui on the Waimakomako stream.\textsuperscript{59} The Ngāpuhi forces had the use of many muskets; Ngāti Whātua had only a few and fought mainly with traditional weapons. While the Battle Te Ika-a-Ranganui was a clear success for Ngāpuhi, fighting between the two iwi lasted till December 1825, when Ngāti Whātua and their allies were forced to flee from Kaipara to the Waikato region.\textsuperscript{60}

In his evidence given at a Native Land Court hearing in 1876, the Ngāpuhi rangatira, Kamariera Te Hau Takari Te Wharepapa, stated that while Hongi Hika’s forces were pursuing the fleeing Ngāti Whātua to the Waikato, other Ngāpuhi rangatira stayed in the Kaipara region and arranged hostage exchanges in order to make peace:

Te Kaha, an ancestor of ours, sought to make peace. He went to Ngāti Whātua at Kaipara and left hostages (wharikimate) with Ngāti Whātua and brought some of them as hostages for Ngāpuhi, 400 of them to [barely legible] Mangakahia - Paikea and his people came to Kukupa, Taka and Te Hemara went to Whareumu.\textsuperscript{61}

Due to kinship ties between Ngāpuhi and Ngāti Whātua, some of the Ngāti Whātua rangatira and their families were not killed but were taken prisoners and came to live at Ngāpuhi residences. Te Wharepapa also explained that at the Battle Te Ika-a-Ranganui Hongi Hika’s life was spared by Ngāti Whātua warriors,

\textsuperscript{57} Ballara, \textit{Murupaenga}.
\textsuperscript{58} Ballara, \textit{Taua}, p. 69.
\textsuperscript{59} For a detailed account of the Battle Te Ika-a-Ranganui, see Ballara, \textit{Taua}, pp. 225-26.
\textsuperscript{61} Maunganui Waipoua Hearing: 27 January 1876, p. 158.
because of his mother’s kinship ties with Ngāti Whātua.\textsuperscript{62} Hongi Hika’s eldest son, Hāre Hika, however, was killed.

During the same Native Land Court hearing in 1876, Tauhia’s said that his hapū fled first to Waikato before being taken as hostages to the Bay of Islands. He also mentioned the death of Murupaenga, which he must have witnessed with his own eyes:

I was at Tuhirangi when the Ikaranganui was fought; all my people were in the fight with our tribe the Ngāti Whātua. My people fled to Waikato. After Ngāti Whātua fled to Waikato, Murupaenga, my tupuna, took me to Mahurangi. Te Hikutu came and attacked us there and killed Murupaenga and five others. After that I and my people went to Waikato. The Hikutu were wounded in the fight and fled. We the Ngāti Rongo left on our own accord to follow the rest of our people to Waikato. We were not afraid of Hongi because we were related to Ruka, one of the Ngā Puhi chiefs.\textsuperscript{63}

Before fleeing with the majority of the surviving Ngāti Whātua people to the Waikato, Tauhia and his family followed Murupaenga to Puhoi on the Mahurangi coast because they felt safe there due to shared kinship ties with Ngāpuhi. At another Native Land Court hearing in 1877, Tauhia stated that it was Hongi Hika who told him and his people to remain at Mahurangi while the Battle Te Ika-a-Ranganui was fought: ‘At the time of Hikaranganui [sic] I was at Mahurangi, Hongi Ika [sic] desired me to remain there quietly!’\textsuperscript{64} However, it is difficult to imagine that Hongi Hika wanted to spare Murupaenga and his whānau. Murupaenga and his warriors had killed Hongi Hika’s father, brother, sister, and now also his eldest son Hāre Hika. It is more likely that Hongi Hika set up a trap by promising protection. Shortly after the Battle Te Ika-a-Ranganui, Murupaenga was killed at the Puhoi river mouth. Tauhia witnessed the attack on his granduncle, Murupaenga.

\textsuperscript{62} Maunganui Waipoua Hearing: 27 January 1876, p. 159.
\textsuperscript{64} NLC, Kaihu No. 2 Hearing: 10 July 1877, Kaipara Minute Book 3, p. 275.
Two accounts of the killing of Murupaenga were recorded by the surveyor and lay ethnographer S. Percy Smith. According to the first account given by the Ngāti Whātua cleric, the Reverend Hauraki Paora, Murupaenga was killed by Hikutu warriors, a hapū of the Ngāpuhi iwi, through a surprise attack near Maungatauhoro at the Puhoi river mouth. Murupaenga’s people, who stayed up the Puhoi River, found his dead body floating in the sea, after the Hikutu had gone. The other account, as heard from a Ngāpuhi source, claims that Murupaenga was fleeing from the Battle Te Ika-a-Ranganui. Not far from the battle site at Mangawhai, Murupaenga was attacked by a small party of Hikutu warriors under the leadership of Te Wharepoaka, who afterwards, as it is claimed in Smith’s account, took on Murupaenga’s name. It is possible that Hongi Hika, who was related to Murupaenga, had hired the non-kin Hikutu warriors to carry out the killing, which, according to historian Angela Ballara, was a common move for conflicting utu demands.

Nothing is known as to whether Tauhia’s father Kahotuanui survived the Battle Te Ika-a-Ranganui. At the Native Land Court hearing in regards to Tiritimatangi Island in 1867, Tauhia said, ‘My father once lived on Tiritimatangi. He was driven off by the Northern natives. I do not know where he was buried.’ Since chiefs were mostly killed on the spot and not taken prisoners, it can be assumed that his father Kahotuanui and grandfather Urungatapu had been killed during the Battle Te Ika-a-Ranganui. According to the local historian Ronald Locker, Tauhia’s mother remarried; he mentions Paratene Te Peta as Tauhia’s stepfather. However, in his evidence recorded in Native Land Court minute books, Tauhia never mentioned a stepfather of that name.
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68 NLC, Tiritiri Matangi Hearing: 15 March 1867, Auckland Minute Book 1, p. 65.
69 Augustus Earle, *Narrative of a Nine Months’ Residence in New Zealand, in 1827; Together With a Journal of a Residence in Tristan D’Acunha, an Island Situated Between South America and the Cape of Good Hope* (London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, Green & Longman, 1832), p. 123, as in <https://books.google.co.nz/books?id=gtgNAAAAQAAJ&pg=PR1&lpg=PR1&dq=A+narrative+of+a+nine+months&source=bl&ots=GiXrtKIYgV&sig=qFUAZN_CnSUl-VsFHQ5e49n_3q8&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjZ2_SatNDL AhWD5KYKHX_LBBgQ6AEIQTAH#v=onepage&q=A%20narrative%20of%20a%20nine%20months&f=false> [accessed 21 April 2016].
70 Locker, p. 77.
2.1.5 Exodus of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo

After the death of one of their greatest warriors, Tauhia’s people decided it was now time to leave their homelands. Despite kinship ties with Ngāpuhi rangatira, the survival of their hapū was no longer guaranteed. Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo followed the stream of Ngāti Whātua refugees south to Waikato. It is highly likely that they joined Ngāti Whātua who found refuge at Nohoawatea, a pā near Pirongia established by the Ngāti Pāoa rangatira, Te Rauroha.\(^\text{71}\) Ngāti Pāoa had also sought shelter among the Waikato tribes after being attacked by Ngāpuhi in 1821.

By the end of 1825 or beginning of 1826, Hongi Hika caught up with the Ngāti Whātua refugees and attacked the pā Nohoawatea. While Hongi Hika promised Ngāti Pāoa they would be spared if they left the pā, the Ngāti Whātua refugees were killed or captured; some managed to flee. After that attack, Ngāpuhi and Ngāti Pāoa made peace, and Ngāti Whātua prisoners were taken back to the Bay of Islands, Hokianga and parts of the Kaipara region over which Ngāpuhi rangatira had extended their mana after the battle of Te Ika-a-Ranganui. At a Native Land Court hearing in 1886, Tauhia gave the following account:

> They [Ngāti Whātua and Ngāti Pāoa] had retired southwards to Waikato, Horotiu, and Hongi Hika followed and defeated N’ Whatua there. Peace was made in Waikato by Te Wharerahi, Toki, Tarahawaiki. Hongi said. Peace is made. After the peace N’ Whataua did not live at Waikato but came home to Kaipara and Bay of Islands.

> Te Whareumu went to fetch N’ Rango [sic] to Kaipara. He was a chief of Ngapuhi. Moetara went to fetch Te Waiaruhe, a hapu of N’ Whatua. They were asked to go to Hokianga. Parore fetched Ngatiapa, also a hapu of N’ Whatua. Te Keha fetched N’ Whatua proper to Mangakahia. Paikea fetched Te Uriohau to Wairoa. None were left at Hauturu, nor on the mainlands opposite, nor at Kaipara, nor at Tamaki. The chiefs who fetched

---

\(^{71}\) Stephenson Percy Smith, 'Wars of the Northern Against the Southern Tribes of New Zealand in the Nineteenth Century: Part VII', *The Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 10.2 (1901), 78-88 (p. 78).
N’ Whatua were related to them. Te Taou remained at Waikato. Te Kawau and Te Tinana were the chiefs of Te Taou.72

S. P. Smith mentioned in his account about Hongi Hika’s attack on Nohoawatea that ‘Pomare's daughter, who was with the taua, saved a child of the Ngati-Whatua alive, and many of that people were enslaved and taken back to their homes by Nga-Puhi.’73 Perhaps that child was Tauhia?

The exact journey during refuge in the Waikato region is not known. It is also possible that Tauhia and his people had joined Te Kawau, who had set up a pā called Te Kopai near present-day Tauwhare.74 Tauhia certainly experienced the hardship and insecurity of life as a refugee. He received help from hapū who shared kinship ties, such as Waikato’s Maniapoto people, as well as assistance from former enemies such as the Ngāti Pāoa. But he also experienced betrayal from people whom his hapū believed to be allies. For example, Te Tirarau Kukupa of the Te Parawhau hapū, who shared kinship ties with Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo, attacked the pā Whātua, Taoū, Rongo at Waiaro (present-day Dairy Bay) in the Mahurangi Harbour, set-up as a refuge for the fleeing Ngāti Whātua hapū; Ngāti Pāoa, who first offered refuge, entered into a peace-agreement with Ngāpuhi while Hongi Hika attacked Nohoawatea.75 Tauhia would have lost certainty as to whom he could trust, and he must have lived in constant fear of getting killed.

Overhearing conversations at the refugee camps, Tauhia would have picked up that the Ngāti Whātua defeat could be entirely attributed to the new weaponry used by the Ngāpuhi forces.76 Muskets were available through trade with Pākehā coming from a place on the other side of the world. Tauhia had encountered such a Pākehā, at least once when the missionary Samuel Marsden visited his tupuna, Murupaenga. Among his kin since that visit, the idea of people like Marsden living in their neighbourhood and trading with their products was not unfamiliar.

72 NLC, Hauturu Re-Hearing: 7 - 13 October 1886, Kaipara Minute Book 5, pp. 14-15; in this context, the use of the preposition ‘to’ Kaipara’ is an error and supposed to be ‘of’ Kaipara; ‘N’ Rango’ is a spelling variation of ‘Ngāti Rongo’.
73 S. P. Smith, ‘Wars of the Northern Against the Southern Tribes’, p. 80.
74 Stone, From Tamaki-Makau-Rau to Auckland, p. 110.
75 Stone, From Tamaki-Makau-Rau to Auckland, p. 103.
76 Such an argument was repeated at a Native Land Court hearing, see Maunganui Waipoua Hearing: 27 January 1876, p. 160.
What was new was the realisation that such a relational neighbourhood could also bring disaster for the local people.

After the defeat at the Battle Te Ika-a-Ranganui and the killing of Murupaenga, the mana of Tauhia’s family had been damaged. A family of former rangatira status was now depending on the mercy and goodwill of strangers who provided food and shelter and thereby exercised mana over them. The treatment of prisoners taken during a battle depended on their status prior to being captured. Prisoners of lower status became slaves. Tauhia, as the young son of a formerly influential rangatira, may well have been regarded as a valuable hostage, who could be exchanged later in the process of peace-making; hence his life was spared. In his evidence given at a Native Land Court hearing in 1876, Tauhia said that he had been fetched by his relatives and brought to the Bay of Islands, ‘My matua fetched me from Waikato.’ Whether his parents and siblings were with him is not known. That his mother, sister and younger brother survived the Battle Te Ika-a-Ranganui and its aftermath is proven by their appearance or mention at Native Land Court hearings.

Throughout his childhood, Tauhia had heard stories about his tūpuna’s battles; now he had seen the bloodshed and misery that followed battle with his own eyes. He had witnessed how war captives were treated when his father, grandfather and grand uncle returned from successful campaigns. Tauhia would have been frightened when thinking of his life ahead as prisoner of war. At the same time, the task to avenge the deaths of his tūpuna and to restore the mana of his whānau and hapū, now conferred to him, would have given him the will and purpose to survive.

—

78 Ballara, *Tāua*, p. 100.
79 Ballara, *Tāua*, p. 100.
80 Maunganui Waipoua Hearing: 27 January 1876, p. 165; how Tauhia’s whakapapa ties with the Ngāti Manu rangatira Pomare and Te Whareumu, who offered him protection and preferential treatment during captivity, will be discussed in chapter 3.1 of this thesis.
2.2 Martin Krippner: Son of Peasant Serfs

Martin Krippner was born in 1817 in the small village of Mantov/Mantau in West-Bohemia, part of today’s Czech Republic. His parents, the blacksmith Johannes Krippner and his wife Anna née Pallier, belonged to the German-speaking peasantry of the Kingdom of Bohemia, which at the time of Martin Krippner’s birth constituted part of the Austrian Empire. There is no evidence as to whether Krippner knew about or placed any importance on genealogy and legacies left by his ancestors. During his lifetime, there was no advantage in showing descent from a line of landless peasants and blacksmiths. However, two generations later, the children of Martin Krippner’s son, Rudolf, who returned from New Zealand to Germany in 1872, traced their ancestry back seven generations in order to prove so-called ‘Aryan’ descent. Descending from ethnic Germans of the Catholic religion, whether peasant or aristocrat, was a matter of life and death during the time of the Third German Reich. Thus, information about Martin Krippner’s paternal ancestors was recorded in extracts from Catholic parish registers issued in 1939 after Bohemia was occupied by Nazi Germany. Those extracts are held at the family archive of descendants of Martin Krippner’s son, Rudolf. Most of the data provided in those documents was confirmed by investigating the original entries in Bohemian parish registers, now accessible via the Internet.

---

81 Towns, villages and rivers in the Bohemian region had both Czech and German names at the time when Martin Krippner lived there. Official documents issued during the nineteenth century often only mention the German names. Since the expulsion of the German inhabitants of Bohemia after World War Two, only the Czech names are used. I will give the place names in both languages when first mentioned in the text; however, for reasons of readability and consistency, I will use the current Czech place name in the remainder of the text. A list of geographical names in Czech and German is provided in an appendix at the end of the thesis.
83 The State Archive of Bavaria and the State Archive of the Plzeň Region (in which Mantov is situated) worked together on a digitisation project accessible on-line <http://www.portafontium.de/>.
Map 3 German Confederation, Austrian Empire and Kingdom of Bohemia

Map 4 Places of significance during Martin Krippner’s formative years
2.2.1 German Immigrants in Czech Lands

The earliest located written record, dated 15 February 1700, is an entry of birth and baptism for Gregorius Martinus, the son of Joann Kriptner [sic] and his wife Magdalena from Miřovice/Mirschowitz.⁸⁴ According to her entry of death, Magdalena was born ca. 1660 in the village Krtín/Guratin; she died on 15 January 1720 and was buried at the cemetery in the village Ves Touškov/Tuschkau near Miřovice.⁸⁵ The villages Krtín, Miřovice and Ves Touškov belonged to the Kladruby/Kladrau County situated in the western Bohemian region, near the border to Bavaria. The Kladruby County was owned by the Kladruby Abbey, a Benedictine monastery founded in the beginning of the twelfth century.⁸⁶ The climate is cold and temperate, and the soils of the hilly terrain are rated as not very fertile. Rich in coal and ore deposits, there were many silver, lead and coal subsurface mines. Hop grows well in this region, and the Kladruby Abbey held the privilege of beer brewing and selling.⁸⁷

Since 950 CE, the duchies of the Bohemian or Czech territory became increasingly dependent on the Holy Roman Empire.⁸⁸ Bohemian dukes and princes supported the Holy Roman Emperor Frederick I (Barbarossa) in his Italian campaigns and crusade during the second half of the twelfth century.⁸⁹ In 1212 the Holy Roman Emperor Frederick II issued the Golden Bull of Sicily, which declared the Premyslid Ottokar I and his heirs Kings of Bohemia and raised Bohemia’s status to an autonomous and indivisible kingdom within the Holy Roman Empire.⁹⁰

During the thirteenth and fourteenth century, Bohemia grew to one of the most powerful dynasties in Central Europe. Monasteries and medieval towns were

---

⁸⁴ Plzeň, State Archive of the Plzeň Region (SAPR), Ves Touškov 02: Birth and Baptism of Gregorius Martinus Kriptner, p. 143; the family names ‘Kriptner’ or ‘Kripner’ are spelling variations of ‘Krippner’.
⁸⁵ Waihi, SFA, Copy of Death Certificate of Magdalena Kripner.
⁸⁷ Sommer, p. 143.
⁹⁰ Měřínský and Mezník, p. 48.
⁹¹ Měřínský and Mezník, p. 51.
Figure 4 Family tree showing Martin Krippner and his paternal ancestors\textsuperscript{91}

Figure 5 Family tree showing Martin Krippner and his maternal ancestors\textsuperscript{92}

\textsuperscript{91} Based on entries in the Catholic Parish Registers of Ves Touškov and Chotěšov.
\textsuperscript{92} Based on entries in the Catholic Parish Registers of Chotěšov.
founded; silver ores were discovered. Due to a rising demand for farmers, artisans and miners, immigrants from the neighbouring estates of Bavaria and Saxony were called to settle on uncultivated lands, especially in Bohemia’s border regions along the mountain ranges.\textsuperscript{93} This medieval settlement movement is sometimes referred to as ‘German colonisation’, whereby colonisation can be here understood as ‘expansion and amelioration of the agricultural landscape’ initiated by Czech aristocrats.\textsuperscript{94} With the arrival of the German-speaking immigrants, the Czech lands became bilingual.

Whether Martin Krippner’s paternal ancestors arrived in Bohemia during this first wave of medieval German settlement or whether they migrated to Bohemia after the Thirty Years War (1618 – 48) cannot be established. German immigrants who arrived during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were initially free peasants.\textsuperscript{95} In return for being allowed to settle and farm on the lordship’s lands, they were obliged to pay yearly taxes, whether monetary or payments in kind, and they had to perform labour services, called robota in Czech and Frondienst in German, on the lordship’s demesne. The robota consisted of compulsory transport services with their draft animals, and hand labour, which had to be performed before the peasants could work on their own land. The nobility and monasteries developed a growing interest in monetary profit stemming from farming and agricultural export, which led to ever increasing hardship for the tenant farmers.\textsuperscript{96}

Influenced by the writings of the Oxford reformer John Wycliffe, and responding to corrupt practices perpetuated by church and civil authorities and the exploitation of the peasants, the priest and Master of Arts at the Prague University, Jan Hus (c.1370 – 1415), called for religious reforms.\textsuperscript{97} After he was burned at the stake, the followers of Jan Hus, called the Hussites, rebelled against the Roman Catholic rulers. The Hussite Revolution, or Hussite Wars, lasted from 1419 to 1436. The Hussite forces, mostly peasants supported by warriors of the

\textsuperscript{93} Měřínský and Mezník, pp. 49-50.
\textsuperscript{95} For an analysis of the relationship between serfs and seigneurs in Bohemia see Karl Grünberg, \textit{Die Bauernbefreiung und die Auflösung des Gutsherrlich-Bäuerlichen Verhältnisses in Böhmen, Mähren und Schlesien} (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1894), as in <https://archive.org/details/diebauernbefrei00grgoog>, [accessed 21 March 2016].
\textsuperscript{96} Grünberg, p. 98.
lower aristocracy, defeated five crusades led by mainly German princes and their armies, called by the Pope. One of the most famous Hussite leaders was General Jan Žižka (c. 1360 – 1424), a name still found among the Bohemian settlers of Puhói, spelled ‘Schischka’ in German. Žižka laid siege to the Kladruby Abbey and converted the monastery into one of his fortresses. The Hussite Wars ended with a peace agreement by which the moderate faction of the Hussites submitted to the authority of the Bohemian King and the Church. In return, the civil authorities tolerated the reformed religious rites of the Hussites. The Benedictine monks of the Kladruby Abbey, who had managed to flee to Regensburg in Bavaria, returned in 1438.

The Hussite Wars changed the societal structure of Bohemia. During the Hussite Wars, many peasants were driven off their lands, which noble landowners then incorporated into their holdings. The landless peasants either took to arms or were forced to work as farm labourers on larger estates. To secure a sufficient supply of labourers on the immensely increased noble estates, laws were introduced to tie peasants to the land and the landowner. Peasants became serfs; they were not allowed to leave the estate, and their servile status was hereditary. The demands of robota steadily increased.

After almost two centuries of religious tolerance in Bohemia, the power struggle between Catholic and Protestant aristocrats led to the outbreak of the Thirty Years War (1618 – 1648). As a result of the Battle of the White Mountain near Prague in 1620, most of the Czech Protestant nobles were either executed or sent into exile. German and other foreign nobles, who had supported the Holy Roman Emperor in his fight against the Protestants, were granted the estates of the Czech nobility. The Kingdom of Bohemia was declared hereditary in the Habsburg family in both the male and female lines. German became the official language of administration; Czech was only spoken by the peasants. All non-Catholic religions were forbidden; Protestants had to convert or go into exile. Some Protestant peasants, who were legally bound to their landlords’ estates, managed

98 Sommer, p. 140.
100 Josef Válka, ‘Rudolfin Culture’, in Bohemia in History, ed. by Mikulas Teich, pp. 117-42.
to flee with retreating Protestant armies mainly into Saxony. While Bohemia was besieged by Swedish Protestant troops, the abbots and monks of the Kladruby Abbey fled again to Regensburg in Bavaria, and they returned after the end of the war.

By the end of the Thirty Years War, Bohemia’s population was reduced to a fifth compared to pre-war times. Vacant farms were added to the nobility’s and monasteries’ estates, or merged to big farms on which so-called Häusler, cottagers or landless farm labourers, settled. Estate officials managed the large farms; due to their often brutal treatment of the farm labourers, the managers were called karabáčnik, slave-driver, deriving from the Czech word karabáč, whip. The ever increasing robota demands and the hard living conditions of the peasants led to rebellions and illegal emigration to Hungary and Poland. The appalling exploitation of the peasants in Bohemia coined the term ‘Bohemian slavery’ used throughout the Habsburg Empire when referring to the social humiliations of serfdom. To replace the lost peasant population, mainly Catholic German-speaking immigrants were called from neighbouring countries to settle and work on the vacant farms. Unless Krippner’s ancestors had already arrived in Bohemia during the first wave of German immigration during the thirteenth and fourteenth century, they must have come to the Kladruby County in the aftermath of the Thirty Years War.

2.2.2 Farmers in Miřovice/Mirschowitz

While the occupation and social status of Joann and Magdalena Kriptner is not recorded in the parish register, their son Gregorius Martinus Kripner [sic] is described as ‘Colony et Judex’, tenant farmer and village magistrate from Miřovice. The duties of a village magistrate usually involved collecting taxes for the landlord, enforcing judgements of patrimonial jurisdiction, and often the

---

103 Sommer, p. 141.
104 Grünberg, p. 104.
106 Grünberg, p. 134; reports on emigration to Hungary can be found in court chronicles from 1700s, see Rippley and Paulson, p. 84.
108 Plzeň, SAPR, Ves Touškov 01: Entry of Death of Martinus Kripner, p. 201.
village judge was the only one entitled to sell beer to the peasants. Gregorius Martinus Kripner married Eva Ströbl, the daughter of a farm manager from Miřovice, and on 21 September 1739, their son Bartholomäus Kripner was born.\textsuperscript{109} Gregorius Martinus Kripner died in 1768.\textsuperscript{110} His wife Eva died four years later on 1 September 1772, aged 69.\textsuperscript{111} The entry of her death is the first recorded statement of Kripner’s address: Miřovice, house number five. This house was also the place of birth of Martin Krippner’s great-grandfather, grandfather and father.

The fact that a peasant family held on to the same house over four generations indicates that the Kripners had ‘bought in’ the holding. By payment of a fee, called Kaufschilling, peasant serfs received the hereditary right to occupy and farm the land permanently; they could transfer the land by sale or testament, however, always with the landlord’s permission.\textsuperscript{112} Peasants, who had not bought in the holding, could be evicted and relocated within the estate at the landlord’s pleasure.

The tenant farmer Bartholomäus Kripner married Margareta Koßlik, the daughter of a landless cottager and tailor from the neighbouring village, Ves Touškov, on 15 November 1768.\textsuperscript{113} Their son Michael Kripner was born on 18 December 1769.\textsuperscript{114} Bartholomäus Kripner died on 8 February 1789 aged 50 years. Martin Krippner’s great-grandparents, Bartholomäus and Margareta, and their son Michael Kripner witnessed far-reaching changes to the political, religious and socio-economic environment; these changes brought some relief to their burdened lives as peasants. During the so-called ‘Age of Enlightened Absolutism’, under the reigns of Empress Maria Theresa and Emperor Joseph II, reforms were introduced in order to strengthen central government and gain control over all the Empire’s subjects. Both sovereigns tried to undermine the political and economic power of the clergy and landowning nobility by introducing taxes. The taxes covered the costs of a growing standing army, mobilized due to the many Succession Wars, and wars with Prussia during the second half of the eighteenth century. Joseph II confiscated the lands of contemplative monasteries and

\begin{flushright}
\textbf{\textsuperscript{109} Waihi, SFA, Copies of Marriage Certificate of Gregor Martin Kripner and Eva Ströbl and of Birth Certificate of Bartholomäus Kripner.}
\textbf{\textsuperscript{110} Ves Touškov 01: Entry of Death of Martinus Kripner, p. 201.}
\textbf{\textsuperscript{111} Waihi, SFA, Copy of Death Certificate of Eva Kripnerin.}
\textbf{\textsuperscript{112} Wright, p. 16; Macartney, p. 69.}
\textbf{\textsuperscript{113} Waihi, SFA, Copy of Marriage Certificate of Bartholomäus Kripner and Margareta Koßlik.}
\textbf{\textsuperscript{114} Waihi, SFA, Copy of Birth Certificate of Michael Kripner.}
\end{flushright}
transferred them to the Religionsfond (Religious Fund) from which public schools, hospitals and orphanages were to be paid. Thus, the Benedictine Kladruby Abbey was dissolved in 1785 and its estate, including the village Miřovice, thereafter administrated by the State.\footnote{Sommer, p. 141.}

The reforms initiated by Joseph II led to a toleration of non-Catholic religions and some improvements of the peasants’ legal status. Under the Leibeigenschafts-Aufhebungspatent (Abolition of Serfdom Decree) of 1781, peasants obtained the right to marry whomever they wished.\footnote{Blum, pp. 52-53.} They still needed to notify their landlord and acquire a registration form, the latter at no charge. From 1781, peasants were free to leave the estate after giving notice to the local recruiting office in regards to military service and after receiving a certificate from the landlord stating that all obligations had been fulfilled. Peasants were now allowed to learn whatever trade they wished. They still had to perform compulsory work robota for the feudal lords as stipulated in already existing contracts recorded in the tax-roles; however, no additional unpaid services for the lords could be demanded; compulsory work at the landlord’s manor by peasants’ children, except for orphans, was abolished.\footnote{Blum, pp. 53, 80.}

From 1781, the Emperor Joseph II also called for more German-speaking immigrant farmers and craftsmen to settle in Bohemia; the immigrants received loans for setting up new farms and workshops, they were to be tax exempt for five to ten years, and their children born outside of the Austrian Empire relieved of conscription to the military.\footnote{Dominik Kostetzky, System der Politischen Gesetze Böhmens : In XII Theilen: Zum Bequemen Gebrauch für den Geschäfts- und Privatmann: Erster Theil (Prague: Carl Wilhelm Enders, 1816), p. 245, as in Bayerische StaatsBibliothek Digital <http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10542973_00375.html>, [accessed 21 March 2016].} Those privileges, of course, contributed to tensions between the new immigrants and the local peasants, who were mostly Czechs.

The premature death of Joseph II in 1790 encouraged the conservative lords and clergy to revoke some of the Josephine reforms, which had anticipated the total abolition of robota in the Holy Roman Empire. Nevertheless, the peasants had gained some freedoms and self-respect through the partly temporarily reforms, and they regarded Emperor Joseph II, despite his closure of monasteries and
reduction of public religious holidays, as ‘almost a patron saint.’

Rumours circulated among the peasants that the Jesuits had poisoned Joseph II.

In 1791, Martin Krippner’s grandfather Michael married the farmer’s daughter Ursula Schuster from Miřovice. Ever since the entry of this marriage in the parish register, the family name was spelled ‘Krippner’. Michael and Ursula belonged to the first generation in the Krippner family who could marry without having to ask the landlord for permission. Their son Johannes, born on 9 June 1795, was allowed to leave his parent’s soil and learn a trade of his choice. That opened the way for Johannes Krippner to move to Mantov in the neighbouring County of Chotěšov/Chotieschau, an approximately five-hour-journey by foot or ox-cart. In Mantov, Johannes Krippner became apprenticed to a blacksmith, and he married Anna Pallier, the granddaughter of the former village blacksmith of Mantov, Johannes Lederer.

2.2.3 Blacksmiths in the County of Chotěšov

Mantov and a further 42 villages, the home towns of most of the Bohemian settlers of Puhoi and Ohaupo, constituted the Chotěšov County which was owned for almost 600 years by the former Premonstratensian Chotěšov Abbey, founded in 1193. Under the reforms of Emperor Joseph II, as was the case for all the purely contemplative religious houses, Chotěšov Abbey was dissolved and its property transferred to the Religionsfond in 1782. After the closure of Chotěšov Abbey, the Chotěšov County stood under state administration until it was sold to Count Karl Alexander von Thurn and Taxis in 1822.

The extracts from Catholic parish registers obtained by Krippner’s descendents in order to prove ‘Aryan’ lineage do not include any information about Krippner’s maternal ancestors. Searching in Catholic parish registers of the Chotěšov County, I found as the earliest record a marriage entry of Martin Krippner’s maternal great-grandparents living in the village of Týnec/Teinitzl, fifteen minutes walking
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120 Kudlich, p. 58.
121 Waihi, SFA, Copy of Certificate of Marriage of Michael Krippner and Ursula Schuster.
122 Waihi, SFA, Copy of Certificate of Birth of Johannes Krippner.
123 Plzeň, SAPR, Chotěšov 10: Entry of Marriage of Johann Krippner and Anna Palier [sic], p. 181.
124 Sommer, p. 105.
125 Sommer, p. 105.
distance north of Chotěšov. On 26 November 1749, Joannes Löderer, ‘Löderer’ being a spelling variation of ‘Lederer’, son of the blacksmith Petri Löderer from the village Vstiš/Stich, married Anna Urschalitz, daughter of the blacksmith Adrian Urschalitz from the village Týnec. This record shows that Martin Krippner’s maternal great-grandparents both descended from Catholic blacksmith families living in the Chotěšov County.

However, according to the Book of Jewish Familianten of the Plzeň/Pilsen region for the period 1799 - 1848, the name ‘Lederer’ was a common name among Jewish families living in Chotěšov and other villages near and in Plzeň. It is possible that Joannes Löderer’s ancestors had converted to Catholicism to avoid expulsion from Bohemia and other forms of discrimination such as marriage restrictions. According to the Familianten Order issued in 1726 by the Habsburg Emperor Charles VI, only the first-born son of each Jewish family was allowed to marry in order to limit the number of Jewish families in Bohemia. Should a family have no son, they were able to sell such a permit. This order was in force until 1848.

Joannes and Anna Löderer’s first child, Anna Dorothea, was born and baptized on 9 July 1750 in Mantov where Joannes Löderer worked as the village blacksmith. The next three children, two daughters and one son, were also born in Mantov in 1752, 1755 and 1757, respectively. In 1758, their son Matthäus was born in Týnec, and Joannes Löderer’s occupation was stated as village blacksmith in Týnec. In the following year, at the birth of their daughter Catherina in 1759, the Löderers lived and worked once again in Mantov; in 1761, at the birth of their son Martin, in Týnec, and they were back again in Mantov when daughter Anna

---

126 Plzeň, SAPR, Chotěšov 11: Entry of Marriage of Joannes Löderer and Anna Urschalitz, p. 176.
Maria was born in 1764.\textsuperscript{130} Johannes Löderer and his family must have moved between the villages of the Chotěšov County depending on where the blacksmith’s work was in demand.

Anna Dorothea Löderer was Martin Krippner’s maternal grandmother. She married Franz Pallier, who served as a grenadier-corporal in the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army.\textsuperscript{131} Originally from the Duchy of Styria, his company might have been stationed at the nearby garrison in Stod/Staab, a three-quarter hour walk away from Mantov; or, as was often the case, Franz Pallier could have been quartered in Mantov or Chotěšov where he met and married the blacksmith’s oldest daughter. In 1772 their son Joseph Pallier was born and baptized in Mantov.\textsuperscript{132} This entry of birth mentions for the first time ‘house number 26’ as the place of residence of the Löderer family in Mantov. Thus, by 1772, Joannes Löderer must have either leased or purchased the smithy where 45 years later Martin Krippner was born. After Joannes Löderer became a widower, he married Walburga Rubelick, a widow and daughter of a farm labourer from Mantov, on 6 February 1776.\textsuperscript{133} A record of the death of his first wife Anna has not been found.

Franz and Anna Dorothea Pallier also had a daughter, Anna, Martin Krippner’s mother. However, her birth is not recorded in the Chotěšov parish register. The Palliers must have moved away from Mantov when Franz Pallier’s company was transferred to another garrison or when Franz was called to active duty. In the entry of marriage for Anna Pallier and Johannes Krippner in 1817, Anna’s age is recorded as 25 years; this means she was born in 1792, at the outbreak of the War of the First Coalition against France.\textsuperscript{134} It is highly likely that Anna Pallier’s father, the grenadier-corporal, and her brother Joseph fought in that war.

The village blacksmith Joannes Löderer, now spelled ‘Lederer’, died in 1794, 75 years old, in Mantov, house number 26. Two years later, his second wife

\textsuperscript{130} Plzeň, SAPR, Chotěšov 04: Entry of Birth of Elisabeth Löderer, p. 239; Plzeň, SAPR, Chotěšov 05: Entries of Birth of Margaretha, Stephan, Matthäus, Catharina, Martin, and Anna Maria Löderer, pp. 6, 15, 20, 25, 34, and 45.
\textsuperscript{131} Since Franz Pallier was a soldier, the marriage of Anna and Franz is not registered in the Chotěšov parish register; it is probably recorded in his regiment’s files.
\textsuperscript{132} Plzeň, SAPR, Chotěšov 05: Entry of Birth of Joseph Pallir [sic], p. 146.
\textsuperscript{133} Plzeň, SAPR, Chotěšov 12: Entry of Marriage of Joannes Löderer with Walburga Rubelick, p. 90.
\textsuperscript{134} Entry of Marriage of Johann Krippner and Anna Palier [sic], p. 181; later entries state Prague as the place of birth of Anna née Pallier.
Waldburga Lederin died, 70 years old. Concluding from subsequent entries in the parish register, the smithy was passed on to Joannes Löderer’s second-youngest daughter Catharina, who had married Laurenz Hield, the son of the ludi rectoris, schoolmaster from the village Ves Touškov, in 1778. At the time of their wedding, the young couple lived in the house opposite the smithy; however, the entries of their deaths confirm that Laurenz Hield became the village blacksmith of Mantov, and both died at the smithy in Mantov, house number 26.

By law, the oldest son or daughter inherited the parents’ workshop or farm if the farmer or artisan had bought into the holding. However, it was Catharina, the sixth of Joannes Löderer’s children, who inherited the smithy. Anna Dorothea, the first-born child of Joannes Löderer, had married a soldier and moved away from Mantov.

Figure 6 Site of the former smithy in Mantov in 2013
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135 Plzeň, SAPR, Chotěšov 15: Entries of Death of Johannes Leder and Waldburga Lederin, pp. 183, 85; their family name is now spelt ‘Leder’ or ‘Lederin’, the female version of the family name.
136 Plzeň, SAPR, Chotěšov 12: Entry of Marriage of Laurenz Hield and Catharina Löderer, p. 91.
137 Plzeň, SAPR, Chotěšov 15: Entry of Death of Laurenz Hild [sic], p. 197; Plzeň, SAPR, Chotěšov 15: Entry of Death of Katharina Hielt [sic], p. 206.
138 Photograph by Anne Eddy.
139 Grünberg, p. 365.
Mantov. What happened to the other Löderer daughters and sons is not known; the sons had probably been enlisted as soldiers and fell during the Napoleonic Wars. At some point, Anna Pallier, the daughter of Anna Dorothea, returned to the smithy in Mantov and lived with her aunt and uncle, who had no children of their own. Thus, Anna Pallier was nominated heir of her grandfather’s smithy.

Laurenz Hield, the new village blacksmith born in Ves Touškov, must have known Johannes Krippner, the farmer’s son from Miřovice near Ves Touškov, and hired him as an apprentice. Probably due to this employment, Johannes Krippner was exempted from serving in the Landwehr, or Home Guard, of the Imperial-Royal Army, which since 1808 was compulsory for all men between the ages of 18 and 45.140 Here at the smithy in Mantov, Johannes would have met and fallen in love with Anna Pallier. Johannes Krippner and Anna Pallier married on 13 August 1817.141 Just over a month later, on 27 September 1817, their first son, Martin Krippner, was born and baptized.142

2.2.4 Mantov: Martin Krippner’s Birth and Baptism

At the time of Martin Krippner’s birth in 1817, the Kingdom of Bohemia formed part of the Austrian Empire. The last Holy Roman Emperor, Francis II, had formally dissolved the Holy Roman Empire in 1806 during the Napoleonic Wars.143 He then reigned as Francis I, Emperor of Austria. After the defeat of Napoleonic France in 1815, the German Confederation was formed as a loose association of German states formerly belonging to the Holy Roman Empire. The fully sovereign member states, including the Austrian Empire and the Kingdom of Prussia, pledged each other mutual military assistance and thereafter maintained joined fortresses, for example in Mainz in the Grand Duchy of Hesse and by Rhine, where Martin Krippner was later stationed from 1850 to 1859.

In a statistical-topographical survey of the Bohemian Kingdom published in 1838, Mantov is described as a village of 265 inhabitants living in 31 dwellings, nestled in the broad valley in one of the many bends of the river Radbuza.144 In spring, when the snow is melting and after heavy rainfalls, the Radbuza regularly bursts

140 Macartney, p. 185.
141 Entry of Marriage of Johann Krippner and Anna Palier [sic].
142 Plzeň, SAPR, Chotěšov 06: Entry of Birth of Martin Krippner, p. 90.
143 Macartney, p. 156.
144 Sommer, p. 110.
its banks and causes flooding, whereas during the summer months, in some places, the Radbuza can dry out completely. The soil around Chotěšov and Mantov was fertile and suitable for growing wheat, corn, barley, hops, legumes, turnips, and fruit trees.

Sheep farms, forests, one coal mine and two limestone quarries, all formerly belonging to the Chotěšov Abbey, were owned and managed by the state authorities until sold to Count Karl Alexander von Thurn and Taxis in 1822. One of the quarries lay just a few hundred metres outside of Mantov. Private owners operated four more coal mines, one of them near Mantov. The proximity of these operations indicates that many of the local peasants must have worked and performed their robota service in the coal mines in addition to farming the land. The imperial-royal spinning works located in the village Chotěšov employed approximately 1500 spinners from the surrounding villages. Some worked in the factory, but most spinners worked from home. Very possibly, also Martin Krippner’s mother and aunt were among those who spun wool for the Chotěšov spinning works to further enable their household’s payment of rent and taxes.

A detailed cadastre map of Mantov, drawn in 1838, shows the smithy at the centre of the village square house number 26. No garden surrounded the building, and, according to the cadastre map, the Krippners had not leased or bought into any other landholding. Thus the blacksmith and his family relied solely on their income from village industries and bought all of their food at the local market.

Today, a small wayside chapel stands at the site of the former smithy; trees and shrubs cover the remaining ground. The stone walls still visible were probably the foundation walls of the smithy. According to the map from 1838, there was no chapel but a wooden crucifix at the village square.

Martin Krippner was born and baptized on 27 September 1817, just over a month after his parents had married. In a society that considered premarital sex and impregnation a sin, the blacksmith Johannes Krippner’s marriage and the birth of his first son would have raised many questions among the locals of Mantov. Why

---

145 Sommer, pp. 107–08.
147 Entry of Birth of Martin Krippner.
was the wedding delayed to the last months of Anna’s pregnancy? Did Johannes Krippner’s parents not agree with this marriage? Were there rejections from Anna’s uncle and aunt? Or was Johannes Krippner not the biological father of Martin? Perhaps an agreement had been reached that the apprentice Johannes Krippner would inherit the smithy should he marry the pregnant granddaughter of the former village blacksmith, Johannes Löderer? Even over a century later, Edward Karl, a descendant of one of the Bohemian families who settled in New Zealand, seemed to doubt whether Johannes Krippner was Martin’s biological father. Karl, whose ancestors were farmers in Mantov, published his family’s chronicle, and he opened a chapter about Captain Martin Krippner with the unusual wording, ‘The local blacksmith’s wife had a son.’

One might also wonder why Martin Krippner was not named after his father or grandfathers. However, birth records of the Chotěšov parish register suggest the convention of naming a child after his or her godparents. Martin Krippner’s godparents were the Mantov farmers Martin Krahl and Barbara Matheiowetz who, because they were illiterate, set their three crosses instead of their signature under their names on the birth record. It is also possible that Martin Krippner’s parents chose their ancestor, the farmer and village magistrate Gregorius Martinus Kripner, as namesake for their son.

Around the time of Martin Krippner’s second birthday, his great-uncle and former village blacksmith smith, Laurenz Hield, died, and his first brother, Johannes, was born, on 25 September 1819. Johannes, who carried the name of his father and his godfather, the farmer Johann Matheiowetz of Mantov, died in the following winter, on 22 January 1820, just seventeen weeks old. When Martin was four years old, his only sister was born on 29 June 1822; she was named Margareth after her godmother, the farmer’s wife Margaretha Krahlin of Mantov. Martin’s sister Margareth died on 8 September 1822, eleven weeks old. By that time,
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149 Entry of Birth of Martin Krippner; about the role of godparents in Bohemia see The Heimatbrief - German-Bohemian Heritage Newsletter, edited by Louis Lindmeyer, 8.3 (1997), pp. 10-11.
150 Plzeň, SAPR, Chotěšov 06: Entry of Birth of Johannes Krippner, p. 94; Chotěšov 15: Entry of Death of Laurenz Hild [sic].
151 Plzeň, SAPR, Chotěšov 15: Entry of Death of Johannes Krippner, p. 198.
152 Plzeň, SAPR, Chotěšov 06: Entry of Birth of Margareth Krippner, p. 99.
Martin Krippner’s mother was pregnant again, and on 24 July 1823 his brother Michael was born, named after his paternal grandfather and his godfather, Michael P [illegible], a farmer from Mantov.\textsuperscript{154}

Martin Krippner and his siblings were all baptised on the day of their birth. The godparents would take the newborn child to the parish church in Chotěšov, and a baptismal banquet for relatives and neighbours would follow, most likely at the house of the godparents. As it was tradition, six weeks after the child was born, a re-blessing of the mother and child took place at the church.\textsuperscript{155} Perhaps also Martin Krippner’s paternal grandparents came to attend the baptism of their grandchildren. The distance between their home in Miřovice and the village of Mantau necessitated a journey by foot or ox cart of about five hours, possibly not an insurmountable distance for contact to take place at special family occasions. Certainly, the tradition to spend at least Christmas together as a family was strong.\textsuperscript{156} Whether Martin Krippner and his siblings ever met their maternal grandparents is doubtful. Since Anna, their mother, had been living with her aunt and uncle and did not return to a former home for her first confinement, it is likely that both her parents had died. Thus, the children’s great-aunt Catharina Hield, who lived together with the young Krippner family at the smithy until her death in 1833, would have taken on the role of a grandmother.\textsuperscript{157} She would have told the children many fairy tales and legends of the region, stories about their great-grandfather, the blacksmith Joannes Lederer, and perhaps also about their maternal grandfather, Franz Pallier, the grenadier. Pallier was of tall build; he must have been a striking figure in his white uniform, long black leather boots, huge fur cap and long moustache, as was required for Austrian grenadiers.\textsuperscript{158}

\section*{2.2.5 Legends of the Region - Hroznata}

The region’s history is depicted in many Bohemian myths and legends, particularly reflective of the time of the Hussite and Thirty Years War. Many stories also tell of the arrival of German immigrants who followed the gold and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{154} Plzeň, SAPR, Chotěšov 06: Entry of Birth of Michael Krippner, p. 101.
\item \textsuperscript{155} Rippley and Paulson, p. 177.
\item \textsuperscript{156} Rippley and Paulson, p. 176.
\item \textsuperscript{157} Chotěšov 15: Entry of Death of Katharina Hielt [sic].
\item \textsuperscript{158} For a visual impression of the Grenadier’s uniform, see \textit{Austrian Infantry During the Napoleonic Wars}, \texttt{<http://napolun.com/mirror/web2.ailmail.net/napoleon/Austrian_infantry.htm>}, \texttt{[accessed 14 March 2016]}.\
\end{itemize}
silver rushes of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries and who settled in the
mountain ranges surrounding the Bohemian basin to mine the precious minerals
during that era. The boy Martin would have heard of the Czech general and
Hussite leader, Jan Žižka, and he might have wondered how his neighbours living
at house no. 2, the Schischka family, were related to this legendary rebel, or
otherwise hero (from the Czech peasants’ perspective). He also would have heard
stories about Count Mansfeld who occupied Plzeň and plundered the treasure at
Chotěšov Abbey during the Thirty Years War.

From the Mantov village square, the former Chotěšov Abbey can be seen at the
top of the hill, overlooking the villages and fields of the Radbuza valley. The
events of the monastery’s foundation, closure, and the recent sale to the Count
Karl Alexander von Thurn und Taxis would have provided plenty of material for
local story-telling. In particular, the story about Hroznata, the founder of the
Chotěšov and Teplá monasteries, must have made a lasting impression on Martin
Krippner’s own sense of his history and background. A version of the legend of
Hroznata written in German can be read in Robert Christoph Köpl’s history of the
Chotěšov monastery published in 1840. Köpl was a Premonstratensian canon
regular and parish priest for the neighbouring town Stod, three kilometres west of
Mantov. He also taught at Teplá Abbey during the time of Martin Krippner’s stay
there from age nine to thirteen. Although Köpl may have manipulated his
account in order to pass the strict censorship of the Teplá Abbot, his written
history of the Chotěšov monastery would reflect in essence the stories and myths
told by the locals. The legend of Hroznata not only reflects the regional history at
the turn of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, it also shows on what childhood
hero Martin Krippner may have modelled his decisions later in life. Therefore, a

159 For examples of collections of old Bohemian legends published in the nineteenth century, see
A. W. Griesel, Mährchen- und Sagenbuch der Böhmen, Teil 1-2 (Prague: J. G. Calve, 1820); Ignaz
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160 Robert Christoph Köpl, Das Ehemalige Prämonstratenser-Chorfrauen-Stift Chotiezchau im
Pilsner Kreise Böhmens: Aus Tepler u. Chottiechauer Archivschriften (Thabor, 1840), as in
https://books.google.co.nz/books?id=q8IGAAAcAAJ&source=gbs_navlinks_s> [accessed 21
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161 Köpl, Robert Christoph, Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon 1815-1950 Online-Edition,
Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, updated November 2014,
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summary of the legend as told by Köpl shall be included at this point in Martin Krippner’s biography.

The Chotěšov monastery was founded by the wealthy Czech nobleman Hroznata (1170 – 1217).\textsuperscript{162} After the premature death of his wife and only son, Hroznata followed the call of the Holy Roman Emperor Frederick I (Barbarossa) to take up the cross and join the Third Crusade. However, upon arrival in Apulia and before crossing the Mediterranean Sea to reach the Holy Land, Hroznata and his troops abandoned the Crusade. It is said that Hroznata was overcome by fear after seeing the undulating waters of the sea. Hroznata returned to Rome and asked Pope Celestin III to release him from his pilgrimage and to allow him to found a monastery on his estate in West-Bohemia instead. With the Pope’s blessing, Hroznata returned home in the year 1193 and started to build the monasteries, in Teplá for friars and in Chotěšov for nuns of the Premonstratensian Order. Before Hroznata went on a second pilgrimage, now following the Holy Roman Emperor Henry VI on his Crusade, he bequeathed all his property to the monasteries at Teplá and Chotěšov. On his way to the Holy Land, Hroznata again stopped in Rome and asked Pope Celestine III for permission to join the Premonstratensian Order instead of fighting with the sword. His wish was granted, and the Pope issued documents which took the Teplá and Chotěšov monasteries under papal protection. Hroznata returned to Bohemia where he became a monk at the Teplá monastery. Today he is known as the Blessed Hroznata. He died on 14 July 1217 as a martyr after he was kidnapped and tortured by robber knights demanding ransom payments. Hroznata preferred to die rather than allowing the Teplá or Chotěšov monasteries to fulfil the robbers’ demands, so goes the explanation in Köpl’s account.

The figure of the Blessed Hroznata was officially celebrated as a hero: a former knight who exchanged his sword for a monk’s robe, who feared crossing the sea, and who, instead of re-conquering the Holy Land, organised the cultivation and Christianisation of the undeveloped border regions in his home country. That not everyone living in the Chotěšov County saw Hroznata as a role model can be imagined; some may have preferred, secretly, the brave Hussite General Jan Žižka, who went on commanding his army even after he had lost both of his

\textsuperscript{162} Köpl, \textit{Das Ehemalige Prémonstratenser-Chorfrauen-Stift}, pp. 3-7.
eyes. As later chapters of this biography will reveal, Martin Krippner, who entered the convent school at Teplá Abbey at the age of nine, most likely chose Hroznata as his hero.

2.2.6 Breaking with Family Traditions

Since 1774, formal schooling for boys and girls in the Austrian Empire started at the age of five or six. So-called Trivialschulen, elementary national schools, existed in every parish where a Catholic priest was available to oversee and conduct the teaching. For a payment of a small school fee, the Trivialschule offered two years of instruction in religion, reading, writing, and numeracy, as well as basic essay writing. In smaller towns, girls and boys were taught together. In their first year, the children attended two hours of school every weekday, during summer in the afternoon, and during winter in the morning. In their second year, the instruction increased to three hours per weekday, during summer in the morning and during winter in the afternoon. Martin Krippner would have attended the Trivialschule in Chotěšov. Like all churches and schools in the Chotěšov County, the Trivialschule stood under the patronage of the Premonstratensian Teplá Abbey. As a centre of education, Teplá Abbey had survived Emperor Joseph II reforms and was not dissolved, under the condition that the monks worked as parish priests, teachers and professors at the schools in the surrounding towns and villages. Thus, the parish priest and canon of the Premonstratensian order, Philipp Pinsker, whose name can be found in the entries at the Chotěšov parish register, was Martin Krippner’s first teacher.

According to his children’s memories, Martin Krippner entered a convent school when he was nine years old, his own or his parents’ intention being that he become a priest. Since the Chotěšov and Kladruby Abbeys had been dissolved,
it can be assumed that Martin was sent to Teplá Abbey. The decision to send their oldest son to a monastery instead of teaching him the trade of a blacksmith so that he could take over the smithy seems unusual. Perhaps Martin had no talent for a craftsman’s work but showed an aptitude for the priesthood instead. Martin Krippner’s son Rudolf, whose reminiscences were recorded by his daughter, noticed his father’s lack of manual skills; this seems surprising for someone descending from families who for generations had been farmers and blacksmiths and yet can be directly attributable to the nature of Martin’s formal education and later training.169

Before and after school hours, the boy Martin would have had to help in his father’s workshop: there was charcoal to fetch, the bellows to be pumped. Perhaps Martin despised such hard, dirty work, and wished to get away from the exhausting life of a peasant blacksmith. Usually, a blacksmith was treated by the community with respect for his skills and for his vital function in serving community needs; at times, however, blacksmiths were subject to superstition due to their handling of fire and metal. Living at the smithy, in the centre of the square at the heart of the village, was likely to have been both exciting and anxiety-inducing: every step taken could be seen and commented on by all. The smithy was often a place where farmers and other workers met, especially if there was no tavern in the village.170 Nothing would have escaped the villagers’ eyes, definitely not the fact that Martin was born shortly after his parents’ marriage. Martin’s lack of talent for the blacksmith’s craft and the circumstances of his birth might have caused continuing doubt as to whether the blacksmith Johannes Krippner was his real father. Perhaps Johannes Krippner sent Martin to the monastery so that his second surviving son, Michael, could take over the smithy one day?

In the year 1826 when Martin Krippner entered the convent school, another brother was born and named Johannes der Täufer, Johann Baptist. He died, only four months old.171 Perhaps it was the loss of three children, together with the harsh living toil of the blacksmith’s family that led Martin’s mother, Anna, who could not even write her own name, to the decision that her oldest son should get

169 Magdalena Krippner, p. 7.
an education and pursue a different life from that of a village blacksmith. It is also possible that Anna, who lost her father, brother and uncles during the Napoleonic Wars, wanted to spare her oldest son Martin from conscription to the Austrian Army once he turned eighteen years.

The question then arises: how were Martin Krippner’s parents able to afford a higher education for their son? The income of the smithy would not have permitted such a choice. Martin Krippner must have received one of the scholarships available at that time; due to a shortage of Catholic priests in Bohemia, suitable sons of poor families received financial assistance to study for the priesthood. Also, the convent school at Teplá Abbey offered four years of education, accommodation, food and clothing for boys of poor families. One could of course also speculate whether someone, who wished to remain anonymous, took a personal interest in Martin Krippner’s wellbeing and provided the means for the boy’s education.

Thus the nine-year-old Martin Krippner left his home village and went on a two-day-journey to reach Teplá Abbey north-west of Mantov close to the Bavarian border. Feeling both an outcast and a chosen one, pride and sadness must have filled his heart. Perhaps there and then the idea grew in Krippner that he needed to show his family and the people of his village his true capabilities. Instead of following in his grandfathers’ and father’s footsteps, Krippner aimed to emulate his hero Hroznata in performing great deeds to the glory of God, and also, and perhaps mainly, to receive human recognition.

♦♦♦
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2.3 Summary

Tauhia’s whakapapa recited by him at Native Land Court hearings and extracts from Bohemian parish registers obtained by Krippner’s grandchildren in order to prove ‘Aryan’ descent serve as starting points to reconstruct Te Hemara Tauhia’s and Martin Krippner’s line of ancestors and years of childhood. The two parallel narratives are embedded in the family, social and historical context into which each boy was born. Thus, the Kaipara – Mahurangi region in Aotearoa New Zealand and the Kingdom of Bohemia forming part of the Austrian Empire come into focus, spanning a timeframe from around 1600 to 1826.

Both boys – Tauhia, in being taught his whānau’s whakapapa, or Krippner by listening to stories about the heroes and significant historical events of his family’s region – would have developed a sense of identity influenced by oral historical accounts. Stories about the origins of the Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo hapū and the German-speaking peasants in Bohemia must have made Tauhia and Krippner aware of their ancestors’ migrant backgrounds. However, Tauhia’s ancestors had conquered other hapū’s lands and maintained their status as rangatira, while Krippner’s ancestors settled on new territory as subordinates labouring for their new feudal lords. While Tauhia was proud as a son of rangatira lineage, Krippner had to accept the inherited status of a peasant serf.

A closer look at legendary characters: Maki, for instance, the heroic ancestor of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo, or Hroznata, the founder of two monasteries in West Bohemia, helps us to understand what made Tauhia and Krippner become the kind of persons they grew to be. At the same time, the two stories about Maki and Hroznata offer valuable insights into the social and historical context in which Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo and German-speaking peasants in West Bohemia lived, at least up to the beginning of the nineteenth century. For example, the responsibilities arising from utu obligations and the interwoven kinship ties between Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo and hapū of the Waikato and Ngāpuhi iwi become apparent in the accounts of Maki and Murupaenga. The legend of Hroznata and the histories about the Hussite War and Thirty Years War illuminate the ‘German colonisation’ of the Czech lands, the gradual transformation of initially free farmers and artisans into peasant serfs, and the role the Catholic Church played during wars and in support of the feudal system based on compulsory unpaid labour carried out by peasants.
War is a shared characteristic of both societies. At the age of ten, Tauhia witnessed how his tupuna Murupaenga was killed and saw his hapū defeated at the Battle Te Ika-a-Ranganui. The world as he had known it was drowned in blood. Tauhia and the few survivors of his hapū were forced to flee from the territory occupied by his people for two centuries. Tauhia, who had enjoyed the status of a rangatira’s son, became a war captive. Multiple times Tauhia had seen his father, grandfather and granduncle go to war and return as heroes with war hostages and slaves in tow. Prior to Te Ika-a-Ranganui, the stories Tauhia heard about past battles were always told from the winner’s perspective. Now, finding himself on the losing side, he would have had no guidance how to live honourably in captivity. As a war captive, Tauhia must have felt degraded, and the utu demands of avenging the deaths of his mātua rested upon him and his surviving cousins. While enabling comprehension of Tauhia’s traumatic childhood experience, the accounts of the Battle Te Ika-a-Ranganui and its aftermath also provide insights into the cause and course of the Musket Wars led by the Ngāpuhi rangatira, Hongi Hika, and his allies.

Krippner, born two years after the end of the Napoleonic Wars, only heard about, rather than directly experienced, the suffering and loss of human lives caused by war. But he would have felt the effects of the recent war, which had resulted in increased tax burdens carried by the peasantry and compulsory conscription into the army for all male peasants aged 18 to 45. He experienced poverty and the death of three of his siblings. He saw his parents and the people of his home village Mantov working hard while Count Thurn and Taxis and his family resided in luxury in the former Chotěšov Abbey sitting on top of the hill.

Why the blacksmith Johannes Krippner sent his oldest son Martin to the convent school instead of teaching him the blacksmith’s craft is not known. Nevertheless, although he might have felt rejected by his father, Martin Krippner must have been proud at the prospect of receiving a better education than most of the other children in the village. For Krippner, whose ancestors held the status of peasant serfs for at least six generations, an opportunity emerged to cross social boundaries and to climb a step higher in society. The new environments Te Hemara Tauhia and Martin Krippner entered into in 1826, and how the two boys coped with new influences, people and ideas, will be shown in the following chapter.
3 Unexpected Education

In 1826 the nine-year-old Krippner and the eleven-year-old Tauhia left their familiar environments: Krippner was sent to a monastery to train and prepare for the priesthood; Tauhia was taken to enemy territory as a prisoner of war. No documents have survived or ever existed that could tell about their experiences, thoughts, or emotions during that time of upheaval. Remarks made decades later, for example, by Tauhia during Native Land Court hearings, or by Krippner in letters of application outlining his educational background, provide only brief references to the locations and persons the two boys, or young men, encountered. The little personal information available serves as a basis to reconstruct the environments Tauhia and Krippner each entered into. Histories of the localities and institutions, and biographical accounts of personalities known to have been of great influence in those spaces, help to show the respective social and cultural backgrounds of Tauhia’s and Krippner’s formative years from 1826 to 1840. In their new environments, both protagonists were exposed to thinking and behaviour that was challenging norms and rules officially accepted at the time. Tauhia and Krippner also enjoyed privileges and kindnesses not normally experienced by a prisoner of war or a peasant blacksmith’s son. Radical ideas and favourable treatment by their patrons planted in Tauhia and Krippner the will and confidence to take their lives into their own hands.
3.1 Te Hemara Tauhia: Among Enemies, Kin and Missionaries

3.1.1 Te Whareumu at Kororāreka

After the disastrous Battle Te Ika-a-Ranganui in 1825, the survivors of Tauhia’s whānau and hapū initially sought refuge in the Waikato. From there, after Hongi Hika and his forces caught up with the fleeing Ngāti Whātua, Tauhia and his people were taken as hostages by Te Whareumu. He was the leading rangatira of the Ngāti Manu hapū of the Ngāpuhi confederation of tribes, and his kāinga was situated at Kororāreka beach in the Bay of Islands. Like Pomare, who resided at the next bay south of Kororāreka, Te Whareumu shared kinship ties with Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo. Therefore, he must have felt some obligation to offer his relatives protection from Hongi Hika’s fury; otherwise, the entire Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo hapū might have been annihilated. Te Whareumu’s thirst for revenging the death of his father, killed by Ngāti Whātua warriors during the Battle at Moremonui, must have been satisfied by the fact that Murupaenga, the military leader of Ngāti Whātua, and many other Ngāti Whātua rangatira were killed during and in the aftermath of the Battle Te Ika-a-Ranganui. Now it was Te Whareumu’s duty to spare the lives of the few surviving Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo who would be absorbed into the Ngāti Manu hapū and no longer pose a threat to Ngāpuhi tribes. Also, Ngāti Whātua members living under his protection were valuable hostages or future peace negotiations, and they increased the strength of his labour and military forces.

Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo women and children worked in Ngāti Manu’s fields and gardens, and the surviving men joined Te Whareumu’s army of warriors. Thus, Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo came to take part in continuing military campaigns against Waikato and Hauraki tribes, as Tauhia stated in his evidence during the Hauturu Native Land Court hearing in 1886, ‘Nga Puhi went again to Waikato: the taua was composed of Nga Puhi and Ngati Whatua. Pomare was the principal chief of this party.’
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1 NLC, Hauturu Re-Hearing: 5 October 1886, Kaipara Minute Book 4, p. 15.
During one of these campaigns, in 1826, Pomare was killed and eaten by Waikato tribes at Te Rore at the river Waipa between Pirongia and Ohaupo. Apparently, nearly all of the Npāpuhi of Pomare’s taua were destroyed. Survivors fled; Pomare’s two sons were captured, but later released.\(^2\) After Pomare’s death, his nephew Whiria, rangatira of the Ngāti Manu at Waikare, assumed Pomare’s name as a reminder to avenge his death; he was to become known as Pomare II. He moved to Pomare I’s former pā at Matauwhi, next to Kororāreka where Te Whareumu and his dependents resided.\(^3\)

No accounts of Tauhia’s life under Te Whareumu’s patronage could be found. In his evidence given at the Native Land Court, Tauhia did not go into detail about his experience of exile, or captivity, in the Bay of Islands. An incident over half a century later, reported in the newspaper Auckland Star, indicates how sensitive this subject was for Tauhia: while at the Public Hotel at Mechanics Bay, Auckland, someone deliberately provoked Tauhia by mentioning that his mother had been taken as prisoner to the Bay of Islands. Tauhia regarded it as an insult and it came to a scuffle that was settled at the Police Court.\(^4\)

Perhaps, observations recorded by a Pākehā visiting Te Whareumu’s kāinga can help to sketch a picture of the world Tauhia had entered as an eleven-year-old boy. Augustus Earle, a painter from London, travelled to New Zealand and stayed with Captain Duke in a hut next to Te Whareumu’s house from late 1827 until April 1828. Earle’s account of travels in the Bay of Islands and Hokianga was published in London in 1832, and it is rated as one of the best descriptions of life in New Zealand prior to colonisation.\(^5\)

Earle regarded Te Whareumu, known to him as ‘Shulitea’ or ‘King George’, as his friend and described him as ‘a most humane and intelligent chief, and

\(^2\) Angela Ballara, Taua, p. 227; NLC, Important Judgments: Delivered in the Compensation Court and Native Land Court: 1866–1879 (Auckland, 1879), as in <http://nzetc.victoria.ac.nz/tm/scholarly/tei-NatImpo-t1-g1-g2-t6-body1-d20.html>, [accessed 10 May 2015], pp. 73 - 74.


\(^4\) ‘Police Court: This Day’, Auckland Star, 6 May 1881, p. 2, as in Papers Past, National Library of New Zealand <https://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/>, [accessed 28 October 2016]; the circumstances of this incident will be coser examined in Chapter 6.1. of this thesis.

\(^5\) Earle, Narrative.
particularly kind to all the English. Te Whareumu and other local rangatira had established trading relationships with incoming Pākehā whalers, and a few Pākehā had settled in the vicinity of Kororāreka. Potatoes, pork, timber, sex services and, apparently Pomare I’s speciality, preserved tattooed heads, were the most important commodities of exchange for muskets, gunpowder, iron tools, blankets, and textiles. Whenever a Pākehā vessel anchored near Kororāreka beach, Te Whareumu and his wives – Earle mentioned three wives – and his children made an effort to welcome and visit the captain and crew. Sensing profitability in long-term trade with the Pākehā, Te Whareumu prevented other hapū from trying to plunder or attack incoming vessels.

Figure 7 The Residence of Shulitea Chief of Kororadika [i.e. Kororareka] Bay of Islands by Augustus Earle

6 Earle, Narrative, pp. 53 - 54.
8 George Lillie Craik and Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge (Great Britain), The New Zealanders (London: Charles Knight, 1830), p. 218, as in <https://archive.org/stream/newzealandersby00craigoog#page/n12/mode/2up> [accessed 21 April 2016].
9 Earle, Narrative, p. 163.
10 Earle, Narrative, p. 55.
At Kororāreka, Tauhia would have observed for the first time in his life how Māori and Pākehā lived and traded with each other. From this coexistence, Te Whareumu and his hapū were able to procure muskets and other Pākehā products; it also influenced how Te Whareumu and other Ngāpuhi rangatira responded to breaches of tapu and events that normally demanded human sacrifices as utu payments. Like all respectable leading rangatira, Te Whareumu had many slaves who, in Earle’s eyes, were subjected to tyranny and treated like machines.\(^{12}\)

Slaves were mostly undernourished, their heads half-shorn, and they constantly feared being punished and killed as payment for the misfortune of members of the host-tribe. Earle witnessed how the body of a sixteen-year-old female slave of Pomare II from the neighbouring kāinga was prepared for the umu (oven). Earle and Captain Duke retrieved the remains of the slave and buried them. Hearing of this incident, Te Whareumu warned the two Pākehā that they could have been killed for interfering with customs. He explained that although he himself no longer ate human flesh ‘out of compliment to you white men’, he could not demand such change of attitude from his fellow hapū members.\(^{13}\) Te Whareumu was also supposed to have pointed out the small difference between how Māori and Pākehā punished a runaway slave, or servant, ‘the only difference in our law is, you flog and hang, but we shoot and eat.’\(^{14}\)

On another occasion, Earle provided shelter for a rangatira of a Hauraki tribe who had been involved in the killing and eating of Pomare I. Te Whareumu, supported by his warriors, demanded that Earle surrender the Hauraki rangatira. However, after Earle threatened to leave Kororāreka and settle at another hapū’s kāinga, Te Whareumu gave up his utu demands and let the Hauraki rangatira live.\(^{15}\) These two incidents illustrate Te Whareumu’s deviance of custom and great tolerance towards his Pākehā visitors whose presence he highly valued; such an extreme revision of customary attitudes and priorities would have been noticed by Te Whareumu’s dependants.

Slaves, together with commoners, worked in the gardens, felled timber, went fishing, collected seafood and performed domestic duties as servants for the rangatira families. Slave girls and women aged nine to twenty years were sent to

---


\(^{13}\) Earle, *Narrative*, p. 121.

\(^{14}\) Earle, *Narrative*, p. 121.

\(^{15}\) Earle, *Narrative*, pp. 184-94.
the ships and, according to Captain d’Urville, who had anchored in the Bay of Islands in 1824, passed ‘on to everyone in turn’, while the chiefs collected the payments. Some girls were ‘married’ to captains and sailors for a few months, and when the ship departed the girls were ‘divorced’ and sent back to their masters. It is possible that such was the destiny of the girls and women of Tauhia’s hapū.

No accounts tell of the life of Tauhia’s older sister Kotare. Perhaps her status as the first-born daughter of a rangatira protected her from being forced into prostitution. It can be assumed that she was regarded and treated as a puhi, a virgin maiden, who would be given as a wife to a rangatira in order to form an alliance or to cement peace between enemy tribes. Records of Native Land Court hearings confirm that she survived the Battle Te Ika-a-Ranganui, and that she later became the wife of Arama Karaka Haututu, a leading rangatira of the Te Uri o Hau hapū of Ngāti Whātua.

While Te Whareumu had been the main initiator of the 1825 campaign against Ngāti Whātua, Earle noticed Te Whareumu’s preference for peace over war among the tribes. During his short stay at Kororāreka, Earle witnessed on two occasions how Te Whareumu prevented violent conflicts. Nevertheless, preparations for military defence and new campaigns, for example, to revenge the death of Pomare I, were on-going. Fortifications at a nearby pā were improved, and the men practised using their weapons. Tauhia, then a twelve-year-old boy, would have received his military training under Te Whareumu, who continually grew his contingent of warriors. According to a Ngāpuhi witness at a Native Land Court hearing in 1876, Te Whareumu had assembled 1600 men under his command during the attack of Waima in the Hokianga which led to Te Whareumu’s death in 1828.

---

16 Jules Dumont d'Urville and Helen Rosenman, An Account in Two Volumes of Two Voyages to the South Seas by Captain ... Jules S-C Dumont D'Urville of the French Navy to Australia, New Zealand, Oceania 1826-1829 in the Corvette Astrolabe and to the Straits of Magellan, Chile, Oceania, South East Asia, Australia, Antarctica, New Zealand and Torres Strait 1837-1840 in the Corvettes Astrolabe and Zélée, 2 vols (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1987), I, p. 106.
17 Wolfe, p. 66.
18 The life of a puhi from Te Arawa taken hostage by Hongi Hika during the attack at Mokoia Island is portrayed in Alfred Denis Foley, Jane's Story: Biography of Heeni Te Kirikaramu / Pore (Jane Foley): Woman of Profound Purpose (Auckland, N.Z.: A.D. Foley, 2004).
19 NLC, Waihakari Succession Hearing: 8 and 13 March 1877, Kaipara Minute Book 3, p. 238.
20 NLC, Te Arawhatatotara No. 2: 13 November 1876, Northern Minute Book 3, p. 286.
3.1.2 Missionary School in Paihia

In addition to Pākehā whalers and traders frequenting Kororārea, Tauhia would have encountered, or at least heard of, ngā mihinari, the missionaries, who had settled under Hongi Hika’s patronage at Paihia across the bay opposite Te Whareumu’s kāinga. The missionary settlement, founded in 1823 by the Church Missionary Society, was called ‘Marsden Vale’ in honour of the Reverend Samuel Marsden. Here lived the Reverend Henry Williams, the assistant missionaries William Fairburn, W. Puckey and W. Puckey, Jnr, together with their families. In 1826, just after Hongi Hika had returned from his campaign against Ngāti Whātua, the missionaries at Paihia were joined by Deacon William Williams and Catechist James Hamlin, known as ‘Te Hemara’, a Māori transliteration of ‘Hamlin’.\(^\text{21}\) Hamlin’s first role in New Zealand was teaching at the local missionary school, and it is highly likely that Tauhia adopted Hamlin’s name when baptized in 1841.\(^\text{22}\)

During his stay at Kororārea, Earle observed occasional public worship conducted by the missionaries. While Te Whareumu and other local rangatira listened politely to the missionaries’ sermons, they did not embrace the idea of eternal punishment for sinners, and they regarded the missionaries’ religion as meant only for Pākehā. According to Earle, the rangatira burst into ‘loud laughs’ when the missionaries tried to convince them that ‘all men’ had to face God’s Final Judgement.\(^\text{23}\) Nevertheless, it is highly likely that Te Whareumu also sent children of his hapū to the mission school at Paihia. According to reports published in the Missionary Register, ‘chiefs were eager to send their sons and some of their daughters to school.’\(^\text{24}\) Marianne Williams, the wife of Reverend Henry Williams, wrote in a letter on 5 July 1826 that shortly after the news of Pomare I’s death reached the missionaries, two boys from Kororārea were brought over to join the school at Paihia, which at that time was attended by about

---

\(^\text{21}\) H. J. Ryburn, *Te Hemara: James Hamlin*.
\(^\text{22}\) James Hamlin, *Diary of James Hamlin*, p. 40; Wellington, Archives New Zealand (Archives NZ), Paihia/Kororareka: Register of Marriages, 1830 – 1841; Baptisms 1823 – 1840; Burials 1830 – 1842, MICRO 2793.
45 men, boys and girls. Quite possibly one was Tauhia, who at some stage learned to read and write in Te Reo Māori and to understand and speak the English language. Unfortunately, no definitive evidence could be found; names of pupils were seldom recorded, and their attendance varied from week to week. However, it is highly plausible that Te Whareumu sent the mokopuna (grandchild) of Murupaenga, the archenemy of Ngāpuhi, to the mission school, where he was better protected from the potential harm that might have been inflicted by utu obligations, especially after the death of Pomare I.

Assuming Tauhia attended the Paihia mission school, the life he encountered there formed an extreme contrast to his existence at Te Whareumu’s kāinga. At the mission school, the pupils’ hair was cut short and, according to Earle, ‘they were habited in the most uncouth dresses imaginable.’ While at Kororārea all actions focused on procuring weapons and preparing for military defence or new campaigns seeking utu for the slain Pomare I, at Paihia all warlike behaviour was condemned. Whether or not Tauhia was aware that the missionaries took part in the trade with muskets, which gave Ngāpuhi warriors an advantage over Tauhia’s hapū and other tribes living in the south of New Zealand, remains debatable. The former missionary George Clarke later noted in his diary: ‘Had not the Bay of Islanders been supplied with arms and made superior to the Natives of the Southward, no mission could ever have been formed.’

Under Te Whareumu, Tauhia was considered a hostage or prisoner of war, but at the mission school, he was a child among other children, interacting with the children of other rangatira as well as Pākehā children, for example, James Hamlin’s oldest son. That the missionaries regarded all Māori, whether rangatira or taurekareka (slaves), as a ‘savage people’, inferior to their own British ‘race’, might not have occurred to him. On the contrary, Tauhia never gave up his deeply

26 Letter by Jane Williams (the wife of William Williams), 23 May 1827, cited in Fitzgerald, p. 133.
27 Earle, Narrative, p. 39.
28 Ryburn, p. 28.
29 Hamlin, p. 40.
held belief that Māori and Pākehā ought to regard and respect each other as equals.\textsuperscript{30}

Apart from instructions in Christian religion in the form of prayers and hymns, and reading and writing in Te Reo Māori, the pupils at the mission school had to perform domestic duties and help in the gardens and workshops of the carpenter and blacksmith. To what extent an eleven-or twelve-year-old boy was interested in learning about a foreign religion remains questionable; however, he certainly would have been curious to observe the habits and practices of the Pākehā. While most of their behaviour and material objects might have appeared strange, for example, their clothing, or the harsh disciplining of their children, other aspects seemed familiar, for example, their prayers and hymns, and the fact that slaves of the local rangatira worked as servants for the missionaries.\textsuperscript{31} What might have impressed him most was the missionaries’ courage to live in an unfamiliar environment without their own warriors and fortifications, but with an enormous trust in the power of their atua (god) to protect them.

3.1.3 Deaths of Hongi Hika and Te Whareumu

Hongi Hika, the most feared warrior of Ngāpuhi, was wounded by a bullet during a campaign against Ngāti Pou in December 1826. The person who shot at him was Maratea, a warrior related to Ngāti Pou and Te Taoū hapū of Ngāti Whātua.\textsuperscript{32} The news of Hongi Hika’s injury and the prospect that he might die caused great concern in the Bay of Islands. While Hongi Hika’s allies expected an attack by his enemies from the southern tribes, Tauhia and other Ngāti Whātua captives living in the Bay of Islands must have feared for their lives as utu obligations demanded that they be killed any time.

Despite his injury, Hongi Hika did not give up his role as main war leader of the Ngāpuhi tribes. During February and March 1827, while he lay wounded at his new residence at Whangaroa, Hongi Hika encouraged the Ngāpuhi warriors to start the campaign seeking utu for Pomare I.\textsuperscript{33} Hongi Hika was not able to take

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{30} Equal in rights and equal in responsibilities, as expressed, for example, in Tauhia’s speeches at the Orakei Parliament in 1879 and at the Kotahitanga Māori Parliament held in 1884 at Aotea (Shelley Beach), see chapter 7.1 of this thesis.
\textsuperscript{31} Letter by Marianne Williams, 11 February 1824, cited in Fitzgerald, p. 81.
\end{flushleft}
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part in this campaign. The Ngāpuhi taua returned defeated from the Tāmaki region after having faced an equally armed and numerically stronger force of Waikato and Ngāti Whātua warriors.34

While most warriors of the Bay of Islands, among them Pomare II, were away on the Waikato campaign, Hongi Hika decided to visit Te Whareumu at Kororāreka. Earle described the hākari (feast) at Te Whareumu’s kāinga in honour of Hongi Hika’s visit. Besides expressions of respect and laments over Hongi Hika’s injury, Earle also sensed caution and fear among Te Whareumu’s people, and consequently a great relief when Hongi Hika’s party departed without attacking Kororāreka.35

In the following year, on 3 March 1828, Hongi Hika died from the infection of his wound.36 Five days later, Te Whareumu, Hongi Hika’s anticipated successor as military leader in the Bay of Islands, was killed during a campaign in the Hokianga, seeking utu for the death of Pomare I’s son Tiki. Against all expectations, the deaths of two of the leading rangatira in the Bay of Islands did not lead to a disastrous war in the region. Upon the express wish of the dying Hongi Hika, no slaves were killed to accompany him into the realm of spirits. Whether some of Te Whareumu’s slaves were killed is not known. Instead of rekindling inter-Ngāpuhi fighting, the leading rangatira and warriors of the various Ngāpuhi hapū from Hokianga and the Bay of Islands met at Kerikeri to negotiate peace within this region.37 Apparently, the Reverend Henry Williams played an important part in those negotiations, and the inter-hapū fighting in the Bay of Islands stopped at least temporarily.38 Kiwikiwi, Te Whareumu’s younger brother, became the new leading rangatira of Ngāti Manu at Kororāreka beach, soon to be overshadowed by the more influential Pomare II residing at Matauwhi.39 Life at Kororāreka and trade with incoming Pākehā vessels continued undisturbed for the next two years.

34 Locker, p. 35; S. P. Smith, ‘Wars of the Northern Against the Southern Tribes’, p. 20.  
35 Earle, Narrative, p. 71.  
37 Urlich Cloher, pp. 287, 290-91.  
38 Wilson, Kororāreka & Other Essays, p. 63; S. P. Smith, Maori Wars, p. 399.  
39 Ballara, Pomare II.
3.1.4 Refuge with Pomare II

Peace did not last. In March 1830, northern Ngāpuhi tribes attacked Kororākeka. Although the take of this war was said to be a dispute between Kiwikiwi’s wife and the daughters of Hongi Hika and Rewa, who lived with Captain Brind at Kororākeka, the underlying motive was a fight over access to Kororākeka as an important trading post. This violent conflict, known as the ‘Girls War’, involved over a thousand warriors fighting in support of Ururoa, Hongi Hika’s brother-in-law, on one side, and Kiwikiwi on the other.40 Whether Tauhia, then fifteen years old, was involved in the fighting is not known.

Wounded warriors and women and children were brought on board a whaling ship anchored off Kororākeka, and many retreated to the Paihia mission station. According to the missionary Richard Davies’ account of the battle, nearly one hundred were killed and wounded.41 The missionaries played an important part in peace negotiations. The historian Angela Ballara explains how opposing rangatira declared peace in the name of missionaries, which allowed rangatira to keep their mana:

They could not have done so in their own names without loss of mana on one side or the other, since the requirements for proper utu for the deaths and wounding of chiefs of rank had not been satisfied.42

As a result of the ‘Girls War’, Titore and Rewa of the northern Ngāpuhi tribes took over the leadership of Kororākeka, while Ngāti Manu were forced to withdraw.43 Kiwikiwi and his people stayed at Paihia until they retreated to Otuihu, six miles south of Kororākeka, where Pomare II had built a new pā offering refuge for Kiwikiwi’s people. Thus, Tauhia and the survivors of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo came to live under Pomare II’s patronage.

Otuihu quickly developed into a new landing and trading place for incoming Pākehā vessels. According to descriptions by the local missionaries, Otuihu was characterized by drunkenness and prostitution, and it soon gained a worse reputation than Kororākeka, which was known by contemporaries as ‘the hell-hole

40 S. P. Smith, *Maori Wars of the Nineteenth Century*, pp. 422 - 23.
41 Letter by Richard Davis, 6 March 1830, cited in Fitzgerald, p. 178.
of the Pacific’.\footnote{44} According to historian Ormund Wilson, Pomare II himself managed the grog-selling and prostitution businesses; he encouraged gambling, and he became addicted to alcohol.\footnote{45}

Tauhia and his people depended on Pomare II’s protection, and in return, they had to support his trading and military campaigns. During a Native Land Court hearing in 1876, Tauhia mentioned taking part in Pomare II’s attack on Waipoua pā in the Hokianga, where some of Tauhia’s relatives of Te Uri-o-Hau hapū lived as refugees under Parore. Tauhia was about twenty years old when this attack took place in 1835:

I was in the fight in which Maratea was killed. I was among Pomare’s party – my people were with him. We went from the Bay of Islands to Pakanae to attend a hui. We were almost at Pakanae when a message came to say that Maratea had been killed. The Ngati Korokoi [Korokoro] and our party at once started to help. To fight against Parore’s party. This was a fight of the tribes amongst themselves. We came to Waipoua where Parore had a pa. We attacked the pa, the fighting lasted a day. When we, that is Moetara, Pomare and our party got to the scene of action, Moetara interfered and peace was made. After peace our party went back to Pakanae and from there returning to the Bay of Islands.\footnote{46}

In the same year, on 28 October 1835, Pomare II set his sign under He Whakaputanga o te Rangatiratanga o Nu TIREN, the Declaration of Independence of New Zealand at a meeting in Waitangi.\footnote{47} News had been circulated that the French Baron Charles Philippe Hippolyte de Thierry wanted to establish a French colony in New Zealand. British Resident Busby, who had arrived in 1833 to keep law and order among the Europeans living in New Zealand, took these rumours as a pretext to draw up He Whakaputanga/The Declaration of Independence to prevent other nations from annexing New Zealand.\footnote{48} Although Busby regarded de

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{44} Wolfe, pp. 7, 65.
\item \footnote{45} Wilson, p. 87; see also Ballara, \textit{Pomare II}.
\item \footnote{48} Wolfe, p. 79.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Thierry – known as a bankrupt and imposter whose self-declaration as ‘King of the Marquesas Islands and New Zealand’ was ridiculed even in Austrian newspapers49 – as a ‘madman’, and he did not understand de Thierry’s ambitious plans as sanctioned by the French government, Busby was concerned that de Thierry or other European powers could potentially interfere with Māori and British interests in New Zealand.50 *He Whakaputanga/The Declaration of Independence* guaranteed ‘all sovereign power and authority’ over New Zealand’s territory to the United Tribes of New Zealand and acknowledged His Majesty, the King of England, as the protector of this infant state of New Zealand ‘from all attempts upon its independence.’51 In his dispatch to the Governor of New South Wales, Sir Richard Bourke, on 31 October 1835, Busby justified the signing of *He Whakaputanga* with the argument that:

> The establishment of the Independence of the Country under the protection of the British Government would be the most effectual mode of making the Country a dependency of the British Empire in everything but name.52

Pomare II’s motivations to sign *He Whakaputanga* are not known. According to the findings of Waitangi Tribunal inquiries as to the significance of *He Whakaputanga* and *Te Tiriti o Waitangi* (Treaty of Waitangi) as understood by Ngāpuhi rangatira at the time of signing, the key reasons for ratifying *He Whakaputanga* were to assert their mana and rangatiratanga over their territories in interaction with non-Māori and to further an alliance between Māori and Britain in order to provide mutual protection and good trading relationships with the British and other Pākehā.53 Perhaps, Pomare II and other Ngāpuhi rangatira also regarded such a formal agreement of mutual protection as a strategic advantage should it come to renewed conflicts with southern iwi such as Ngāti

49 ‘Provinzialnachricht’, *Der Siebenbürger Bote*, 9 July 1836, pp. 1–2, as in Anno: Historische Zeitchungen und Zeitschriften, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek <http://anno.onb.ac.at>, [accessed 1 May 2016]; years later, an Austrian satirical newspaper reported that De Thierry had been cooked and eaten by New Zealand chiefs, see ‘Neuigkeits-Plauderer’, *Der Humorist*, 16 June 1845, p. 572, as in Anno: Historische Zeitchungen und Zeitschriften, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek <http://anno.onb.ac.at>, [accessed 1 May 2016].
51 New Zealand History Online, *The 1835 Declaration of Independence*.
Whātua and Waikato who had regained strength in the Tāmaki region. Whether Tauhia accompanied Pomare II to this signing hui at Waitangi is not clear.

Tauhia formed a close relationship with Pomare II. He must have earned Pomare’s trust and respect which is shown in the fact that, after Pomare II’s death in 1850, Tauhia became the guardian of Pomare’s two sons, Wiremu and Hare.\(^{54}\) Tauhia was not only a valuable hostage because of his whakapapa, crucial for peace negotiations with Ngāti Whātua starting around October 1838\(^ {55}\), he also became indispensable to Pomare II for his linguistic and other cross-cultural skills acquired at the mission school and in interaction with other Pākehā living at Pomare’s pā. However, while gaining a position as Pomare’s trusted partner, Tauhia had not given up hope for a revival of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo as an independent hapū and for their return to ancestral lands. Tauhia would have heard about recent defeats of Ngāpuhi warriors by Ngāti Whātua and Waikato forces, for example, during the battle at Whangarei in 1832, which Tauhia denoted in his evidence at a Native Land Court hearing as ‘the final ending of the fights’ between Ngāpuhi and Ngāti Whātua.\(^ {56}\) After that battle, Ngāti Whātua gradually returned from exile in the Waikato.\(^ {57}\) The people of Ngāti Whātua, under the leadership of Te Kawau, had gifted land at Onehunga and Awhitu to Te Wherowhero and his people, so that they could settle in Tāmaki and offer support to the severely diminished Ngāti Whātua.\(^ {58}\)

Perhaps, Ngāpuhi’s recently lost battles with Ngāti Whātua and Waikato and the signing of *He Whakaputanga* gave Tauhia the impression that the mana of the Ngāpuhi hapū, who kept Tauhia and his people as hostages, was waning. Also, Tauhia would have often witnessed Pomare II in a state of drunkenness, which revealed a weaker side of his master and relative. Thus, Tauhia might have sensed by the late 1830s that the time was coming to restore his and his hapū’s mana.

---

\(^{54}\) See Wiremu Pomare's evidence at NLC, Hauturu Re-Hearing: 7 - 13 October 1886, Kaipara Minute Book 5, p. 38; the two sons, Wiremu and Hare, are from Pomare II's marriage to a woman from Ngāti Raukawa, see 'Papers Relative to the Working of the Native Land Court Acts', in *AJHR*, Session I - 1871, A-02a, pp. 1-51 (p. 35), as in *Papers Past*, National Library of New Zealand <https://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/parliamentary>, [accessed 29 October 2016].

\(^{55}\) NLC, Orakei Hearing: 31 October 1868 - 9 February 1869, Orakei Minute Book 2, p. 60

\(^{56}\) Hauturu Re-Hearing: 7 - 13 October 1886, p. 16.

\(^{57}\) Hauturu Re-Hearing: 7 - 13 October 1886, p. 16.

Part of recovering his identity was to acquire and maintain knowledge of his hapū’s whakapapa and history. Over three decades later, during hearings at the Native Land Court, Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo claimants referred to Te Hemara Tauhia when asked to recite their whakapapa. This shows that Tauhia had become an expert in his ancestors’ knowledge while other members of his hapū either lost such knowledge during the years in exile or were too low in status to have been instructed. Perhaps, it was Tauhia’s mother, Te Anini, who took on the task of preparing her son for his role as rangatira while living in the Bay of Islands.

In March 1837, fighting broke out between the Otuihu-based Ngāti Manu under Pomare II and their rivals Rewa and Titore, living at Kororāke. Samuel Marsden, who had arrived at that time for his last visit to New Zealand, together with Henry Williams and William Colenso, tried in vain to negotiate peace between the two war parties, which were supported on both sides by Pākehā who had settled in their pā. Marsden wrote in his diary:

Pomare’s pa is very strong. It appears to be impossible for Titore to take it.
A few days ago, Titore sent eight hundred men, in forty-two war canoes, to attack Pomare’s pa, but they returned, after much firing on both sides without effect.

The war lasted till July 1837, resulting in about 30 to 50 Māori deaths; peace was restored after the deaths of Titore and a rangatira of the southern Ngāpuhi alliance. Captain William Hobson, who, together with James Busby, visited the missionaries at Paihia in May 1837, had also witnessed this conflict. Hobson’s and Busby’s reports to the War and Colonial Offices in London, in addition to petitions from the missionaries and some local rangatira asking the British Government to provide protection for this island, contributed to Hobson’s later appointment and return to New Zealand as Lieutenant-Governor in February 1840. This war was Tauhia’s last engagement in a violent conflict between

---


61 Waitangi Tribunal, He Whakaputanga me te Tiriti, p. 208.

62 Journal entry by Marianne Williams, 29 May 1837, cited in Fitzgerald, p. 239.

63 Waitangi Tribunal, He Whakaputanga me te Tiriti, pp. 208-09.
tribes. His master, Pomare II, must have favoured the profits of trade in times of peace over the losses suffered in times of war because thenceforth he concentrated on commercial business and sales of land to Pākehā.

3.1.5 Peace Negotiations with Ngāti Whātua in Tāmaki

In his evidence given during the Orakei Native Land Court hearing in 1868, Tauhia mentioned a first journey to Tāmaki together with Pomare II in early summer 1838. Accompanied by the consul of the United States, Captain James Clendon, and 60 of Pomare II’s men, they travelled on board the missionary vessel *Columbine*. Although Tauhia did not state so, it can be assumed that the main purpose of this journey was to enter into peace negotiations between Pomare’s branch of Ngāpuhi and the various hapū of Ngāti Whātua who had returned from the Waikato and settled at the Tāmaki isthmus.

Captain Clendon’s interest in this journey was his desire to buy land in the Tāmaki region. In 1830, while anchored at Kororāreka, Captain Clendon, a ship owner and merchant from London, had bought land at Okiato from Pomare II and Kiwikiwi. Okiato lies between Kororāreka and Otuihu pā, the latter being Pomare’s and Kiwikiwi’s new residence after being forced out of Kororāreka. Whether the deal was made before or after the ‘Girls War’ is not clear. However, selling the land at Okiato to a Pākehā captain and merchant might have been a strategic move, thus creating a kind of buffer zone between the rival rangatira, Titore and Rewa at Kororāreka, and Pomare II and Kiwikiwi at Otuihu. Perhaps, in 1839 Clendon entertained the idea of a similar deal: the acquisition of land lying between Ngāpuhi and Ngāti Whātua territory.

After anchoring off Maraetai and staying with Ngāti Pāoa for two days, the *Columbine* sailed to Okahu, where they finally met with the three hapū, Te Taoū, Ngā Oho and Uringutu, of the Ngāti Whātua confederation of tribes. Tauhia stated in his evidence to the Native Land Court that he met with his grandfather there; however, he did not mention a name. Whether he was referring to his maternal grandfather, Te Urungatapu, or his paternal grandfather, Te Huia, or to a relative of his grandparents’ generation is not clear. The term ‘tupuna’, grandparent, is not

64 Orakei Hearing: 31 October 1868 - 9 February 1869, pp. 56-60.
specific in this regard. Te Kawau, who had united the three hapū of Ngāti Whātua under his leadership, presented the visitors from the Bay of Islands with a waka named ‘Te Keene’ after the Ngāti Whātua rangatira Te Keene Tangaroa. Tauhia said the waka was given to his father.66 Again, Tauhia did not mention a name, and since his biological father most likely had been killed during the Battle Te Ika-a-Ranganui, he must have either referred to a stepfather or else regarded Pomare II as his matua, or parent.67 A waka given to Pomare II by Ngāti Whātua could be understood as a token of peace between the former opponents at the Battle Te Ika-a-Ranganui.

During their week’s stay at Okahu, Tauhia accompanied Clendon, inspecting the surrounding land. Clendon expressed his interest in buying land, and after the Ngāti Whātua rangatira agreed to Clendon settling among them, Clendon gave Te Kawau and Te Tinana a Spanish Doubloon worth three pounds as down-payment for the land.68 Both the presentation of a waka to Pomare II and the handing over of land to Clendon, who was understood to be associated with Pomare II and also with his rivals at Kororāreka, could be regarded as a first step of establishing peace between the Ngāti Whātua and Ngāpuhi.69 However, Tauhia and his hapū were not yet released from captivity to join their Ngāti Whātua relatives. The 60 followers of Pomare II paddled the waka back to the Bay of Islands, and Tauhia returned with Pomare II and Clendon on board the *Columbine*.70

Tauhia stayed with Pomare II for a few more years, serving as a cross-cultural mediator and fulfilling his role as a token of a still fragile peace. Seeing and speaking with the rangatira and relatives of Ngāti Whātua at Tāmaki had given Tauhia a sense of relief and hope that his time in captivity would come soon to an end. While still present in the Bay of Islands, Tauhia came to witness the arrival of Lieutenant-Governor William Hobson and the signing of Te Tiriti, the Treaty of Waitangi, in 1840.

---
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3.2 Martin Krippner: Between Monastery, Village and Metropolis

3.2.1 Pupil at Teplá Abbey

The Teplá Abbey is located on a mountain plateau, 600 metres above sea level, about 44 kilometres north-west of Mantov, close to the border of Bavaria. Although the name Teplá means ‘warm’ in Czech, this nomenclature does not refer to the location’s climate. In 1857, the Austrian writer I. F. Castelli travelled in the Teplá region and called it the ‘Bohemian desert’, where fruit trees bear no fruit and no wheat ripens because of frosts and low temperatures even in summer. Rather, the word ‘warm’ refers to the thermal mineral springs issuing into the Teplá River after which the region is named. The land belonged to the Premonstratensian Teplá Abbey, which was founded by Hroznata in 1193. Under the direction of the entrepreneurial Abbot Karl Prokop Reitenberger (1779 - 1860), the famous spa town Mariánské Lázně/Marienbad, sixteen kilometres west of Teplá, was established in 1818. It attracted aristocrats, wealthy burghers and artists from all over Europe; the operation of spa baths and the sale of bottled mineral water proved a valuable source of income for the monastery.

By the first decade of the nineteenth century, the Teplá Abbey had developed into an important educational and scientific centre in the Austrian Empire. Many canons of Teplá Abbey became university professors and writers. Among the guests who regularly visited the spa town Mariánské Lázně was the celebrated German writer Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749 – 1832). Goethe also visited Teplá Abbey, where he admired the monastery’s library, its collection of minerals and the natural history cabinet. Goethe developed a friendship with Abbot Reitenberger and two other members of the canon, both of whom were professors.

---
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at the Plzeň grammar school, where Martin Krippner would later continue his education.75

Figure 8 Teplá Abbey in 201376

In 1826, the year Krippner arrived at Teplá Abbey, Abbot Reitenberger was forced to resign. Although church authorities saw in Abbot Reitenberger a supporter of the Catholic Restoration and an opponent of the anti-clerical Josephine reforms, his ideas of religious tolerance and his friendship with Goethe, who declared himself a ‘non-Christian’, and the Abbot’s worldly engagement with the spa town Mariánské Lázně, were viewed with suspicion and envy by the Prague bishop and by some of the canons at Teplá Abbey. Following accusations of financial mismanagement from official quarters, Abbot Reitenberger was
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moved to the Wilten monastery near Innsbruck. Teplá’s new abbot, Adolf Koppmann, was elected in 1828.

Thus, for the first two years of Krippner’s stay at Teplá Abbey, there was no abbot. However, it can be doubted that Krippner paid attention to or thought about the monastery’s politics. At first after arriving at Teplá Abbey, Martin was probably amazed at the sight of the impressive buildings of the monastery. He was very likely to have been intrigued by the Baroque paintings and architecture of the monastic complex and entranced by the white garb of the Premonstratensian canons, such a sharp contrast to the dirty work clothes of a blacksmith. But soon, like most nine-year-old boys, he very likely felt homesick and might have struggled to adapt to monastic discipline. He probably studied hard for exams in order not to disappoint his parents or the sponsors who made possible his stay at this prestigious centre of education. Whether the monastery’s pupils were allowed access to the famous library, and whether they had a chance to view the mineral collection and the natural history cabinet with its three electrostatic generators built by one of the canons, is not known. There are no records of Martin Krippner’s time at the monastery. Questions as to whether he was allowed to visit his family during the summer holidays, and how he got on with his teachers and fellow students, remain unanswered. We will never know whether he experienced discrimination because of his social background or whether he was exposed to sexual abuse, a question that is so often voiced today when consideration is given to the practice of entrusting children to the care of celibate men or women at religious institutions. Perhaps, the experiences of the pupils at Teplá Abbey were not so different from those as described by the former Capuchin monk, Franz Amman, whose book published in 1841 exposed the monks’ abuse of pupils and novices at various monasteries in Switzerland.

---
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According to memories of his daughter, Krippner left the monastery at age thirteen. However, he did not return home to learn the trade of a blacksmith: Krippner was accepted to study at the Gymnasium in Plzeň, a grammar school that also stood under the direction of the Teplá Abbey. Thus, Krippner must have achieved outstanding results during the four years of education offered at Teplá, to have been accepted at the prestigious Plzeň grammar school.

### 3.2.2 Student at Plzeň Grammar School and Philosophical Institute

Krippner’s experiences as high school and as a university student can be reconstructed on the basis of family lore passed on by Krippner’s daughter and granddaughter, by references in formal letters written by Krippner himself and by an unidentified author, and by entries in the Catalogues of Listeners at the Faculty of Law at Charles University in Prague. Statistics and newspaper articles of that time, diary entries and letters by one of his high school teachers, as well as general accounts describing the education system in the Austrian Empire during the first half of the nineteenth century provide background information for illustrating the environment in which Krippner received his formal education.

From 1830 to 1835, Martin Krippner studied at the Gymnasium Pilsen, a grammar school, and from 1835 to 1837 at the Philosophische Lehranstalt, a philosophical institute; both were in the city of Plzeň in West-Bohemia. The Gymnasium and the Philosophische Lehranstalt stood under the direction of Teplá Abbey: the schools’ prefect and teachers were canons of the Premonstratensian order. However, like everywhere in the Austrian Empire, all institutions of higher education were subjected to strict state control. Thus, the overall supervision of the Gymnasium Pilsen and Philosophische Lehranstalt was in the hands of Magistratsrath Philipp Bubak, magistrate and councillor of Plzeň, who acted as the institutions’ vice director.

---
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To be accepted to a high school, students, boys only, had to pass all middle-school exams with first-class grades, provide a certificate of morality, and prove sufficient financial support. Occasionally, there were state and private scholarships available for poor students with the best exam results. Some of these scholarships were specifically for students inclined to study for the priesthood, others were open for potential students at the faculties of law, theology, philosophy or physics. The historian and Premonstratensian canon, Basil Franz Graßl, mentioned that many canons of Teplá established scholarships for students at the Gymnasium Pilsen. Krippner might have received such a scholarship to cover school fees and living expenses. According to Krippner’s daughter, he also supported himself during his college and university studies by teaching. Where he taught, whether at a school or privately, is not known.

The Gymnasium Pilsen was located in the buildings of a dissolved Dominican Convent, not far from the city’s central square. On the ground floor of the complex were the rooms of the middle school of the Plzeň district, attended by about 2000 boys and girls. On the first floor were the rooms of the Gymnasium Pilsen and the apartments of its teachers. Above the Gymnasium, on the second floor, were the lecture rooms of the Philosophische Lehranstalt, the library, a natural history and science museum and an observatory in one of the towers. The school’s extensive library, and its collections of minerals and physical and astronomical instruments, were well known. Because of its reputation as one of the best high schools in Bohemia, students came from all over Bohemia, even from Prague. About 400 boys were taught at the Gymnasium, and about 200 students were enrolled in the Philosophische Lehranstalt.

The school provided no accommodation for its students; Krippner, therefore, must have found board outside the school’s walls and sphere of influence. What a contrast this school and a city of over 8,000 inhabitants living in multi-storey buildings must have been to the remote Teplá Abbey in the ‘Bohemian desert’! Most of Plzeň’s inhabitants spoke Czech; however, throughout the multi-ethnic
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Austrian Empire, German was the language of instruction at school, apart from a few exceptions at primary-school level. Plzeň had such a primary school that offered classes in Czech language. This unique school was set up in 1819 by one of the Premonstratensian canons and professors, Josef Vojtěch Adalbert Sedláček, and funded by the city’s brewery tax fund. 89

The subjects taught at the Gymnasium were German and Latin philology, natural science and natural history, geography, ancient history and the modern history of states, mathematics, Greek and Czech languages, Catholic religion and moral instruction. Since 1833, the French and Italian languages were also offered at the Plzeň Gymnasium. 90 According to Krippner’s files created by the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army, he had studied French and Czech in addition to Latin and Greek. 91

Since the reforms of Emperor Joseph II in 1781, Jewish and other non-Catholic students were admitted to state schools and universities. 92 During the daily morning mass and lessons of religious and moral instruction, Jewish students were allowed to be absent; however, they had to pass an exam in religious and moral instruction based on the state-authorized textbook Bnei Zion. 93 The city of Plzeň only allowed three Jewish families to live within the city walls. 94 Most Jews lived, therefore, in the surrounding villages. Among the Jewish families of Plzeň were the Lederer brothers, owners of a factory producing highly priced leather goods. 95 Whether this Lederer family was related to Krippner’s maternal ancestors, the blacksmith Johannes Lederer’s family, is not known.

In official letters, which Krippner wrote in the 1870s applying for a position as German Immigration Agent for the New Zealand Government, he mentioned his friendships with influential officials employed by Queen Victoria and Emperor
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Francis Joseph.\textsuperscript{96} These friendships reached back to his high school and university years. One of his friends at the Gymnasium was Joseph Julius Kann, later known as Julius Kanné, Courier to Britain’s Queen Victoria.\textsuperscript{97} He was born in 1818, in Plzeň, son of the Jews Leopold Kann and Josephine née Loewenfeld.\textsuperscript{98} Another friend was Adolph Aloys Braun, born in 1818, near Prague.\textsuperscript{99} Like Krippner, Braun attended the Gymnasium Pilsen and studied law at the Prague University. He was later knighted as Baron Freiherr von Braun, and he became a diplomat and then Director of the Austrian Emperor’s Cabinet’s Chancellery; Braun was also nicknamed the ‘Vice-Emperor’.\textsuperscript{100} Krippner maintained these friendships throughout his life, before and after migrating to New Zealand.\textsuperscript{101}

The intellectual environment at the Gymnasium was heavily influenced by the prefect, Benedikt Steinhauser, and the professor for classical humanities, Stanislaus Zauper, both supporters of enlightened Catholicism. Steinhauser and Zauper were influenced by the works of the Catholic priest and Prague university professor for philosophy and mathematics, Bernhard Bolzano (1781 – 1848), and further intrigued by the German writer Johann Wolfgang von Goethe.\textsuperscript{102} Bolzano had called in his lectures for the overcoming of prejudices towards the Jews; for the equal status of the Czech and German languages, and for an end to military spending and conflict.\textsuperscript{103} The Emperor and Austria’s mainly German aristocracy and conservative clergy certainly did not support such liberal and pacifist thoughts. Consequently, Bolzano was relieved of his professorship at the Prague
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University in 1819 and banned from speaking in public.\textsuperscript{104} Adolph Koppmann, before becoming the new abbot of Teplá Abbey in 1828, was responsible for rating Bolzano’s texts as ‘anticlerical’.\textsuperscript{105}

The Premonstratensian canon and professor, Stanislaus Zauper, also experienced the long arm of the secret police and censorship. Zauper’s encounters and correspondence with Goethe, who had been a thorn in the side of Austria’s statesman Prince Metternich because of Goethe’s association with Freemasonry, led to Zauper being subjected to a police investigation in 1823.\textsuperscript{106} The investigation was soon closed thanks to the intervention of the police commissioner stationed at the spa town Mariánské Lázně near Teplá Abbey, who assured Metternich’s investigators that Zauper’s admiration of Goethe was simply ‘child’s play’.\textsuperscript{107} Despite his narrow escape from prosecution, Zauper continued promoting the inclusion of Goethe’s theatre play \textit{Iphigenia in Tauris} for the Austrian school curriculum, and he wrote essays and aphorisms in reference to Goethe’s work.\textsuperscript{108} Encouraged by Goethe, and with his students in mind, Zauper translated Homer’s \textit{Iliad} and \textit{Odyssey} into German prose with the aim of creating a greater interest in classic Greek literature. Zauper also shared with Goethe an interest in mineralogy, and often he sent Goethe samples of minerals collected by his students.\textsuperscript{109}

One of the teachers at the Philosophische Lehranstalt, Professor Josef Vojtěch Adalbert Sedláček (1785 – 1836), supported the revival of the Czech language and literature. He founded the Czech primary school in Plzeň, promoted Czech newspapers and theatre performances, and wrote textbooks for mathematics and science in Czech.\textsuperscript{110} In 1821, Sedláček became an honorary citizen of Plzeň.
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Through teachers such as Zauper and Sedláček, students at the Plzeň grammar school and philosophical institute were exposed to critical and innovative thinking and to inter-ethnic tolerance within a restrictive imperial regime under Emperor Francis I.

During his stay in Plzeň, Krippner witnessed two imperial visits. In August 1833, when Emperor Francis I and his consort, Empress Karoline Auguste, spent four days in Plzeň, the Empress inspected the Gymnasium and attended the final examinations in religious instruction.\(^{111}\) After the death of Emperor Francis I in 1835, his son Ferdinand I accessed the throne. Seven months after his accession, Ferdinand I and his wife, Empress Maria Anna of Sardinia, visited the city of Plzeň on 7 September 1835. The imperial entourage also inspected the school’s library and natural history and science museum.\(^{112}\) Krippner was then a first-year student at the philosophical institute. He would have been very curious to meet face-to-face the new emperor whom the people of Austria nicknamed ‘Gütinand der Fertige’, ‘Goodinand the Finished’, a play on words referring to the emperor’s good nature yet perceived powerlessness because of his epileptic seizures, speech impediment and general ill health.\(^{113}\) Under Ferdinand I, censorship relaxed slightly, and both teachers, Zauper and Sedláček, were decorated with a Golden Medal of Honour in recognition of their contribution to Austria’s education.\(^{114}\)

### 3.2.3 Visits Home

Mantov, Krippner’s home village, was only a couple of hours walk away from Plzeň. Therefore, it can be assumed that he visited home regularly, especially during the summer months, when students had a long semester break. The Krippner family most likely also spent Christmas and Easter together. When staying at home, Krippner would have been expected to help in his father’s smithy
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or with his village’s robot duties during harvest time. Joining in his community’s work, Krippner had the opportunity to catch up with childhood friends, and to get to know better his two younger brothers. The youngest brother, Johann, was born on Christmas Day in 1829 while Martin Krippner was away at Teplá Abbey.  

How the student and future priest was received at family reunions and village festivals we do not know. His parents and brothers must have been proud of him; but they may have also regarded him as a burden for not contributing to the family income. Perhaps there was a rivalry among the brothers, even though Martin had obviously not been destined to take over the family’s smithy. However, later actions in life suggest that Martin always looked out for his two brothers’ wellbeing.

Throughout the calendar year, there were feasts of saints and special commemorations during harvest time with feasting, dancing and courtship. Baptisms, weddings and funerals were village events where relatives and neighbours met in celebration or mourning. In July 1833, Martin Krippner’s great-aunt Catharina Hield née Lederer died, aged 75. The widow of the former village blacksmith had lived with the Krippners in the smithy, and the children would have regarded her as their maternal grandmother. Martin Krippner later gave his daughter the middle name Katharina, perhaps in remembrance of his great-aunt. His paternal grandfather, the farmer Michael Krippner of Miřovice, died in April 1836 aged 67.

During his visits home, Krippner was reminded of the reality of rural life in Bohemia. Everyday peasant life in Mantov consisted of hard physical labour in the fields, and in the artisans’ workshops, the local spinning factory, coalmines and quarries. Religious and seasonal feasts and celebrations of life-circle events were the only occasions for having a break from the hardship of existence. One tradition around harvest time involved tying up the farm owners, for whom the labourers had completed the harvesting or threshing. The restrained farmers were only released after supplying plenty of beer and schnapps for all. Beer and brandy helped people to forget the burdens of everyday life. Landlords created
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and enforced laws that made the purchase of beer from their own breweries compulsory on occasions such as baptisms, weddings and funerals, and thus were inclined to encourage the drinking of alcohol. The so-called Bier- and Branntweinzwang, the Compulsory Purchase of Beer and Brandy Law, was only repealed after the revolution in 1848.119

In West-Bohemian folklore of the nineteenth century, Christian rituals were often interwoven with pre-Christian rituals. One of the funeral rituals relates to the boards on which the body of the deceased was laid out and carried to the cemetery by those who could not afford coffins. After the burial, the boards were decorated and placed near the dwellings or along the path to the church in remembrance of the dead. It was said that the soul of the deceased would only find rest after the death board had withered away. Such reasoning would justify the use of cheaper soft woods, such as pine and spruce.120 These beliefs would not have been upheld by the more affluent people of the community who could afford to place cast iron crosses made by the village blacksmiths on to the graves of their loved ones.121 Perhaps the few remaining cast iron crosses above dilapidated graves at the Chotěšov cemetery, near Mantov, were made by Martin Krippner’s father or brother.

Whether it was Krippner’s observations and participation in village life during his visits home, or the contact with his friends who were of non-Catholic religion, there was something that caused Krippner to give up the idea of studying theology. Perhaps his experiences of monastic life at Teplá Abbey, the years of religious instruction and attendance at daily mass, and compulsory confession up to eight times per year, had put him off joining the clergy.122 Despite witnessing some of his teachers’ engagement and success in both ecclesiastical and secular matters, it is possible that Krippner simply could not imagine a life of celibacy, especially not having joined in traditional festivities in his home village. His decision to study law instead of theology may have also been influenced by his encounter with Emperor Ferdinand I during his visit to the Plzeň Gymnasium in
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1835. Perhaps Krippner felt called to serve the feeble yet tolerant Emperor, and he hoped that a law degree would pave the way for a position in government circles.

![Figure 9 Cast iron crosses at Chotěšov cemetery in 2013](image)

### 3.2.4 Law Student at Prague University

To be accepted for the study of law, students had to pass all examinations with first-class grades in compulsory courses at philosophical institutes. Thus, Martin must have completed his two years at the Philosophische Lehranstalt in Plzeň with excellent results. In 1837 he enrolled in the course ‘Law and Political Studies’ at the Faculty of Law at Charles University in Prague. A note in the Catalogue of Law Listeners informs that Krippner was one of the students who were exempted from paying course fees. The reason for such an exemption is not stated. He still needed to find funds to cover costs for lodging and food; had he studied theology, the Diocese would have provided funding for accommodation,

---
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food and dress. However, Krippner might have received a scholarship that paid for living expenses from another source thereby allowing him to study law instead of theology.

Prague, the capital of the Bohemian kingdom, and twice in history the residence of former Holy Roman Emperors, counted in 1838 approximately 112,000 inhabitants. About 3,479 students were enrolled at Charles University of Prague in 1838. Academic life in the Austrian Empire was supervised by the absolutist state. After the crushing of student revolts in 1817 against absolutism in the states of the Germanic Confederation, universities in the Austrian Empire stood under strict police supervision. The Austrian Police Minister, Count Joseph Sedlinitsky, sent spies everywhere, recruiting from all social backgrounds. They reported on everything and everybody who seemed critical of the absolutist regime. Student associations were banned, and visits to universities outside of the Austrian Empire were not allowed. However, some students managed to cross borders during the semester breaks, using their exam papers as travel documents – some border officials obviously did not know the difference. Students caught in opposition were conscripted to the army as punishment.

Universities were regarded by the Austrian state as institutions to train ‘loyal civil servants’ and not scholars. Some of the professors, who were restricted to lecturing according to state-authorised textbooks, joined philanthropic organisations and so-called learned societies. Membership in such clubs and organisations added to their social prestige, and also provided an alternative platform for study and discussion outside of the direct surveillance of the state.

Among Krippner’s lecturers was Dr Franz Haimerl, professor for commercial law.

---
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During the 1848 revolution, Haimerl was elected Deputy of the city of Prague; he demanded impunity for arrested revolutionaries, the retreat of the Austrian troops from Prague and the dismissal of the army’s commander, Prince Alfred Windisch-Grätz. However, Haimerl’s demands were ignored, and the Prague uprising was crushed by the army under Windisch-Grätz.

According to entries in the Catalogue of Law Listeners, Krippner passed all of his subjects with first-class grades. The subjects included: Natural and Criminal Law, European and Austrian Statistics in the first year; Customs, Commercial and Taxation Law, Roman and Canon Law in the second year; Austrian Civil Law, Feudal Law, Commercial Law and Finance in the third year; and in the fourth and final year, Legal Proceedings, Political Science and Political Law. At the end of each academic year, law students had to pass exams with first class in order to move up from one year to the next. Students, who did not pass the exams with best results, or who could not provide an annual certificate of high morality, also risked losing their exemption from military service.

Graduates of the Faculty of Law were thus prepared for a career in government services in the justice and administration sector. To be able to work as a lawyer, a doctorate was regarded as a significant advantage. The doctorate, however, attracted extra fees. After completion of their university studies, law graduates had to undergo practical training, working without pay as legal interns. Krippner did not attain the doctorate degree; in 1841 he graduated with a Diploma as a lawyer at the age of 23. A year after his graduation, he joined the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army.

There are various reasons why Krippner may have joined the army. According to remarks made by Krippner’s daughter, Martin Krippner ‘passed his exam with
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honour [sic] as a lawyer to qualify for entry to the army as officer. Had Krippner envisaged a career in the army right at the beginning of his law studies?

In one of his letters from 1872 applying for the position of New Zealand Immigration Agent in Germany, Krippner stated that he worked as a clerk in the ‘Commissariat’, and after seeing no chance of promotion, joined the Austrian army as Lieutenant in 1848. However, according to his military records held at the Vienna War Archive, Krippner joined the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army voluntarily as a non-commissioned officer in the role of Fourier, or quartermaster, in December 1842.

Since Krippner had no private income, he probably could not afford working as an unpaid legal intern while waiting for a position as civil servant or lawyer. He had to realise that despite his academic abilities, descent from a peasant blacksmith limited his chance to climb the social ladder. His lack of social and financial capital would deny him access and success in the legal world. Perhaps for a moment Krippner regretted his decision to study law instead of theology; perhaps he should have joined the clergy, following the wishes of his parents and the benefactors of his education at Teplá Abbey.

In the Austrian Empire before the revolution of 1848, all men of the peasantry aged between 18 and 45 years were subject to compulsory military service for a term of fourteen years. Nobility, priests, burghers, professionals and only-sons of farm owners were exempt. Krippner had been temporarily exempted from military service while he was a university student; had he been employed as a civil servant, this exemption would have continued. Without relevant employment following his graduation, Krippner could be drafted at any time. Conscription into the ranks was regarded as a disaster marked by low rations and pay, severe discipline and harsh punishments. By volunteering as a Fourier, or

142 Mary Pulham.
143 Martin Krippner, ‘Letter to Honorable Mr Vogel, 8 July 1872’, Waihi, SFA.
144 Grundbuch IR 11.
145 Regarding selective conscription, see Carl (Edler von) Bundschuh, Uibersicht des bey K.K. Oesterreichischen Armee bestehenden Militär-Oeconomie-Systems, und aller dahin Bezug nehmenden Gesetze (Prague: Gottlieb Haase, 1813), p. 39, as in https://books.google.co.nz/books?id=dug1AAQAAAMAJ&q=Bundschuh,+Uibersicht+des+bey&source=gbs_navlinks_s, [accessed 21 April 2016]; see also Günther E. Rothenberg, 'The Austrian Army in the Age of Metternich', The Journal of Modern History, 40.2 (1968), 155 - 65 (p. 160); after 1848 the term of compulsory military service was reduced to eight years, see Dumont, p. 24.
146 Rothenberg, p. 160; Kudlich, p. 60.
quartermaster-sergeant, Krippner was regarded as a military official rather than a soldier. In such a position, he was not at the mercy of officers and drill sergeants who often humiliated and hit new recruits in order to break their spirits and individuality.\textsuperscript{147} Also, if the blacksmith’s oldest son joined the army, his second son, Michael, who had reached enlistment age, could be exempted from military service.\textsuperscript{148} Thus, Krippner’s younger brother Michael would have been allowed to support his father’s work in the smithy.

Krippner’s friend, Alois Adolph Braun, who graduated in law and political science a year after Krippner, found employment as an intern at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Vienna and, a year later, he moved to Rome for further studies of mineralogy, church law and the Italian language.\textsuperscript{149} Braun must have earned the trust and favour of the Austrian foreign minister, Prince Metternich, to be allowed a special entitlement to study abroad. Not much is known about the early career following graduation of Krippner’s other friend, Julius Kann. At some point, Kann migrated to England; he changed his name to John Julius Kanné and entered Queen Victoria’s service in 1850. He fought and received multiple decorations during the Crimean War (1853-1856).\textsuperscript{150}

\begin{itemize}
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3.3 Summary

As a war captive held at the Bay of Islands or as a pupil at Teplá Abbey preparing for a career in the clergy, both Tauhia and Krippner were tested in their capability to adopt and develop under unfamiliar and often harsh circumstances. Tauhia and his people witnessed the misery and exploitation of taurekareka, slaves captured by Ngāpuhi warriors. Whilst inter and intra-tribal wars continued, Tauhia had to take part in military campaigns on the side of his captors. Resulting from these experiences during his early life, Tauhia came to detest warfare for the remainder of his life. As the mokopuna of Murupaenga, one of Ngāti Whātua’s leading military leaders, Tauhia was a vulnerable target for those Ngāpuhi members seeking utu. On the other hand, this precarious relatedness probably brought him to the mission school at Paihia where Tauhia was not only protected but also introduced to the skills of reading and writing, and also to a religion that condemned violence (at least on the surface) and seemingly rewarded its followers with material wealth. Tauhia, who studied the manners and language of the Pākehā, acquired a position as valuable partner to his captor and relative, Pomare II. Tauhia accompanied his master on a mission to negotiate peace with Ngāti Whātua in Tāmaki, and Pomare II later trusted Tauhia to be the guardian of his two sons.

During this time, life at the Bay of Islands was increasingly marked by local interactions with people from overseas. Most intriguing for Tauhia must have been his observation that leading Ngāpuhi rangatira such as Te Whareumu and Hongi Hika, ignored breaches of tapu by Pākehā: strict observance of customary traditions in regards to tapu and utu were lessened in favour of establishing and maintaining good trading relationships with the newcomers. Thus, Tauhia learned from his captors the strategies of balancing political and economic advantages with the demands of custom. On various occasions, Tauhia witnessed peace negotiations after wars between hapū and iwi where Pākehā missionaries and merchants acted as mediators between hostile tribes.

After four years living and studying under Premonstratensian monks at the geographically isolated Teplá Abbey, Krippner continued his formal education in Plzeň, Bohemia’s second largest city. Here, he was exposed to cosmopolitan life, and he was taught by teachers who were not afraid to question the ethnocentricity and religious intolerance that characterised both the Austrian state and the
Catholic Church. Krippner was encouraged to think critically and independently within a restrictive and conservative educational system. Emboldened by Premonstratensian canons to challenge the status quo, Krippner abandoned his plan to enter the clergy, opting instead for a legal education. Personal friendships with fellow students of different religions and social classes, encounters with Emperors Francis I and Ferdinand I, and a preference for the pleasures of the secular world may have also contributed to his decision to study law instead of theology.

Krippner was accepted at the Faculty of Law at Charles University in Prague, and again, he delivered the highest grades possible in his examinations. His success at school and university must have created in Krippner a belief that skills and knowledge would allow even a blacksmith’s son to pursue a career of his choice. Whether joining the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army after his graduation was part of his career plan, or whether he was forced to take that step after finding no viable employment in a legal profession, we cannot know. Krippner certainly came to realise that talent and education were no guarantee for fair access to the professions in a society that judged people by their inherited status or by their wealth.

Both Tauhia and Krippner not only adapted well to their respective new environments, but also gained recognition of their skills by their superiors and contemporaries. However, family descent played a crucial role during the early formative years in both Tauhia’s and Krippner’s lives. His descent from rangatira lineage and to some extent his own personal acumen and skills determined Tauhia’s survival and privileged position among enemy tribes. Krippner’s peasant origins set barriers in a feudal, estate-based society that even his privileged education and excellent academic results could not overcome.

Pomare II’s growing focus on trade with Pākehā instead of ongoing warfare, and the beginning of peace negotiations between Pomare II and Ngāti Whātua, filled Tauhia with optimism that the time had come to regain his and his hapū’s former independent status. Entering the army as a Fourier, or quartermaster sergeant, may have created in Krippner a sense of failure and frustration. Nevertheless, he may have clung to the hope that even within the army social mobility was possible. Whether Tauhia and Krippner could turn their ambitions into reality will be examined in the following chapter.
4 Seizing Opportunities

During the 1840s both Te Hemara Tauhia and Martin Krippner witnessed key political events that brought about drastic changes in their respective societies: in Aotearoa New Zealand, leading rangatira and an emissary of the British Crown signed Te Tiriti o Waitangi/Treaty of Waitangi in 1840; in the Austrian Empire and most other states of the German Confederation, a political mobilisation across social classes and ethnicities led to the Revolutions of 1848. Although the revolutions failed and Te Tiriti in its application was often misinterpreted and deceiving, opportunities arose in direct consequence of these events for both Tauhia and Krippner.

While Ngāpuhi rangatira signed Te Tiriti o Waitangi/Treaty of Waitangi agreeing to share power and authority with officers of the British Crown in order to exercise control over Pākehā residents in New Zealand, Tauhia and Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo seized the moment to return to freedom and political autonomy. After fourteen years in captivity, Tauhia’s time had come to lead his hapū back to ancestral lands to start afresh after their tūpuna’s defeat in battles. Krippner, who had joined the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army and for five years and nine months hoped in vain to move up the ranks, was promoted to second lieutenant during the time of revolution. His commission as army officer opened access to the bourgeois society of Frankfurt am Main, reaping unexpected results.

The reconstruction of Tauhia’s and Krippner’s experiences during the 1840s is based on Krippner’s military records held at the Vienna War Archive, memoirs and diary entries of contemporaries of Krippner’s acquaintances in Frankfurt, Tauhia’s evidence given at Native Land Court hearings, parish records, his correspondence with New Zealand government officials, and speeches delivered at the Orakei Parliament in 1879. Published statistics, manuals of the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army, historical accounts of the Austrian Empire and New Zealand during the relevant period, as well as biographical sketches of Tauhia’s and Krippner’s contemporaries, and New Zealand newspaper articles are among the secondary sources that provide information to view both men’s actions in a broader societal context.
4.1 Te Hemara Tauhia: Return to Ancestral Lands

4.1.1 Arrival of Lieutenant-Governor Hobson and the Treaty of Waitangi

On 29 January 1840 the vessel HMS Herald arrived in the Bay of Islands and anchored off Kororāreka Beach. On board were Lieutenant-Governor William Hobson, four police troopers, and four other subordinate government officers sent by the UK Colonial Office to proclaim British sovereignty in New Zealand.\footnote{Waitangi Tribunal, He Whakaputanga me te Tiriti / The Declaration and the Treaty: The Report on Stage 1 of the Te Paparahi o Te Raki Inquiry (Lower Hutt: Legislation Direct, 2014), p. 340.} Hobson invited local rangatirā, especially those who had signed the 1835 Declaration of Independence, to attend a meeting on 5 February at the property of the former British Resident in Waitangi, James Busby.

Whether Pomare II was present at that assembly is not clear; it is proven that Pomare II did not sign Te Tiriti o Waitangi on 6 February 1840.\footnote{Waitangi Treaty Copy, Ministry for Culture and Heritage, updated 5 February 2015, <http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/media/interactive/waitangi-treaty-copy> , [accessed 14 May 2015].} Tauhia did not go to the meeting at Waitangi, so he stated during a Native Land Court hearing in 1868.\footnote{NLC, Orakei Hearing: 2 November 1868, Orakei Minute Book 2, p. 58.} However, he witnessed the discussions among Ngāpuhi rangatirā leading up to the signing of Te Tiriti.\footnote{See Tauhia’s statement at the Orakei Parliament in 1879, in ‘Paora Tuhaere’s Parliament at Orakei’, AJHR, Session II – 1879, G-08, p. 17, as in Papers Past, National Library of New Zealand <https://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/parliamentary>, [accessed 29 October 2016].} In any case, the words of Hobson’s address on 5 February, translated into Māori by missionary Henry Williams, would have been reported to Pomare II and thereby to Tauhia. Nothing is known as to how Pomare II interpreted the content and effect of Te Tiriti. He must have been aware of warnings expressed by both Ngāpuhi rangatirā and Pākehā settlers that the British Crown was attempting to take over the mana of the rangatirā, and that Māori of New Zealand would face a similar destiny to the indigenous people at Port Jackson in Australia. Such predictions might have been the reason why Pomare II did not attend the meeting on 5 February 1840 and hesitated to sign Te Tiriti the day after.

However, on 17 February 1840, Pomare II affixed his tohu tapu (distinctive mark) to Te Tiriti, after Kawiti, leading rangatirā of Ngāti Hine, and Te Tirarau of Te
Parawhau and Te Uri o Hau also agreed to sign. Their decision to sign Te Tiriti might have resulted from the persuasiveness of the United States Consul, James Clendon, who had resided near Pomare II’s pā since 1832. Clendon’s signature next to Pomare II’s tohu tapu confirms his presence as witness of the signing. It is significant that Kawiti, Te Tirarau and Pomare II set their tohu tapu above that of Hone Heke, who was reportedly the first to sign Te Tiriti. Perhaps this small act of claiming precedence over a Ngāpuhi rival and former enemy gave them some satisfaction while agreeing to part with a portion of their mana through signing Te Tiriti.

The Waitangi Tribunal report *He Whakaputanga me te Tiriti – The Declaration and the Treaty of Waitangi* discusses how Māori rangatira might have interpreted these contracts at the time of signing. The conclusion of the report suggests that the signatory rangatira must have trusted Hobson’s proclamation that Te Tiriti was a contract whereby rangatira accepted British kāwanatanga (governorship) for the purpose of maintaining law and order among Pākehā residents in New Zealand. Pomare II must have been assured that he was thereby not giving up his mana as rangatira over his hapū and land. The fact that Lieutenant-Governor Hobson arrived with merely four police and four government officers might have convinced Pomare II that Te Tiriti was not any more significant than the Declaration of Independence, which was signed five years prior and had not in the slightest affected his and other rangatira’s mana. The presence of a few British government representatives, especially under a rather frail and sickly Lieutenant-Governor, did not seem like a serious threat to Māori power. Pomare II and others, who had not been overseas, simply were not aware of the dimensions and the power of the British Empire or the reach of its influence in colonizing enterprises. On the other hand, it is hard to imagine that the signatory rangatira were not suspicious of a treaty that, as Claudia Orange phrased it, ‘was asking little of them but offering much.’ Perhaps Ngāpuhi rangatira also realised that an influx of Pākehā settlers could not be stopped or returned; therefore, it might be wise to enter into an agreement of mutual protection with the British Empire.
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However, Māori rangatira would have expected to discuss laws for Māori-Pākehā co-existence in New Zealand together with Pākehā officers.

Four days after Pomare II signed Te Tiriti, Lieutenant-Governor Hobson, the Reverend Henry Williams, the surveyor Felton Mathew, Captain William Symonds and others on board the HMS Herald left the Bay of Islands and sailed south in order to collect signatures of influential rangatira elsewhere. They were also searching for a site suitable for the colonial capital of New Zealand.\(^9\) Apparently, Williams and Symonds suggested the Waitematā Harbour as a suitable location.\(^10\) Clendon, who had become an instrumental advisor to Hobson, might have also pointed in the direction of the Tāmaki isthmus, especially after he had entered into negotiations to buy land there owned by Ngāti Whātua.

The HMS Herald soon returned to the Bay of Islands; the expedition had to be cut short because Hobson suffered a paralysing attack. However, the travelling party managed to gather signatures from Ngāti Pāoa and Ngāti Whātua rangatira who signed Te Tiriti on 4 and 20 March 1840, respectively.\(^11\)

### 4.1.2 British Authority Established at ‘Russel’ Opposite Pomare II’s Pā

Hobson’s illness put the establishment of a colonial capital on hold, and a temporary solution was sought to accommodate the government officers, mounted police and newly arrived immigrants. Thus, Clendon, who ran a profitable trading station at Okiato, land he bought from Pomare II and Kiwikiwi in the early 1830s, offered his land and buildings to the British governor as the seat for his capital.

After the initial price of £23,000 was reduced to £15,000, Clendon’s offer was accepted, and plans for the first New Zealand capital, named ‘Russel’ in honour of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Lord John Russell, were drawn up.\(^12\) Clendon, however, never received his asking price for the land and buildings; he was paid £2,250 rent for his premises, and as compensation for approximately 300

---


\(^10\) Mathew and Mathew, p. 57.


\(^12\) Mathew and Mathew, p. 116; after the capital shifted to Auckland in 1841, Kororāreka became known as ‘Russel’ and Okiato returned to its former name.
acres at Okiato, he was offered 10,000 acres of yet to be acquired Crown land.\textsuperscript{13} In any case, Clendon fared well with the governor’s arrival; according to the local Kororāreka newspaper, \textit{New Zealand Advertiser and Bay of Islands Gazette}, Clendon became Magistrate of the Territory on 21 February 1840.\textsuperscript{14} In September 1840, he was appointed President of the New Zealand Banking Company.\textsuperscript{15}

Tauhia would have soon realised that this time the agreement Māori rangatira had entered into with British Crown representatives effected noticeable changes in the region. The signs of British authority became increasingly evident. Pākehā vessels arrived from New South Wales which were different to the usual trading ships: on 17 March 1840, the vessel \textit{Westminster} anchored off Kororāreka, with immigrant families, the wives of government officers, and horses for the mounted police all aboard.\textsuperscript{16} On 16 April 1840, a detachment of the 80th Regiment of Foot of the British Army, commanded by Major Thomas Bunbury, disembarked from the \textit{Buffalo} and was stationed at Russel, former Okiato, just opposite Otuihu pā.\textsuperscript{17}

The presence of armed Pākehā police and soldiers was felt and employed by Pomare II himself. An article in the first issue of the \textit{New Zealand Advertiser and Bay of Islands Gazette} reports a quarrel between the crew of an American vessel and Pomare II’s men on 3 June 1840.\textsuperscript{18} The American captain demanded the handing over of a deserter, who had found protection at Otuihu pā. Pomare II’s people refused to deliver up the deserter unless due payment was given. The captain declined and wanted to take the deserter by force. In response, Otuihu men seized two whale boats belonging to the vessel. When a scuffle ensued, one Māori
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\begin{itemize}
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and one Pākehā were injured. Anyhow, twenty soldiers were sent to the pā, and the dispute was settled without anyone being killed and the boats returned. What happened to the deserter was not reported. The newspaper article claimed that, following this incident, Pomare II, Kawiti and other influential rangatira requested a permanent presence of Pākehā police at their pā to prevent similar conflicts.19

Thus, Pomare II and other rangatira accepted the role of Pākehā police and military keeping law and order in regards to Pākehā residents and visitors.

However, when a first murder trial under British Law with a Māori named Kihi as the accused took place in April 1840, armed Māori demanded the release of the offender so that he could be judged according to Māori law.20 Their demand was denied, and Colonial Secretary Willoughby Shortland called for military help.

Richard Wolfe, author of Hell-hole of the Pacific, called this incident a ‘crucial moment’ in New Zealand’s history: ‘[h]ad a trigger been pulled on this occasion, this would have been the beginning and end of the Colony of New Zealand.’21

However, no violence ensued, and eventually, the accused died of dysentery in prison before facing his execution according to British Law. Māori rangatira must have sensed for the first time that British authorities were encroaching on their mana as leaders of their own people. They began to realise that British government representatives presumed that kāwanatanga applied also to Māori.

The seat of government did not stay long in Russell. On 13 September 1840, seven government officers, Surveyor-General Mathew’s wife and 32 immigrant labourers sailed under Captain Symond’s command to Waiotamā to set up the new capital, which was to be called ‘Auckland’ after Hobson’s patron, Lord Auckland.22 Lieutenant-Governor Hobson and the remaining government officials moved to Auckland in February 1841. Thus, within a year after signing Te Tiriti, the headquarters of British kāwanatanga in New Zealand moved to land offered to Lieutenant-Governor Hobson by Tauhia’s relatives of Ngāti Whātua. With this move, the region of the Bay of Islands began to lose its importance as a trading
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centre, which seriously affected Ngāpuhi’s economy, and subsequently led to the outbreak of the Northern War in 1845.23

4.1.3 Return to Mahurangi and Puhoi

Ever since Tauhia saw his Ngāti Whātua relatives when visiting the Tāmaki isthmus with Pomare II and Clendon in 1839, he thought about returning to his hapū’s lands:

When Ngati Whatua heard that Te Kawau & his people were living at Tamaki, they determined to return to their lands, & each hapu reoccupied his own land. Ngati Rango returned to Mahurangi, Ngati Manuhiri to Mangawhai & Pakiri to their original kaingas.24

Exactly when Tauhia and his people went to Mahurangi is not clear. According to Tauhia’s evidence at a Native Land Court hearing in 1886, they returned not long after Governor Hobson arrived in New Zealand. At Mahurangi and Puhoi, Tauhia’s people caught up with Ngāti Whātua relatives of the Te Taoū hapū who had returned from exile in the Waikato:

I myself accompanied Ngati Rongo on their return to Mahurangi. I stayed a while and went back. There were people living at Mahurangi who were related to Te Taou: Ripiro, Te Ru Pohipi, Tamauma & others. They had previously been with Te Taou in Waikato. In the time after Hobson the Ngati Rango came from [the] Bay of Islands to live at Mahurangi.25

Whether Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo left the Bay of Islands with Pomare II’s approval is also not known. The fact that Tauhia returned to the Bay of Islands after having guided his people to ancestral lands indicates that there was perhaps some sort of agreement between Pomare II and Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo: while Tauhia was still not free to go and live as independent rangatira, his hapū was released from the bonds of captivity. In later Native Land Court hearings it became clear that Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo had gifted parts of their land to

24 NLC, Hauturu Re-Hearing: 7 - 13 October 1886, Kaipara Minute Book 5, p. 16; Ngāti Rango is a spelling variation of Ngāti Rongo.
Pomare II’s two sons, Hare and Wiremu, which might have been part of that deal with Pomare II.26

Tauhia found himself balancing his responsibilities for his hapū with his expected role as a token of peace between Ngāpuhi and Ngāti Whātua. Certainly, by guiding his people back to Mahurangi he must have regained mana as rangatira in the eyes of his people. However, others obviously had given up on Tauhia’s and Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo’s existence as an independent hapū. In April 1841, Tauhia heard from George Clarke, the Chief Protector for Aborigines and Native Land Purchase Commissioner, that the entire eastern coast, south of Te Arai to the northern shore of Waitematā Harbour, had been sold to the government by Ngāti Pāoa and other Hauraki hapū of the Marutūahu confederation of tribes. This block of approximately 220,000 acres included Mahurangi, Puhoi, Waiwerawera and other parts of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo’s ancestral lands.27 A map, however, did not accompany the deed of sale, only a rough description of landmarks. The payment in kind, valued at £200, to the Hauraki tribes for the so-called ‘Mahurangi Purchase’ consisted of ‘400 blankets, 100 gowns, 2 horses, 2 cows, 200 pairs trousers, 30 coats, 100 caps, 4 casks tobacco, 6 casks flour, 2 bags rice, 1 bag sugar, 60 camlet cloaks.’28 Tauhia protested immediately against this sale, and apparently, he received assurance from Governor Hobson that, at the very least, reserves for his hapū to live on and sacred places, especially Maungatauhoro at the Puhoi river mouth, the burial place of Murupaenga, would be excluded from the ‘Mahurangi Purchase.’29

One month after the Hauraki tribes sold the Mahurangi block, Pomare II claimed ownership of Mahurangi, receiving a vessel and £50 from the government after he signed a deed of sale.30 In the following month, a first group of Ngāti Whātua
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rangatira sold their interest in land forming part of the ‘Mahurangi Purchase’ for £100 cash, a horse, saddle, bridle and a boat. One year later, the Ngāti Whātua rangatira Te Kawau, Reweti, Te Hira and Paora (Kawharu?) claimed ownership and received together three horses, two saddles, two bridles, 40 blankets, and £30 cash for selling the land.  

When Tauhia found out that Pomare II planned to sell Mahurangi and apparently also the island of Hauturu (Little Barrier Island), he stood up against his master and tried to stop him. Pomare II’s son, Wiremu Pomare, remembered Tauhia arguing with his father:

> Hemara was very angry with my father for proposing to sell Mahurangi and Hauturu. He spoke to my father about it first at Otuihu (at Bay of Islands) and again when my father went to Mahurangi. My father Pomare did sell a portion of Mahurangi, and got a cutter called ‘Riripeti’ (The Elizabeth) in payment. This was after the removal of the seat of Government from Russel to Auckland.'

Tauhia and his hapū might not have been surprised that former enemy tribes such as Ngāti Pāoa and Ngāpuhi under Pomare II claimed ownership based on conquest of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo’s former territory. Apparently, Pomare II had tried selling Mahurangi previously, in December 1839, which caused Tauhia to write a letter to the British Resident, Busby, asking him not to buy Mahurangi from Pomare II because the land belonged to Tauhia and his hapū. However, hearing that relatives of Ngāti Whātua had also sold their claim over Mahurangi to the government would have been a heavy blow for Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo. Perhaps Ngāti Whātua rangatira became involved in the sale of Mahurangi because they regarded the former captives of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo as ‘dead’ – a customary attitude based on the belief that war captives have been stripped of their mana. Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo had only just dared to return to their ancestral lands because they felt safe with Ngāti Whātua’s presence in the neighbouring Tāmaki
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region. Tauhia and his people would have perceived the news of the sale of Mahurangi as abandonment and betrayal by their own kin.

Although only a small group of approximately one hundred people, Tauhia and Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo did not give up trying to revitalise and maintain their status as independent hapū. They remained living in the area between the rivers Mahurangi and Waiwerawera and sought to re-establish their ownership through various tactics. For example, Pākehā squatters who cut timber without the hapū’s permission were asked to leave the area or pay compensation; surveyors, called in by Pākehā who claimed to have bought land off the government, were hindered in their job. This non-violent battle for at least parts of their ancestral lands lasted
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35 Based on map showing in Ngāti Manuhiri and the Crown, Deed of Settlement of Historical Claims, 2011, p. 7
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more than ten years until the so-called ‘Te Hemara Reserve’ was surveyed and legally confirmed in 1853.38

In 1840 the time had arrived for 25-year-old Tauhia to prove his ability to lead his people. His negotiating and linguistic skills acquired under Te Whareumu, Pomare II, and also from the missionaries, were of great value for this task. Apart from re-occupying the land with his people and disregarding its sale to the Crown, Tauhia addressed Governor Hobson and other colonial government officers directly, and brought his hapū’s history and right of ownership to the Mahurangi land to their attention. This effort resulted in Hobson’s (at least) verbal promise of a certain reserve set aside for Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo. Apparently, Tauhia also made himself familiar with formalities of British Law. For example, he could prove that Pomare II had inserted in the deed of sale of Mahurangi the tohu tapu of Tauhia’s deceased father, which rendered the document invalid.39

When faced with renewed attempts to erase the existence of his hapū, Tauhia sought help from British authorities and their law, the very authorities rangatira of Ngāpuhi as well as Ngāti Whātua had accepted in their midst by signing Te Tiriti. The fight for his ancestral lands and his resistance to Pomare II might have also been a decisive factor in Tauhia’s turning to the Christian religion.

4.1.4 Baptism, Marriage, and Acknowledgement of Rangatira Status

On Sunday, 10 October 1841, Tauhia was one of 116 candidates baptized into the Anglican Church at Paihia by the Reverend Henry Williams.40 He took on the baptismal name ‘Te Hemara’, a transliteration of ‘Hamlin’, after the missionary and probably Tauhia’s first Pākehā teacher, James Hamlin. Te Hemara Tauhia’s statement at the Kohimarama Conference held in 1860 sheds light on his motivations to become a follower of the Christian faith:

Ko tenei iwi ko Ngati Whatua he iwi ngaro. I penei i nga ra kua pahure me te iwi o Iharaia. Na nga ra o te Rongo-pai ka hoki ahau ki te rangatiratanga: koia taku ihu ka puta ki waho i roto i te Rongo-pai; tae noa

38 Wellington, Archives NZ, Mr Johnson's Report of Visit to Mahurangi [Map Included]: 3 September 1853, 1853/2092.
ki nga ra i noho ai te Kawana tuatahi ki Niu Tirani ka tino puta taku ihu ki te ao.

This iwi, the Ngati Whatua, was a lost people like the tribes of Israel in the past. Since the day when the Gospel was brought here I have returned to my chiefly status. It was the Gospel that enabled me to rise from disaster; and, on the arrival of the first Governor in New Zealand, I was enabled to breathe freely.  

Thus, Tauhia saw the Christian faith as a source of moral strength to regain his mana as rangatira. His identification with the Israelites who returned from slavery to the homelands of their ancestors encouraged and legitimised Tauhia’s and Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo’s mission to reoccupy ancestral lands. The Christian religion, as Tauhia had heard and experienced it in the Bay of Islands, took away the stigma and feeling of shame attached to living in captivity.

Concluding from the names as they appear later during Native Land Court hearings, Tauhia’s mother, sister and younger brother were also baptized. Since their names are not recorded in the Paihia/Kororāreka Register of Baptisms, it can be assumed that they had left Pomare II’s pā before Tauhia was baptized, and they converted to Christianity at a different time and place. Tauhia’s mother, Te Anini, adopted the name ‘Mereana’ (Marianne, or Mary Ann), his sister, Kotare, took on the name ‘Makareta’ (Margaret), and his brother, Te Kahu, became ‘Henare Winiata’ (Henry Wynyard). Choosing the name ‘Henare Winiata’ indicates that Tauhia’s brother was baptized after the arrival of Lieutenant Colonel Robert Henry Wynyard, who commanded the 58th Regiment of the British Army, deployed in the Bay of Islands to fight against Hone Heke and Kawiti in 1845. Such a name choice can be interpreted as an expression of support for troops of the Crown in their war against opposing Ngāpuhi forces.

---
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At the time of his baptism and return to Mahurangi, Tauhia was about 26 years old. This might also have been the time of his marriage to Miriama Houkura. She was the daughter of Makoare Ponui, a descendent of Maraeariki, one of the older sons of Te Kawerau’s eponymous ancestor Maki. Before the Battle Te Ika-a-Ranganui in 1825, Ponui and his people of Te Kawerau hapū had their kāinga at Mahurangi, next to settlements of their relatives of the Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo hapū.

Nothing is known about where and when Tauhia and Houkura met. Because Houkura’s whānau did not belong to Ngāti Rongo, and thus were not closely related to Te Whareumu and Pomare II, they might have been kept as hostages by another Ngāpuhi rangatira. The name ‘Makoare’, adopted by Houkura’s father Ponui upon baptism, suggests that they spent their time in captivity under Makoare Te Taonui, the leading rangatira of the Popoto hapū living at Hokianga.

Through this marriage, the two hapū, Te Kawerau and Ngāti Rongo, renewed their kinship ties; but it can also be assumed that this union was founded on love and mutual affection: Tauhia and Miriama Houkura stayed together until Tauhia’s death, despite their marriage being childless. They raised two whāngai (adoptive) children: Henry Wiapo from Kaipara, Tauhia’s nephew, and Te Huia, Miriama’s nephew. Henry Wiapo died before reaching adulthood.

Unfortunately, no visual image of the couple could be found. Only a brief description of Tauhia in his late fifties by a Pākehā journalist has survived:

He is a fine specimen, standing some six feet and equally proportioned, with a countenance at once candid and determined, and with the eloquence and gesture of a thorough orator, carrying conviction to all unbiased minds.
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44 See Makoare Ponui’s evidence in NLC, Tungutu Hearing: 25 January 1866, p. 9.
45 Locker, p. 29; S. P. Smith, The Peopling of the North, p. 98.
47 Locker, p. 85.
The Bohemian settlers later described him as ‘six feet tall, of fine features, and a noted orator’ who spoke English very well and who wore a ‘dark suit and bowler hat on all important occasions.’

Miriama Houkura is remembered by Mahurangi residents as a kind and ‘very small woman.’

Other marriage bonds were formed at the time of returning to Mahurangi: Miriama Houkura’s younger sister Merehae became the wife of John Sullivan in 1844. Sullivan, born in London in 1810, came to New Zealand in 1834 and worked as a skipper and logger. He had settled at the Mahurangi Heads where he must have met and fallen in love with Merehae. The rangatira Makoare Ponui allocated land at Otarawao Bay (Sullivan’s Bay) next to Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo’s kāinga at Te Muri for his daughter Merehae and her family. They had two children, Julia, born in 1846, and William, born in 1848. This family symbolised a first bond between members of Te Kawerau hapū and Pākehā settlers.

Tauhia’s older sister, Makareta Kotare, became the wife of Arama Karaka Haututu, a nephew of the leading rangatira Paika of Te Uri o Hau hapū. Arama Karaka Haututu’s father had been killed during the Battle Te Ika-a-Ranganui; after the battle, like other survivors of his hapū, Haututu would have lived under the protection of the Ngāpuhi rangatira Parore. After being released from captivity, Arama Karaka Haututu returned to his kāinga at the Otamatea River, joined by his wife Makareta Kotare. From Native Land Court records it is known that Arama Karaka Haututu and Kotare had no surviving children. According to an obituary note at Haututu’s death in 1885, his five children had predeceased him.

Through Makareta Kotare’s marriage to Arama Karaka Haututu, the two hapū, Te Uri o Hau and Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo, renewed their kinship ties and joined

50 Locker, pp. 85-86.
51 Locker, p. 263.
52 NLC, Waihakari Succession Hearing: 8 and 13 March 1877, Kaipara Minute Book 3, pp. 217, 238; Arama Karaka Haututu also identified as Ngaitahuhu and Ngāti Manuwhiri, see Rigby, p. 124.
forces in their legal battles to reclaim ancestral lands. The two brothers-in-law, Te Hemara Tauhia and Arama Karaka Haututu, appeared jointly at Native Land Court hearings and assemblies, both taking on a leading role for their respective hapū.

Tauhia was soon recognised as a leading rangatira, not only among his people living at Mahurangi, but also by relatives of Te Uri o Hau who resided at the Kaipara Harbour. The ethnographer George Graham (1874–1952) preserved a document rendering the ōhaki (dying speech, will) of the Te Uri o Hau rangatira, Taikiamana, written on 26 January 1843:

E hoa, e Te Hemara Tauhia, kia atawhai ki o tuakana ki o tuahine i muri nei. No te mea ko te tukunga atu tenei o te mana o te whenua kia koe, ara kia koutou ko tuakana. I a au ano e ora ana ki a au te mana o te whenua kia he rano tooku tinana katahi ka oti ki a koutou te mana o te whenua.

Friend, Te Hemara Tauhia, look after your brothers and sisters in the future. This is the bequeathing of the mana of the land to you, that is, to you and your brothers. While I was alive and well I had the mana of the land but with death upon me I give you the mana of the land.55

Te Hemara Tauhia, Taikiamana, Hori Kingi Te Puia and seven others signed the original pukapuka ōhaki (written ōhaki) at Te Rurunga pā at the Kaipara Harbour. Graham sent a copy of the document with his translation to Elsdon Best.56 Tauhia was appointed to take a leading role in looking after the hapū’s lands, not single-handedly, but in accord with his tuākana (elder brothers). The tuākana Taikiamana referred to were Tauhia’s cousins who descended from more senior lines, for example, Arama Karaka Haututu and Hori Kingi Maukino.57 That such an elevation of Tauhia’s status created jealousy among the cousins cannot be ruled out.58

55 Ōhaki written in 1843 for Te Hemara Tauhia and others, see Wellington, Alexander Turnbull Library (ATL), Correspondence and Notes for Papers, 80-115-04A/03A.
56 Correspondence and Notes for Papers; Tauhia’s grave is at Te Rurunga pā, today Alan Gibb’s Farm, see chapter 8.1 of this thesis.
58 Hori Kingi Maukino and his whānau left the Puhoi-Mahurangi region in the early 1860s, settling on ancestral land at the Kaipara Harbour; whether disagreements among the cousins contributed to such a move is not known, see also chapter 7.1 of this thesis.
4.1.5 Economic Enterprises

The return to ancestral lands at Mahurangi and the Puhoi River must have filled Tauhia and his hapū with new hope, joy and confidence. They established their main kāinga and māra on land between the Mahurangi heads and the sacred mountain Maungatauhoro south of the Puhoi river mouth. By 1847, Te Hemara Tauhia was registered as the owner of a schooner *Elizabeth*. On this schooner, Tauhia’s people shipped their produce, firewood and timber to the growing Auckland market. The hapū received additional income from selling rights to cut timber on their territory, much to the annoyance of the colonial government officials who missed out on revenue for issuing timber licenses on what they deemed to be Crown land.

On 1 June 1844, after Governor FitzRoy waived the government’s right to preemptive purchase of Māori land, Tauhia and other Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo rangatira agreed to sell land (about twenty acres) south of the Waiwerawera river mouth to Robert and David Graham from Auckland. The payment for the land consisted of:

- 26 Blankets, 4 Spades, 4 double barreled Guns, 1 piece Print, 1 Coat, 1 pr. Trousers, 1 Bag Shot, 4 Cartridge Boxes, 3 Casks Powder, 1 Cask Tobacco, 2 Cloth Caps, 2 boxes Percussion Caps, 5 Shirts, 1 Cloak, and £16. 0. 0 cash.

The piece of land sold to the Graham brothers included the hot springs called ‘Te Rata’ (red hot, or ‘the doctor’) at Waiwerawera beach, well known for their healing qualities and frequently visited by Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo, and also by Ngāti Pāoa. Apparently, Robert Graham witnessed how at one time up to 3,000 members of Ngāti Pāoa bathed there after having completed their shark fishing trips.

The sale of Waiwerawera by Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo might have served strategic purposes rather than the need for Pākehā goods and money. First, the
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sales agreement established Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo as owners of the land and not Ngāti Pāoa. This would help the hapū’s fight to be recognised as rightful owners of their ancestral lands at Mahurangi. Second, with the Graham brothers settling and building a sanatorium at Waiwerawera, a buffer zone was created between the two rival tribes. Thus, the small group of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo would feel less intimidated should thousands of Ngāti Pāoa land ashore to take a hot bath.

In the following year, on 13 February 1845, Tauhia and six other rangatira signed a deed of sale of 800 acres next to Graham’s property at Waiwerawera to the Smithson family. The payment in kind consisted of a cutter and one double barrelled gun. Interestingly, the signature of Pomare II appears on the deed of sale, which indicates that he still held an interest in Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo’s lands and was included in the hapū’s affairs.

4.1.6 Northern War 1845 - 46

When the uprising against British sovereignty initiated by Hone Heke, Kawiti and their followers started in the Bay of Islands in March 1845, Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo probably feared that Ngāpuhi warriors would move south towards Auckland, where the colonial government had its seat. That would also mean a threat to their enjoyment of freedom and peace at Mahurangi. They found themselves in a difficult position: on the one hand, they hoped that kinship ties with Pomare II would protect them from attack from Ngāpuhi hapū, but at the same time, they probably did not wish to be associated with Ngāpuhi forces opposing the British Crown.

Their situation became even more precarious after Pomare II was arrested and his Otuihu pā destroyed by British canons on 30 April 1845. Pomare II, despite having maintained a neutral position in this war, was brought to Auckland as prisoner on a charge of treachery. After the intervention of Tamaki Waka Nene, a Ngāpuhi rangatira considered loyal towards the Crown, accusations against
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Pomare II were dismissed as unfounded, and Governor FitzRoy released him. As compensation for the unwarranted arrest, Pomare II was given another vessel.\textsuperscript{65}

The fighting in the North continued until January 1846. British forces, despite being better equipped with weapons and canons, were not able to defeat their opponents, and Kawiti and Heke were not captured. However, thanks to a willingness on Kawiti’s and Heke’s side to enter into peace negotiations, the fighting stopped. The new Governor, Sir George Grey, realised that he could not afford an ongoing war in the North and pardoned the two Ngāpuhi rebellious leaders without insisting on land confiscations, as demanded by the former Governor, Robert FitzRoy.\textsuperscript{66}

At a meeting in 1848 at Pomare II’s pā at Otuihu, which had been destroyed in 1845, Governor Grey and Hone Heke met face-to-face and reaffirmed their intention of keeping peace between Ngāpuhi and the colonial government. According to an account of a former slave at the Bay of Islands, it was also decided at this meeting that all slaves and their descendants should be released from bondage to Ngāpuhi hapū, and that the Crown would help in their return to ancestral lands.\textsuperscript{67} Pomare II’s son Wiremu later remembered accompanying former captives to their homelands at Maketu, Bay of Plenty.\textsuperscript{68} The outcome of this meeting would definitely have influenced Tauhia’s position towards Governor Grey and the British Crown. Over the next two decades he placed his trust in the British Queen and her representatives, and he was committed to keeping the peace between Māori and Pākehā.

In the winter of 1850, both Hone Heke and Pomare II died. Apparently, Pomare II agreed to being baptized shortly before his death in July or August 1850.\textsuperscript{69} After Pomare II died, the chapter in which Tauhia and his hapū subordinated to Ngāpuhi power came to a close. However, Tauhia kept his promise to act as guardian for


\textsuperscript{68} Hauturu Re-Hearing: 13 October 1886, p. 37.

\textsuperscript{69} Ballara, \textit{Pomare II}. 
Pomare II’s two young adult sons, Wiremu and Hare. They came to live among Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo and were allocated land at the Puhoi River. Until the proclamation of the so-called Waste Lands Act in 1858, Tauhia, his wife and his hapū would have looked into the future full of confidence, despite their land having been sold over their heads three times to the Crown.

4.2 Martin Krippner: Moving Slowly up the Ranks

4.2.1 Quartermaster Sergeant at the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army

On 1 December 1842, at the age of 25, Martin Krippner joined the 42nd Bohemian Infantry Regiment, stationed in Terezin/Theresienstadt near the northern border to the Kingdom of Saxony. His tasks as Fourier, or quartermaster sergeant, involved the administration of provisions, uniforms and accommodation and doing the accounts and clerical work for his regiment. He had to report to the troop’s accounting officer. After years of studying classical languages, philosophy, religion, history and law, Krippner may have found little satisfaction in such work. His monthly salary as a quartermaster sergeant was fourteen gulden, which equalled approximately the wage of a textile weaver in Vienna.

In the Kriegs- und Marine-Verfassung des Kaiserthums Oesterreich (Constitution of the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army) from 1842, the characteristics of a Fourier are described as being a trusted and discreet man, well versed in accounting and the arts of pen. Fouriere were usually recruited from suitable conscripted men, from cadets at the regiment’s school, or, occasionally, from civil persons applying for such a post. Since German was the language of command and service in the

70 Vienna, Österreichisches Staatsarchiv - Kriegsarchiv (Austrian State Archives - War Archive, ASA), Grundbuch IR 11, II 1850 / 60 1/40.
72 Ignaz-Franz Bergmayr, Kriegs- und Marine-Verfassung des Kaiserthums Oesterreich: Volume 1 (Vienna: Ghelensche Erben, 1842), p. 49, as in
army, native German speakers were preferred, although knowledge of the language of the rank and file, mainly Czech in the case of the 42nd Infantry Regiment, was also required. Candidates had to pass an examination by the army commissioner and swear an oath of service to His Majesty the Emperor Ferdinand I and all commanders of the regiment and corps. A Fourier had the rank of a non-commissioned officer; he was to be addressed with the formal ‘Sie’ (you) and wore a black uniform jacket with the colours of his regiment. Krippner also had to grow a moustache, which was compulsory for soldiers of the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army.

Since the end of the Napoleonic Wars in 1815, the Austrian Empire had seen a time of relative stability and peace. During the so-called pre-March period (1815 – 1848), the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army was called to suppress only minor local uprisings such as the revolutionary movement for a unified Italy in 1831 or the revolt of Galician Polish nobles in 1846. The military budget was drastically cut. Instead of upgrading the army’s weaponry or holding military manoeuvres, the Emperor focussed on extravagant uniforms, military parades and Sunday concerts by the military bands. Although army officers enjoyed a high social status, their pay was low, lower than for civil servants. To save costs, lower ranks were often granted leave without pay, especially during harvest time. During that time of absence from the garrison, soldiers were forced to find other sources of income, and if they were stationed near their home towns, they helped with their family’s workload. On other occasions, squads of privates of the infantry were sent as labourers to factories or mines, or were assigned to build roads, bridges or channels. Such employment tactics ensured a sufficient, cheap
workforce while keeping large parts of the male peasantry under military command.

### 4.2.2 Bundesheer – the Federal German Army

A little over a year after joining the army, on 1 January 1844, Krippner was transferred to the 35th Bohemian Infantry-Regiment, which had its headquarters in Plzeň; however, since 1837, some battalions of the regiment were stationed at the fortress of the German Confederation at Mainz in the Grand Duchy of Hesse and by Rhine. Whether Krippner served at Plzeň or Mainz cannot be established with certainty. But his future career movements within the army suggest that he was positioned at the Fortress of Mainz.

The Deutsche Bund, or the German Confederation, was formed at the Congress of Vienna in 1815 after the abolishment of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation during the Napoleonic Wars. It was a loose conglomeration of 35 states and four independent cities, including the Free City of Frankfurt am Main. The main purpose of the German Confederation was to keep peace in Central Europe and to protect the sovereignty of its member states, but also to suppress any liberal and nationalistic movements within the states. Aristocratic delegates from all member states of the German Confederation met at the Bundestag, or Federal Diet, in Frankfurt, with the Austrian representative acting as president of the Federal Diet. Through such an arrangement, the Austrian Empire hoped to ensure its domination over Central Europe. The Bundesheer, or Federal German Army, ensured the external and internal security of its member states, which each had to contribute troops and money.

The Fortress of Mainz was regarded as one of the most important bulwarks of the German Confederation against potential French military attacks. The city of Mainz was positioned at the junction of the rivers Main and Rhine, close to the city of Frankfurt, where the Federal Diet of the German Confederation met. Thus, the troops stationed at Mainz offered protection for the political institutions of the

---
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German Confederation, and also ensured tight control over any liberal and nationalistic movement with which the city of Mainz was associated. It was not forgotten that in 1793 the citizens of Mainz – among them the naturalist and ethnologist Georg Forster – welcomed Napoleon’s troops and the ideas of liberté, égalité, fraternité of the French Revolution. They proclaimed the Mainzer Republik, the first German republic, which lasted four months until Prussian troops re-conquered French occupied territory and persecuted supporters of the Republic. In Mainz was also the central bureau of the intelligence service with a large network of informants to detect any conspiracies against the status quo of the German Confederation.

The Federal Fortress of Mainz stood under the command of a governor and vice-governor who were usually members of either the Prussian or Habsburg royal families, and of a commanding officer. Every five years, the Austrian Empire and the Kingdom of Prussia took turns in occupying the positions of governor, vice-governor and commanding officer. During time of peace, about 8,000 soldiers from regiments of the Austrian and Prussian forces were stationed at Mainz. In times of war, this number was supposed to reach from 12,000 to 21,000 soldiers. Since the facilities of the fortress could not accommodate so many soldiers, former monasteries and churches, already transformed into barracks by French troops, served as sleeping quarters, and some of the soldiers were accommodated in private homes of the citizens of Mainz. The relationships between the Austrian and Prussian soldiers were not always peaceful. After many brawls, especially after visits to the pubs, the city of Mainz and the fortress were divided into a Prussian and an Austrian district.

84 Blum, In the Beginning, p. 275; about the intelligence service Mainzer Zentraluntersuchungskommission, called Mainzer Informationsbüro until its dissolution in 1848, see Wolfram Siemann, 'Deutschlands Ruhe, Sicherheit und Ordnung': Die Anfänge der Politischen Polizei 1806 - 1866 (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1985), p. 170.
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The battalions of the 35th Infantry Regiment were stationed in Mainz from 1837 to 1847. On 1 September 1847 Krippner was transferred to the 11th Bohemian Infantry Regiment, which arrived in Mainz as the new Austrian contingent. Krippner’s services as Fourier at the Fortress of Mainz may have been regarded as irreplaceable, which would explain his transfer to yet another regiment. Still, we cannot say with certainty that he was positioned in Mainz and not in Jindřichův Hradec/Neuhaus in South Bohemia, where the 11th Regiment had its headquarters.

4.2.3 Brother’s Wedding in Mantov

On 12 October 1847 Martin Krippner’s brother Michael married Barbara Schischka, the daughter of the farmer Joseph Schischka from Mantov. Perhaps Martin Krippner was given leave to attend his brother’s wedding. However, he might not have been too keen on attending a wedding, which was a reminder of his involuntary celibacy and the slim chances of his ever marrying and starting a family. Soldiers of the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army could not marry without the permission of the regiment’s colonel, and the numbers of married soldiers was restricted. Only one-sixth of the officers’ corps were allowed to get married, and that was after payment of a marriage bond and proof of sufficient private income in addition to their army salary.

For non-commissioned officers and lower ranks there existed two categories of marriages: under the first category, wives and children were allowed to live within army quarters and were ensured financial help in case of the husband’s death in addition to a place for the children in the regiment’s school. Only eight percent of the rank and file of an infantry regiment received permission to marry under this category. Once the quota for marriages of the first category was reached, soldiers might receive permission to marry under the second category, which did not allow wives and children to live within army quarters, and did not entitle them to any financial support through the
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Brides had to provide certificates proving that they had enough means to support themselves and their children. The pay for soldiers was not intended to allow starting and supporting a family. That a woman of independent means would be willing to marry him, a poor soldier with no private income, Krippner probably never dared to imagine.

If Martin Krippner attended his brother’s wedding, this would have given him the opportunity to catch up with old friends and all the Krippners and Schischkas of Mantov and the surrounding villages. Apart from feasting and dancing, the wedding was a time to exchange family news, stories about military life or robota services in the fields, coal mines and spinning works, and perhaps the latest gossip about the local feudal landlord, the Duke of Thurn and Taxes. Hearing of his people’s hardship and seeing their poverty, Krippner might have become more content with his job as Fourier: although he had hardly any chance of marrying, at least he was not forced to do heavy physical work for long hours every day for hardly any pay. Thus, he might have returned to his post in the army more at ease. Michael and Barbara Krippner’s first son, Johann, was born on 9 February 1848; he died just over a month old on 17 March 1848, in the days of turmoil of the March Revolution in Vienna.

4.2.4 Revolution

In nineteenth-century military accounts, the year 1848 was called the ‘year of war’. The ‘year of war’ brought not only revolutions to Europe, but also drastic changes to Krippner’s military career and personal life. After news of the abdication of the French King, Louis Philippe, and the proclamation of the French Republic on 22 February 1848 reached the Austrian Empire, the Chancellor and Foreign Minister, Prince Metternich, feared foremost a French military attack. The Federal German Army was on alert, and the 42nd Bohemian Infantry Regiment, the regiment Krippner had joined at the beginning of his military service, was called as reinforcement to another fortress of the German
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Confederation at Rastatt, at the Upper Rhine on the border with France.\textsuperscript{97} However, it was not the external threat but the internal uprisings, sparked by the news of the events in Paris, which shook the existing political system in the Austrian Empire and all parts of the German Confederation.

Students, burghers, workers, and peasants in Budapest, Vienna and Prague demanded constitutions, representative governments, and the abolition of censorship and serfdom.\textsuperscript{98} After petitions and peaceful demonstrations were ignored, tumults broke out. On 13 March 1848, army units were called to Vienna and fired at the unarmed crowd of protesters. In response, students of Vienna called to arms and organised themselves in so-called ‘Academic Legions’; workers stormed police stations, courts, factories and the villas of factory owners. Prince Metternich, who over the last decades had refused to respond to reform requests, was forced to resign, and he fled to London on 14 March 1848. The Austrian Emperor Ferdinand I, and like him the King of Prussia and other German monarchs, granted concessions and agreed to draw up constitutions and to abolish censorship.\textsuperscript{99} General male suffrage was granted for the election of delegates for the Reichstag, the constituent parliament for the Austrian Empire in Vienna, and for the German National Assembly in Frankfurt. On 18 May 1848, the first German Parliament met in Frankfurt in the Lutheran church Paulskirche. Its first task was to draw up a constitution for a united Germany. Two days later, on 20 May 1848, the Emperor Ferdinand I and his court left Vienna in fear of violence and retreated to Innsbruck in Tyrol. The Austrian Reichstag met for the first time at Vienna on 11 July 1848.\textsuperscript{100}

The Prussian and Austrian troops stationed at Mainz and Frankfurt found themselves right in the centre of the revolutionary movement for a united German constitutional monarchy. While the German-speaking soldiers may have followed the events with great excitement, the mainly Czech soldiers of the 11\textsuperscript{th} Regiment
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probably did not join in the German nationalist enthusiasm to such an extent. However, the news of Prince Metternich’s resignation and the Emperor’s concessions might have given them hope for an improvement of their own situation as soldiers and for their families at home. Disillusionment soon followed initial euphoria after reports arrived that the grenadiers of the 35th Bohemian Infantry Regiment, under the command of Prince Windisch-Grätz, Military Commander in Bohemia, crushed the revolutionary uprisings and a first Slav Congress held in Prague in June 1848.  

The events in Prague and a growing German nationalism further inflamed a Czech-German conflict among the revolutionaries. Once censorship and police despotisms were lifted, the anger over German oppression, accumulated over centuries, erupted. Nationalistic interests led to a split in the revolutionary movement. Initially united in their demands for a democratic monarchy, German nationalists realised that the ethnic Germans were actually a minority in a liberal Austrian Empire. Thus, they dreamed of Austria becoming part of a united Germany even at the cost of losing Bohemia, Hungary and other non-German parts of the Austrian Empire. In such a united Germany, the German National Assembly in Frankfurt would possess the supreme decision-making power. On the other hand, Czech revolutionaries, mostly middle-class intellectuals, rejected such an idea since, within a German Empire, the Czechs’ dream of emancipation and equal status for their language and culture would remain unfulfilled. Demands for a Bohemian Kingdom united with Moravia and Silesia were voiced; this, in turn, frightened the nobility who were mostly of foreign origin and the ethnic Germans living in these provinces of the Austrian Empire. Nationalist fanatics had no time for the ideas of the philosopher and mathematician, Bernhard Bolzano (1781 – 1848), who called for peaceful co-existence and cooperation between the various ethnicities within the Austrian Empire. The very existence
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105 Bernhard Bolzano, Über das Verhältniß der beiden Volkstämme in Böhmen: Drei Vorträge im Jahre 1816 an der Hochschule zu Prag gehalten (Vienna: Wilhelm Braunmüller, 1849); Bolzano’s work had greatly influenced Krippner’s teachers at the Plzeň Grammar School, see chapter 2.2 of this thesis.
of the Austrian Empire was threatened; that the House of Habsburg would not stand-by to see it collapse was almost certain.

Despite all the nationalistic disagreements, the Austrian parliament, the Reichstag, decided unanimously for the liberation of the peasants and the end of unpaid labour services, robota, on 8 August 1848; Emperor Ferdinand I signed this law on 7 September 1848.106 Peasant emancipation was the only achievement of the Austrian Reichstag that was not overturned again after the Reichstag was dissolved through the counter-revolution in 1849. The reason for the retention of this revolutionary legislation might have been a realisation by the nobility that unpaid robota was actually inefficient compared to hired labour.107 The new law also gave financial compensation to the former feudal landlords, money that was welcomed by the nobility and which allowed them to invest in advanced agricultural technologies or industries.

4.2.5 Promotion

After his family was freed from servile bonds to their seignior and received full citizenship, Krippner’s rank and status within the army also improved. On 19 September 1848 he was commissioned Unterleutnant 2. Klasse, or Second Lieutenant.108 His promotion coincided with the so-called September Revolution in Frankfurt. On 18 September 1848 workers, peasants and artisans tried to storm the German National Assembly in Frankfurt by which they felt betrayed. Delegates of the National Assembly had backed down to a Prussian-Danish armistice, and they continued to ignore demands for social and economic reforms in order to improve the living conditions of industrial workers and peasants. To reinstall peace and order in the city, the mostly bourgeois delegates of the parliament and the wealthy citizens of Frankfurt called again Prussian and Austrian soldiers from Mainz who fired into the unarmed protesters. The supporters of liberal principles feared for their properties and lives when the labouring class demanded their share. By midnight, the uprising was crushed, and, according to one source, about 30 insurgents, twelve soldiers and two delegates of

107 Blum, In the Beginning, pp. 255-56.
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the National Assembly were killed. In the aftermath of the September Revolution, about 5,000 Prussian, Austrian and Bavarian soldiers remained in the garrison in Frankfurt. While military action brought an end to the revolution in Frankfurt, it meant promotion for Krippner, probably because of a vacancy among the lieutenants of his regiment.

Krippner was appointed commander of the regiment’s sergeant school Feldwebelbildungsschule. For the next three years, he instructed corporals and privates in the arts of bookkeeping and calligraphy, preparing suitable candidates for placement in the regiment’s accounting office. Finally, after serving as Fourrier for nearly seven years, Krippner rose to the lowest rank of officer and entered the officers’ corps. He was paid 24 gulden per month, which was still less than what a journeyman could earn, and up to one-quarter of his salary was deducted to pay off his new uniform and sword. Krippner was now entitled to his own quarters and to free firewood and candles, and he could hire a batman if he wanted.

The sergeant school of the 11th Infantry Regiment occupied two rooms in the former Carmelite Monastery in Frankfurt, which had been used as barracks since the French attack in 1792. Since quarters in the provisional barracks were limited, and officers were paid a supplement to find lodgings in the city, it is possible that Krippner took a room outside the barracks. Thus, the newly commissioned officer Krippner entered the civilian life of the Free City of Frankfurt. Officers frequented cafés and attended theatres and concerts; they were invited to balls, whereby subalterns were often required to dance with the older ladies. During the next two years, Krippner made acquaintance with the Frankfurter merchant, Friedrich Pfeffel, and through him, he met Emily Longdill,
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Krippner’s future wife. In order to understand the influences they had in Krippner’s life, both Pfeffel and Longdill shall be introduced in more detail.

4.2.6 Friedrich Pfeffel

Only a few minutes’ walk from the military barracks at the Carmelite Monastery was the Neue Mainzer Strasse, the street where the wealthiest and most esteemed families of Frankfurt lived in neo-classic palaces with paved courtyards, horse stables, coachmen houses, and huge gardens stretching to the parks along the former city walls. Here, in mansion number 47, was the residence of Carl Friedrich Pfeffel, partner of the bank house Brothers Bethmann. Next to the Pfeffels, in mansion number 45, lived the banker and honorary Austrian Consul, General Anselm von Rothschild.

Friedrich Pfeffel, born in Frankfurt on 19 March 1812, was the second son of Carl Friedrich Pfeffel and Maria Salome Müller. Carl Friedrich Pfeffel was the son of the German-French writer Gottlieb Konrad Pfeffel (1736 -1809) of Colmar in Alsace. Carl Friedrich became a burgher of the Free City of Frankfurt in 1808 after payment of 800 Gulden and a reference from the banker Moritz von Bethmann, who made Carl Friedrich Pfeffel partner of the Bethmann Bank and later installed him as guardian of his four sons. As partner of the Bethmann Bank, which traded with European treasury bonds and invested in railway construction, Carl Friedrich Pfeffel became very wealthy. But heavy blows hit the family: his wife, Maria Salome, died in 1817 giving birth to their fifth child, daughter Susanna, who was stillborn. His youngest son, Moritz August, died of consumption in 1830, at the age of fourteen. His daughter, Louisa Clementine, died in 1839 while on honeymoon with her husband, Johann Georg Jacobi, a
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merchant of Frankfurt. His oldest son, Peter Karl, who was a merchant based in New York, boarded the transatlantic steamer President in order to return home to Frankfurt via Liverpool on 11 March 1841. The President, then regarded the largest ship, was lost at sea without any trace. It is assumed that the ship sank on 13 March 1841 with all passengers on board. After his wife and four of his five children had died, Carl Friedrich Pfeffel retreated from all social life in Frankfurt. His niece, Louise Clementine Schmiedt, later wrote in her memoirs that only on Thursdays, every Thursday until the end of Carl Friedrich Pfeffel’s life, he invited his close family to dinner in his house.

Carl Friedrich Pfeffel’s only joys were his last remaining son, Friedrich, his daughter-in-law and the grandchildren, who lived in the wing of his mansion.

During a longer stay in London, Friedrich Pfeffel had fallen in love and married Mary Adele Longdill on 16 June 1836 in Exeter. The young couple moved to Frankfurt, and Friedrich Pfeffel became a partner in his uncle’s wine trading business J. F. Müller & Co, which had its offices and salesrooms also at 47 Neue Mainzer Strasse. Mary Adele gave birth to ten children; one son, named Carl Friedrich after his grandfather, died in infancy.
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How Krippner became acquainted with the Pfeffels is not known. Because of insufficient and unsuitable quarters for the troops stationed in Frankfurt, the burghers of Frankfurt were obliged to accommodate officers in their homes. Quite possibly, the Pfeffels rented out the empty rooms in the upper floor of their mansion, which were originally intended for Pfeffel’s daughter and her husband. Perhaps Lieutenant Krippner found quarters there, or perhaps he met the Pfeffels at official receptions or balls held by the Austrian Consul Rothschild, who lived in the house next to the Pfeffels.

Both father and son Pfeffel were actively involved in the city’s public affairs: Carl Friedrich was a member of the Citizens’ Committee, of the committee for the School of Economics and of the board of the Civic Hospital of Frankfurt, as well as an elder of the Lutheran Church of Frankfurt. Friedrich Pfeffel, as an
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advocate for constitutional rights and religious tolerance, was elected on 19 October 1848 to the Constituent Assembly and contributed to writing a draft constitution for the Free State of Frankfurt am Main in 1849.\textsuperscript{131} Schmiedt described the Pfeffel family circle in her memoirs as 'highly educated and stimulating, of rational, free and non-orthodox Lutheran religiosity'.\textsuperscript{132}

In his friend’s family circle, Krippner found a spiritual and intellectual environment he might have missed tremendously during his service as quartermaster sergeant over the last seven years. That Krippner was accepted into the Pfeffel family, in turn, permits conclusions to be drawn about Martin Krippner’s personality. He must have shared the Pfeffel family’s interests and engaged in political discussions regarding a democratic, united Germany. Perhaps the financially successful, yet mourning Pfeffels saw in Krippner a welcome distraction. Krippner may have entertained his friends with stories from his Bohemian country: about his childhood as a blacksmith’s son, the monks at Teplá Abbey, his enlightened teachers at Plzeň, and his time as law student in Prague. Krippner not only became a lifelong friend of Friedrich Pfeffel, he also won the heart of the younger sister of Friedrich Pfeffel’s wife.

4.2.7 Emily Longdill

Emily was born on 13 March 1818 in Central London, in the parish of St. Pancras. She was the fourth child of Pynson Wilmot Longdill, a solicitor, and Selina Longdill, née Smith. Pynson Wilmot Longdill was the second living child of Margery Wilmot and Prowde Longdill of St. Botolph’s Aldgate, London, master and owner of a ship trading with India.\textsuperscript{133} Selina Longdill, née Smith, was the ninth child of the then famous painter and engraver, John Raphael Smith (1751 – 1812) and of his third wife, or partner, Hannah Croome.\textsuperscript{134} The Longdills belonged to the circle of friends including William Godwin and Percy Bysshe

\textsuperscript{132} Schmiedt, pp. 34, 57.
Shelley; Longdill acted as Shelley’s solicitor in his case for the custody of Shelley’s children.\textsuperscript{135}

By 1823, Emily and her four siblings were orphans. According to a reference in Henry Grabb Robinson’s diary, their mother Selina Longdill died the night of King George IV’s coronation, on 19 July 1821, shortly after giving birth to her fifth child, Edward Benjamin.\textsuperscript{136} Two years later, on 1 May 1823, their father Pynson Wilmot Longdill died after having ‘gone mad’ grieving for his beautiful wife.\textsuperscript{137} Another source, a family pedigree composed in a letter by Lewis E. Wilmot in 1899, states that Pynson Wilmot Longdill died suddenly in 1823 either of meningitis or a brain tumour.\textsuperscript{138} The author of this letter quoted Longdill’s will, which was ‘scribbled’ in the last hours of his life. According to this will, Longdill’s wife, Selina née Smith, was still alive at the time of his death, but this must have been an error, or a delusion. Only a week after Pynson Wilmot Longdill’s demise, the family’s house at 1 Sidmouth Place, Gray’s Inn Lane, London, was offered for sale with all furniture, draping, linen, cutlery, books and pictures.\textsuperscript{139}

Hearing about his younger brother’s death, Benjamin Prowde Longdill, who worked as a surgeon in the Madras Army in India, returned to London in 1824. There were rumours that Uncle Benjamin had left behind in India an indigenous wife and children. However, back in London, he married his first cousin, Elizabeth Charlotte née Wilmot.\textsuperscript{140} According to a remark in Robinson’s diary, Benjamin Prowde Longdill was then already on his ‘death bed’, and the couple only married so that they could look after their orphaned nieces and nephews.
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Selina, Pynson, Mary, Emily and Edward Longdill. Uncle Benjamin died on 18 June 1829, 52 years old, in St. Sidwell, Exeter, County of Devon. In his will, he left his estate to his wife and the children of his deceased brother.

After Uncle Benjamin’s death, the care of the five siblings was probably shared among relatives. Mary Adele was adopted by a relative of the Wilmot family. Emily also was supposed to have lived with the Wilmots. The youngest brother, Edward Benjamin, followed in Uncle Benjamin’s footsteps. He was sent to India and joined the 24th Native Infantry Regiment as Ensign and Assistant-Surgeon.

According to the census from 1841, Emily and Pynson Wilmot Longdill lived at Shawfield Cottage, St. Luke, Chelsea, which was the address of their aunt, the painter Eliza Aders née Smith. Aunt Eliza’s third husband was Charles (Carl) Aders, a German merchant and insurance broker based in London. Uncle Charles Aders had accumulated great wealth, and during the Napoleonic Wars, he bought German and Flemish medieval Masters, rescued from dissolved churches and monasteries, for a relatively low price. His famous art collection, his library holding the latest German publications, the splendid dinner parties, concerts and balls held at his summer palace in Bad Godesberg, near Bonn at the Rhine, attracted many visitors. The Aders’ house became a meeting place, not only for English and German merchants, but also for some of the greatest Romantic writers and painters of their time. Their circle of friends included Henry Crabb Robinson, Samuel T. Coleridge, William Wordsworth, Charles Lamb, John Linnell, William Blake, and the German writers and poets August W. von Schlegel, Bettina and Achim von Armin, Clemens Brentano, and the German painter, Jakob Götzenberger. After Aders’ business went bankrupt in the mid-1830s, the palace in Bad Godesberg, their house at Euston Square, London and the library and art collection were all sold by auction. Among the buyers of the German and Flemish paintings was Johann David Passavant, an artist and art

141 Pope, *Three Wives, Three Husbands Living*.
142 Wilmot, ‘Letter to George Frederick Longdill’.
143 Wilmot, ‘Letter to George Frederick Longdill’.
144 Public Record Office, Census 1841, Parish St. Luke Chelsea, South District: HO 107 / 688 / 12, p. 28, as in Ancestry.co.uk <http://sharing.ancestry.co.uk/1606775?h=bbef7f7> , [accessed 2 May 2016].
historian from Frankfurt. When he was appointed curator of the Frankfurt Städel
Art Museum in Neue Mainzer Strasse in 1840, he added paintings purchased from
the Aders to the museum’s collection. After the collapse of her husband’s
business, Eliza Aders retreated from social life. An exhibition at the Royal
Academy in 1839 displayed her painting *Luxuriating in the Pleasures of Memory*,
perhaps a motto of her life until her death in 1857. Charles Aders died
impoverished in 1846 in Florence where he had moved for his health in 1842.

In the Aders’ house, the Longdill siblings witnessed the fickleness of wealth and
social popularity. Yet, it was through the Aders’ circle of friends and business
partners that Mary Adele Longdill met Friedrich Pfeffel, the young merchant from
Frankfurt. They got married in 1836 at St. Sidwell’s, Exeter, where Uncle
Benjamin Longdill was also buried. Mary Adele Longdill’s siblings, Selina,
Pynson and Emily and Friedrich Pfeffel’s sister, Louisa, were all present at the
wedding. After aunt and uncle Aders left for Italy, Emily must have followed
her sister Mary Adele to Frankfurt. Here she would have been of great help to her
sister who, by 1842, had given birth to three children of whom two daughters,
Selina and Emily, survived.

In Frankfurt, Emily found a comfortable life in one of the most elegant houses of
the city, in the company of her sister and her liberal and wealthy family-in-law.
She needed to learn the German language, unless she was already fluent after
living at her German uncle’s, Charles Aders’, house. According to family
memoirs, Emily studied art in Frankfurt. In the same street, only a few houses
away from the Pfeffel residence, was the Städel Art School and Gallery. Although
Johann Friedrich Städel, the founder of the art school, had intended it to be for
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everyone, free of charge and regardless of gender, women were officially permitted as students only after 1869. Perhaps the inspector of the Städel Art School and Gallery, Johann David Passavant, made an exception for the granddaughter of the painter and engraver, John Rafael Smith, and the relative of his friend Charles Aders, and Emily was allowed to visit art classes. Her niece, Emily Pfeffel, born in 1840, was supposed also to have studied at the Städel Art School and Gallery.

In addition to her other attributes, Emily Longdill had a beautiful voice and was an accomplished pianist, as reported in newspaper articles about concerts she gave later in New Zealand. With her love for music, she certainly would have heard concerts given by Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy, then one of the most celebrated German composers, who visited Frankfurt often from 1836 until his death in 1847. Perhaps she was also one of the 200 members of the famous Frankfurt choir Cäcilienverein to whom Mendelsohn dedicated his St. Paul Oratorio. She definitely would have been present at many occasions frequented by Frankfurt’s high society, attending concerts, theatre shows and balls. There was also resident in Frankfurt at that time a large English community, which had grown after the signing of a Free Trade Agreement between Frankfurt and England in 1832. Although ‘portionless’ herself, as Robinson described the Longdill orphans, her connection with the wealthy Pfeffel family would have provided Emily Longdill plenty of chances to meet potential husbands, perhaps even someone who spoke her language, shared her religion and could offer a comfortable lifestyle. What attracted her to the penniless Lieutenant Martin Krippner can only be speculated.

In general, in Frankfurt and Mainz there prevailed a widespread opinion that Austrian officers were much more charming than Prussian officers; however, officers of the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army, unless they had a private income, were known for their poverty, owing to their miserable salaries. That two of the Friedrich and Mary Adele Pfeffel’s daughters would also later marry Austrian
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officers, one from Chotěšov near Krippner’s home town, shows that such marriages were not uncommon among the Frankfurt upper middle class.\textsuperscript{157} 

4.2.8 Counter-Revolution, Promotion and Wedding

While members of the German National Assembly in Frankfurt were drafting a constitution for a united Germany with the Prussian King as the head of state, in Lombardy-Venetia, then part of the Austrian Empire, a republic had been proclaimed on 23 March 1848; meanwhile, Hungary planned on becoming a sovereign state with its own constitution, an independent ministry and Hungarian as the official language.\textsuperscript{158} The existence of the Austrian Empire was seriously threatened. The initially almost bloodless revolutionary changes were soon to be crushed by forces of the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army. By August 1848, Lombardy-Venetia had been re-conquered.\textsuperscript{159} In October 1848, Field Marshal Prince Windisch-Grätz formed the so-called Northern Army with grenadiers of the 11\textsuperscript{th} Regiment and companies of the 35\textsuperscript{th} regiment and marched to Vienna fighting the armed revolutionaries. After about 2,000 people fell during the street battles, Vienna was quietened and martial law imposed on 30 October 1848.\textsuperscript{160} Afterwards, Prince Windisch-Grätz and his troops proceeded to Hungary, trying to stop and reverse the separatist movement.\textsuperscript{161} The weak Emperor Ferdinand I was forced to abdicate by supporters of his sister-in-law, and his eighteen-year-old nephew, Francis Joseph, succeeded to the throne. The new Emperor Francis Joseph declared it his mission to re-establish the old order. When in spring 1849 the Hungarians were still not defeated, Emperor Francis Joseph, who fought as supreme military commander at the head of his troops, called the Russian army under Tsar Nicholas for help. On 13 August 1849 the Hungarian rising was crushed and about 100,000 were killed.\textsuperscript{162} The constituent parliament Reichstag for the Austrian Empire was dissolved on 4 March 1849, and a constitution,
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written by the Emperor Francis Joseph and his chief minister Schwarzenberg, replaced the constitution approved by the Reichstag.\textsuperscript{163}

After the Imperial Constitution written by the German National Assembly in Frankfurt was rejected by several states of the German Confederation, and after the Prussian King – formerly elected by the German National Assembly to act as head of a Federal German State - had refused to take the Imperial Crown, the German National Assembly partly dissolved, and remnants retreated to Stuttgart.\textsuperscript{164} On 23 July 1849 mainly Prussian troops of the Bundesheer, under command of the Prince of Prussia, the future Emperor Wilhelm I, defeated the army of revolutionaries and rebellious soldiers stationed at the Fortress of Rastatt in the Grand-Duchy of Baden, a neighbouring state of Frankfurt. The Fortress of Rastatt became the place of execution of revolutionaries. Those who managed to escape captivity fled across borders, and many joined the stream of emigrants to England and America.\textsuperscript{165}

The attempts to create a Federal German State under a constitutional monarchy had failed. In the Austrian Empire, years of absolutism and political repression followed.\textsuperscript{166} Nothing is known about Krippner’s thoughts and actions during the revolution from 1848 to 1849. His military records show a second promotion on 8 April 1849, when he was commissioned Unterleutnant 1. Klasse.\textsuperscript{167} His rank still equalled that of a Second Lieutenant but with a slightly higher monthly pay of 28 gulden.\textsuperscript{168} For two more years, Krippner was in charge of the regiment’s school for sergeants until he was assigned in 1851 to help with the accounting and financial management at the Supreme Command of the German Federal Army at Frankfurt.\textsuperscript{169}
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On 12 May 1851 Emily Longdill and Martin Krippner married at the Catholic Cathedral of Frankfurt am Main. To be able to marry, Krippner had to obtain the permission of his regiment’s Colonel-in-Chief, and he needed to deposit the so-called marriage bond. The money for the bond most likely came from the Pfeffels; the Krippners would not have been able to come up with the required amount. Krippner’s financial circumstances are described in his military records as ‘son of a burgher without fortune; the marriage bond of 12,000 gulden belongs to his wife.’ The annual interest received from the bond and Krippner’s salary as second lieutenant had to be sufficient for leading a life fitting for an officer and his family. Krippner would not have worried about money at this stage: he had
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just been promoted, a beautiful and intelligent woman was at his side, and
together they had more resources available than he ever dreamt of.

♦ ♦ ♦
4.3 Summary

During the decade of the 1840s, both Aotearoa New Zealand and the Austrian Empire saw radical changes at the macro-level of society: by signing Te Tiriti o Waitangi/Treaty of Waitangi, Māori rangatira agreed to share kāwanatanga with representatives of the British Crown; during the Revolution of 1848, the peasants in the Austrian Empire won their hard-earned freedom from serfdom. Whether Tauhia and Krippner participated in the movements leading to such changes is not fully known. However, both Tauhia and Krippner benefited from the new political and social structures in their respective societies. Tauhia and the survivors of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo hapū were released from captivity, and they returned to ancestral lands at Mahurangi. There, Tauhia married Miriama Houkura of Te Kawerau, and with his hapū established cultivations and a coastal trading business. After the abolition of serfdom, Krippner received full citizenship, and the soldier with a law degree was promoted to second lieutenant. As an army officer – although at the lowest rank – Krippner gained access to Frankfurt’s bourgeois society, where he met lifelong friends and his future wife.

Shortly after Tauhia and his hapū returned to their ancestral kāinga at the Puhoi River, they found out that their land had been sold three times over their heads by Ngāti Pāoa, Pomare II and Ngāti Whātua, former enemies and kin, to the colonial government. Feeling deceived by his own people, Tauhia turned to Pākehā government officials and used the British legal system to contest the sale of his hapū’s lands. Tauhia placed his trust in the new political power in the country, which, he believed, shared the kāwanatanga of Aotearoa New Zealand at an equal level with Māori rangatira. Tauhia also embraced the Christian religion, which gave him the feeling of being freed from the stigma attached to living in captivity, and thus encouraged him to return to his homeland and fully embrace his role as rangatira of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo. Upon baptism, he took on the name Te Hemara Tauhia after the missionary James Hamlin.

By September 1849 the revolutions in the Austrian Empire and states of the German Confederation were crushed by Prussian and Austrian armed forces with
the support of the Imperial Russian Army. While the so-called ‘Decade of Absolutism’ began in the Austrian Empire, Krippner found love and prosperity in Frankfurt am Main. He married Emily Longdill, an orphan from London, who was related to the wealthy Pfeffel family of bankers and merchants in Frankfurt. This relationship and friendship with the Pfeffels secured the young couple an income sufficient to live comfortably and raise a family; Krippner’s wage as second lieutenant would have never afforded such a lifestyle. The Pfeffel family circle also provided a space where ideas of a democratic society and religious tolerance were discussed and supported.

Two promotions within one year and his placement as officer entrusted with the accounting and financial management at the Supreme Command of the German Federal Army at Frankfurt must have given Krippner the confidence that his career and advancement in society were only just starting. He probably felt satisfied with his private and professional position. Tauhia also must have felt reassured in his mission to revive his hapū’s mana, after Governor Hobson promised to acknowledge a reserve for Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo at Mahurangi. While the events of the Northern War in 1845 indicated tensions and misunderstandings between Māori and representatives of the British Crown, the following peace negotiations would have convinced Tauhia that a harmonious coexistence between Māori and Pākehā was also the concern of the new Governor, Sir George Grey. Thus, by the end of the 1840s, both Krippner and Tauhia had good reasons to look forward to a fulfilling and undisturbed future. However, new wars in Europe and an increasing encroachment of the British Crown on Māori rights and mana challenged both men and their families to seek a new balance between conformity and resistance. Having already experienced profound change in both their wider social and private lives, Tauhia and Krippner would look to new decisions and compromises during the 1850s. These will be discussed in the following chapter(s).
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5 Dreams and Schemes

While Tauhia and the people of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo were successfully asserting their ancestral rights to land in the Puhoi-Mahurangi region, the British legislature passed the New Zealand Constitution Act in 1852, which laid the foundation for the political marginalisation of Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand. Nevertheless, still believing in the protective role the British Crown assumed based on Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Tauhia and other members of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo agreed to the sale of large tracts of land formerly belonging to their hapū. In return, they expected infrastructural development and economic growth through Pākehā settlement in their neighbourhood. In order to attract more immigrants to New Zealand, the New Zealand government integrated parts of the cheaply purchased ‘waste land’ into schemes for free land grants. Overseas emigration agents and shipping companies, who saw migration as a source of lucrative business, advertised these schemes in Great Britain and on the European continent, hoping to establish New Zealand as a dream destination for prospective emigrants. Among those Europeans contemplating to start a new life across the oceans were Krippner and his family. New wars in Europe threatened Krippner’s convenient non-combative military service in Frankfurt, and he was concerned for his and his family’s future. New Zealand – in 1859 still a rather unusual destination for German emigrants – became the focus of Krippner’s emigration dreams. His family and a first group from his Bohemian home village managed to leave Europe at a time when the Austrian Empire was still in a state of war against France and the Kingdom of Sardinia.

♦ ♦ ♦
5.1 Te Hemara Tauhia: Consolidating Position in the Puhoi-Mahurangi Region

5.1.1 Declaration of Waiwerawera/Puhoi Reserve

Two deeds of sale of land, a letter of protest against a planned road cutting across ancestral burial sites, shipping news, and reports by journalists and government officials are the only records found that provide evidence of Tauhia’s public presence as Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo rangatira during the 1850s. His private life remains obscure. The only information about his immediate whānau relates to his mother, Mereana Te Anini, who died some time during the late 1850s. However, neither the exact date nor the place of her burial are known. It is likely that her final resting place is at Mihirau on Maungatauhoro at the Puhoi river mouth, where her matua kēkē (uncle), the great warrior Murupaenga, is buried. No records of Tauhia mentioning his mother’s passing have survived. The only source referring to her death is Robert Graham’s pamphlet advertising Waiwera Hotsprings, published in 1878.¹

The growing importance of the Mahurangi region as a source for sawn timber prompted the government to determine the undefined boundaries and to settle the unresolved ownership of lands included in the Mahurangi Purchase from 1841. Because Te Kawerau/ Ngāti Rongo continued either to demand payment or else send away Pākehā loggers who did not get permission from the hapū to fell and saw timber, the government was forced to finally recognize Ngāti Rongo and Te Kawerau’s interests in the Mahurangi blocks of land.² In November 1853, the Crown paid Parihoro, a Te Kawerau rangatira with links to Ngāti Manuhiri and Te Parawhau, £150 for his Mahurangi claim, and set aside a reserve of approximately 1,000 acres at Matakana/Te Wharanui for Parihoro and his hapū.³

Tauhia and his people did not accept any monetary payment. Instead, they insisted on keeping the land between Waiwerawera River and Te Pukapuka Bay. Thus, after negotiations with John Grant Johnson, the government interpreter and
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² Rigby, pp. 12, 51; Turton, Maori Deeds of Land Purchases, p. 255.
³ Rigby, pp. 37, 40.
District Land Purchase Commissioner, the Waiwerawera/Puhoi Reserve comprising 6,635 acres was finally drawn up in 1853.4

A so-called ‘Government or Back Line 1845’ drawn with a ruler along the Kaipara Ranges marked the western border of the reserve; the land south of the Waiwerawera River and north of Te Pukapuka Bay was declared ‘Government Land’.6 The native title to this ‘Government Land’ was extinguished after the signing of further deeds of sale. On 22 June 1854 Te Hemara Tauhia and 41 other members of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo and Ngāti Whātua set their signature under the Crown purchase deed of the Wainui block south of the Waiwerawera/Puhoi Reserve; the signatories included Tauhia’s sister, his brother-in-law, mother,

Figure 12 Sketch of Waiwerawera/Puhoi Reserve in 1853, by John G. Johnson5

6 Johnson, ‘Mr Johnson's Report of Visit to Mahurangi’.
brother, and father-in-law. The vendors, or rather claimants seeking compensation since their land was already sold in 1841, received £800, of which £600 was paid in 1854, and £200 in January 1855. The block comprised approximately 13,300 acres and included the land at Nukumea Stream near Orewa where Martin Krippner and the first group of Bohemian immigrants would settle six years later. Also on 22 June 1854, Tauhia’s brother-in-law, Arama Karaka Haututu, and others signed the Crown purchase deed of the Ahuroa-Kourawhero block, approximately 14,867 acres north-west of the Waiwerawera/Puhoi Reserve, for which they received £1200: £900 was paid in 1854, £300 in January 1855. Te Hemara Tauhia’s name was not included in this deed of sale.

No plans accompanied the deeds of sale. Over a year later, in November 1855, Charles Heaphy was appointed first Crown surveyor for the Mahurangi region. He finished his surveys, including a plan for the ‘Great North Road’, in 1856. In 1859, Tauhia wrote a letter to the Auckland Superintendent protesting against the proposed route of the Great North Road, which cut right through the burial grounds on his land at the Puhoi river mouth. He not only asked for a change to the route, but also made clear that he expected payment for any land taken from the reserve for the road.

Although Tauhia and his people signed deeds of sale for Mahurangi land in the mid and late 1850s, it was, in fact, compensation – one shilling and two pence per acre – they claimed and received for land that used to belong to Te Kawerau and Ngāti Rongo, but later sold to the Crown by Ngāti Pāoa, Pomare II and Ngāti Whātu rangatira in 1841. Besides regulating financial compensation, these deeds of sale from the 1850s were also of social and political significance for the region. The historian Vincent O’Malley calls these deeds of sale ‘local treaties’: ‘They were not just a matter of real estate but of relationships.’ While Māori accepted the low price paid for their land, they anticipated a ‘mutual beneficial relationship’ with incoming Pākehā settlers and the ‘real payment’ in form of

7 Turton, An Epitome of Official Documents, pp. 141, 42.
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13 O’Malley, Beyond the Imperial Frontier, p. 15.
development of infrastructure, including roads, hospitals, and schools, as promised by government representatives during the course of negotiation.14

5.1.2 Timber and Coastal Shipping Enterprises

The money received for selling the Wainui block allowed Tauhia and his hapū to buy another vessel. In 1854 Te Hemara Tauhia and Te Kingi were registered as owners of the 18-ton cutter Duke of Wellington, built by Thomas Scott & Sons at Mahurangi.15 The Duke of Wellington operated between the ports of Mahurangi River and Auckland, mainly transporting timber and firewood to the Auckland market and returning with beef, pork, flour, tea, rum and tobacco for the Mahurangi residents.16

In March 1855 the freely distributed bi-lingual government newspaper Te Karere Maori o Nui Tireni - Maori Messenger reported Te Hemara Tauhia’s purchase of the cutter. While using Tauhia as an example of an entrepreneurial Māori chief embracing European civilization, the article tried at the same time to belittle Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo’s coastal shipping enterprise, and they portrayed Tauhia as ‘shrewd’ and focused on ‘money making’.17 The fact that Tauhia employed Pākehā sawyers, which some colonists might have regarded as an embarrassment for themselves, was interpreted by the authors as his ‘having but little confidence in the perseverance of his fellow natives, [thus] he has engaged Europeans to saw his timber, and pays them at the rate of 15s. per hundred.’18 This article illustrates a position of double-standards towards Māori economic enterprise: while European attitudes tended to dictate that Māori should adopt so-called civilized European modes and techniques of industry, they also tended to condemn Māori attempts to derive wealth as equal competitors in European-dominated enterprise.19 When seen as becoming too successful in the eyes of colonists,

14 O’Malley, Beyond the Imperial Frontier, p. 45; Turton, An Epitome of Official Documents, p. 57.
15 Locker, p. 373.
18 'Ko te Rangatira nei, ko Te Hemara: The Chief Te Hemara', p. 11.
Māori, and in this case Tauhia and his people, were portrayed ‘as the most covetous people in the world.’

### 5.1.3 Response to the New Zealand Constitution Act 1852

While Tauhia and Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo were developing their kāinga, māra and forestry operations, they would have noticed changes in Pākehā kāwanatanga.

In June 1852 the British Parliament in London passed the New Zealand Constitution Act, which established settler self-government in New Zealand in the form of a General Assembly consisting of a Governor, Legislative Council and House of Representatives. The Governor, appointed by her Majesty, would appoint members of the Legislative Council, while the members of the House of Representatives were to be elected every five years by eligible New Zealand residents. Voting was restricted to male British citizens 21 years of age or older who owned freehold property, or alternatively, a leasehold property, or a tenement of a certain value. The same restrictions applied to voting representatives of the newly proclaimed six provincial assemblies. Such electoral legislation excluded all women, non-British residents, and most Māori who owned their land communally under customary title. Apparently, in 1853, the 5849 enrolled voters included some 100 Māori. Thus, the New Zealand Constitution Act from 1852 gave control over key elements of state power to a Pākehā minority, and Māori were effectively denied political representation. No councils where Māori rangatira and Pākehā government officers could discuss laws concerning their co-existence in Aotearoa New Zealand were provided.

If up to that point Tauhia was under the illusion that the representatives of the British Crown intended a sovereign partnership between Māori and Pākehā, then this new legislation must have started to create serious doubts. However, while being denied a voice in the General and Auckland Provincial Assemblies, Tauhia might have still believed that Māori tino rangatiratanga was respected pursuant to Section 71 of the New Zealand Constitution Act from 1852: Section 71 provided
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for setting apart ‘particular districts’ within which Māori self-government would be maintained and laws and customs observed ‘so far as they are not repugnant to the general principles of humanity’. The historian Paul Moon interpreted Section 71 as not much more than a pragmatic concession to Māori, which was ‘cheaper than having the colonial Government police them.’

According to historian Barry Rigby, Te Hemara Tauhia served as one of the first Native Assessors installed by Governor Grey in respect of the Magistrates Courts’ Ordinance, 1846. As Native Assessor Tauhia would have been called to help the Resident Magistrates of the Kaipara or Auckland districts in civil and criminal cases involving Māori. No annual salary was paid for this service. However, there is no evidence that Tauhia was officially appointed as Native Assessor before 1861, when his appointment was announced in Te Karere Maori. Exactly when he became known to Crown officials as ‘Mr Mahurangi’, representing the interests of local Māori in that region, could not be established. Concluding from Native Secretary McLean’s suggestion to Governor Browne in 1857 to designate influential rangatira in the districts north of Auckland as Native Assessors, it is unlikely that Tauhia was appointed as Assessor before then. However, according to findings reported in the Deed of Settlement of Historical Claims of Ngāti Whātua o Kaipara, Tauhia’s relatives living in the Kaipara area, the Ngāti Whātua rangatira Te Kawau, Te Keene and Te Tinana, had been appointed as Native Assessors as early as 1852.

In response to political marginalisation and growing pressure on Māori to part with large tracts of their land, the idea of establishing a Māori King emerged. The Ngāti Toa rangatira, Tamihana Te Rauparaha, after returning from his visit to England in 1852, envisaged a Māori King as representative and leader of a Māori
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nation, whose installation would overcome disunity between iwi and hapū. By uniting under the leadership of a king, Māori would be able to face the increasing number of immigrants and the growing power of the Pākehā governing system, and in particular, to resist the growing Pākehā pressure for land sales. A Māori King would not replace the British Queen, but act co-operatively as her equal partner.

Tauhia’s thoughts regarding the emerging Kīngitanga movement and the crowning of Potatau Te Wherowhero as the first Māori King in 1858 are not recorded. Judging from his future involvement in demanding equal numbers of Māori representatives in parliament in 1868, and in the establishment of the Kotahitanga Māori parliamentary movement in 1879, Tauhia might not have been a supporter of the idea of a Māori King, preferring to advocate for Māori political representation under a modified political constitution. However, he certainly welcomed the concept of Māori political unity across tribal boundaries. Such a position became apparent when, during the mid-1850s, Tauhia and his hapū invited members of Waikato and Ngāti Kahu to settle in the Puhoi region.

5.1.4 New Residents at Waiwerawera/Puhoi Reserve

After all Native Title to land included in the Mahurangi Purchase from 1841 had been extinguished with the exception of the Waiwerawera/Puhoi Reserve and Parihoro’s Reserve, the Ngāti Kahu hapū of Te Kawerau, residing at Whangaparaoa, became landless. Consequently, some of them moved to the Waiwerawera/Puhoi Reserve and settled among Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo. Tauhia and his hapū also invited a group of Waikato people to settle next to their kāinga between Puhoi River and Mahurangi River. According to evidence given at a Native Land Court hearing in 1866, Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo had allocated a piece of land (123 acres) at Opahi Bay to the Waikato rangatira, Te Tuna, and his people in 1856. Te Tuna stated in his evidence during the hearing: ‘The land has

33 Tauhia’s involvement in those movements will be discussed in chapters 6 and 7 of this thesis.
been given to us as a residence for myself and people for loan but not to dispose of it to other persons (for sale).”

There is no information in the Land Court hearing about the relationship between Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo and Te Tuna and his people. Since Opahi used to be the seat of Maki, the eponymous tupuna of Te Kawerau, this gift of land to Waikato might have been a symbolic expression of gratitude for Waikato’s help during the time when Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo were fleeing from the Battle Te Ika a Ranganui in 1825. It is also possible, that Te Tuna and his people were related to Wiremu and Hare Pomare’s mother who belonged to Ngāti Raukawa. Or, perhaps, inviting Waikato people to live among Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo at the Waiwerawera/Puhoi Reserve came about as a result of an awakening Māori nationalist movement which sought to overcome fragmentation along tribal lines. In Locker’s historical account of the Mahurangi region, the Opahi Bay is also called Waikato Bay.

Thus, the Waiwerawera/Puhoi Reserve became a residence for members of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo, Ngāti Kahu, Waikato, Ngāti Manu (Ngā Puhi), in addition to Pākehā bushmen, sawyers, skippers, whalers and shipwrights, all engaged with each other in economic enterprises and later connected through intermarriage.

When the first Pākehā child was born in 1860 at the timber-camp next to Te Muri, Tauhia asked to become the adoptive father. This inter-tribal and inter-ethnic co-existence at Puhoi River might have been a realization of Tauhia’s dream of a peaceful and mutually beneficial partnership with former enemy tribes and incoming Pākehā settlers.

5.1.5 Sales of Land Declared ‘Waste Land’

In 1857 Native Secretary and Chief Land Purchase Commissioner, Donald McLean, inspected the region north of Auckland, and he visited the Presbyterian Nova Scotian settlers at Waipu. In his report to Governor Browne about this journey, McLean was full of praise for the progress made by the Nova Scotian
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settlers who had arrived in 1854. He suggested that New Zealand would profit tremendously from more special settlements of hard-working immigrants ‘bringing along with them their religious and educational establishments already in operation: no chance-collection of men, but an active and organized community.’ Such immigrant groups could be easily induced to come to New Zealand by offering free land grants at a value equivalent to passages paid. McLean’s report about his visit to the Nova Scotian community at Waipu exemplifies that the often-used argument that the government had to satisfy settler demand for more land did not reflect the whole picture: in order to secure the colony through the establishment of stable and culturally coherent communities, the provincial governments tried to lure more immigrants to New Zealand with offers of ‘free land’. This plan put pressure of the House of Representatives to pass legislation which would enable the purchase of as much land as quickly and cheaply as possible. In consequence of McLean’s report, the Crown sped up the process of extinguishing Native Title to large tracts of land in the Mahurangi and Kaipara regions.

Although in 1846 all Māori land not actively cultivated or occupied was declared ‘waste land’ and therefore belonging to the Crown, the New Zealand government did not attempt a straight-out appropriation of such land during the 1850s out of fear of Māori uprising. Sir George Grey’s tactics of acquiring land during his first term of governorship (1845 - 1853) were based on his belief that buying waste land ‘was always much cheaper than fighting them for it.’ However, with an increase in European population and a decreasing reliance upon Māori supplies of produce, labour, and protection from potential violent attacks, the government’s land purchase tactics became more and more aggressive.

To increase the willingness of Māori to part with their land, throughout 1857 Te Karere Māori published articles arguing against communal land ownership and praising the advantages of individual ownership of property and individual industry. The newspaper’s propaganda linked communal ownership of land with
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poverty and with inter- and intra-tribal quarrels and bloodshed arising from disputes over land; it advocated individual ownership as found in European and Christian societies as the basis of peaceful co-existence and much higher profits.\textsuperscript{46} The verifiable fact that, up to the mid-1850s, Māori tribal enterprises contributed more to New Zealand’s revenue than the Pākehā economy was ignored by the newspaper. In addition to condemning communal ownership of property, a political rhetoric spread that the possession of too much land or, alternatively, monetary profit from its sale or lease was not good for Māori.\textsuperscript{47} This double-standard was expressed, for example, by Walter Mantell, the South Island Commissioner for Extinguishing Native Titles, who argued that Māori in possession of large tracts of land were enabled ‘to continue to live in their old barbarism on the rents of a uselessly extensive domain.’\textsuperscript{48} The hypocrisy of arguments against communal industry also became obvious in propaganda published in England in order to encourage European emigration to New Zealand.\textsuperscript{49} Referring to the success of the Nova Scotian settlement, provincial immigration agents such as Alex Ridgway pointed to the advantages of a ‘Grouping System’: potential immigrants should form groups of 50 to 100 persons, choose their allotments of land together in one block, and thus be able to offer each other ‘mutual aid in erecting residences, felling trees, &c.’\textsuperscript{50} In other words, community effort, not individual enterprise, would guarantee success.

Whether Tauhia was a regular reader of \textit{Te Karere Maori}, and whether the paper’s propaganda affected his decisions, is not known. He did set his signature on a further deed of sale in 1858. Perhaps due to financial pressure after an economic recession affected the Auckland market, or thinking that it was better to receive a nominal price of eight pennies per acre rather than nothing, Tauhia, his brother-in-law, father-in-law, and others signed the Pakiri purchase deed in March 1858. For the block of approximately 38,000 acres of ‘waste land’, part of the Mahurangi
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Purchase from 1841, the vendors or claimants of compensation received £1,070. A year later, Purchase Commissioner Rogan congratulated Native Secretary McLean on his Pakiri purchase for a 'ridiculously low price; the Kauri alone is worth 20 times the sum paid by the government'.

Tauhia signed no further deeds of sale during the 1850s; his Ngāti Whātua relatives negotiated the sales of large tracts of land in the Kaipara region without Tauhia being part of the group of claimants. His brother-in-law, Arama Karaka Haututu, together with other members of Te Uri o Hau, continued signing Crown purchase deeds in 1858 and 1859; for example, they sold the Paparoa block at North Kaipara, comprising 15,021 acres, for eight pennies an acre. These sales in the Kaipara region were facilitated by the Wesleyan missionary, William Gittos, who had set up a mission station at Otamatea River near Arama Karaka Haututu's kāinga in 1856. According to historian Dick Scott, Gittos worked for the government organising the purchase of Māori land in order to create a ‘cushion of European settlement’ between Auckland and Ngāpuhi territory. Te Uri o Hau might have deemed such a plan of Pākehā settlements attractive, not only because of the prospects of new trading opportunities and the development of infrastructure in their neighbourhood, but also because it coincided with their desire to have a buffer zone along the northern border between Ngāpuhi and the Ngāti Whātua confederation of tribes. Recent conflicts over the rightful ownership of land between Ngāpuhi, Te Parawhau and Te Uri o Hau probably created a new fear of possible violent attacks from former enemies. Further, resulting from the Battle Te Ika-a-Ranganui in 1825, large tracts of land in this border-region were considered tapu, and thus inaccessible for members of Te Uri o Hau.
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In Auckland Province from 1858, the activities of resale, lease and distribution of ‘waste lands’ where Native Title had been extinguished were regulated according to the Auckland Waste Lands Act. The Act stipulated that blocks of land could be bought after being surveyed for at least ten shillings per acre plus ‘the price paid to the Natives for the release of their rights in the land sold, and the cost of surveying thereof.’\textsuperscript{58} The government intended to invest the profit of ten shillings per acre in the development of infrastructure and the promotion of further immigration.

To attract more immigrants, the Auckland Province offered grants of ‘free land’ in proportion to the cost of passage paid: for example, adults eighteen years of age or older were entitled to 40 acres (worth £20), and children upwards of five years were entitled to 20 acres (worth £10).\textsuperscript{59} Recognizing the importance of military settlers for the colony, discharged naval and military personnel from Her Majesty’s Services or from the East India Company were lured to New Zealand with entitlements to larger sections of land: officers received 400 acres, non-commissioned officers 80 acres, and privates, 60 acres. ‘Special Settlements’ for groups of 100 to 500 immigrants were to be set apart and proclaimed by the Provincial Superintendent.\textsuperscript{60} One such Special Settlement was intended along the ‘border-land’ between Ngāpuhi and Te Uri o Hau on Paparoa block, where in 1862 a group of about 300 non-conformist Albertlander families settled.\textsuperscript{61} Before arriving at Paparoa, the Albertlanders had inspected and refused to settle on Komokoriki block, land in the middle of the forest adjoining the Waiwerawera/Puhoi Reserve to the west. A year later, in 1863, the Komokoriki block was allocated to the immigrants from Bohemia.

### 5.1.6 Arrival of the Austrian Naval Frigate Novara in Auckland

An event that Tauhia may have witnessed directly, or alternatively followed through newspaper reports or conversations with Ngāti Whātua relatives residing in Auckland, was the arrival of the Austrian frigate \textit{Novara} in November 1858; according to the \textit{Daily Southern Cross}, the \textit{Novara} was the largest vessel that had
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ever entered the Waitematā Harbour. In an article in Te Karere Maori, Austria was classified as a ‘friendly neighbour’ of Britain, and the Novara, although a Man-o-War with 340 men on board, described as having circumnavigated the world on a peaceful, scientific excursion. The political mission of the expedition – to keep an eye out for possible localities ‘should the desire and need to own overseas territories awake among the Germanic people’ – was well masked.

After a brief stay in Auckland, where the expedition’s scientists explored and described the region’s mineral riches and coalfields, the Novara continued its journey to Hawaii, Tahiti, South America, and back to Austria. Because two of five indigenous South Africans aboard, who – with the permission of the governor of the Cape Colony at the time, Sir George Grey – were taken from a Cape Town prison and signed on as sailors, later deserted the Novara in Auckland, the captain of the Novara asked whether indigenous New Zealanders would like to join its crew and travel to Austria. Thus, Wiremu Toetoe Tumohe and Te Hemara Rerehau Paraone, two rangatira from Waikato, signed up as crew and travelled on board the Novara to Austria.

The Austrian newspaper Wiener Zeitung reported that on Christmas Day, 1858, the officers and scientists of the Novara attended a festivity hosted by local Māori. Apparently, all influential rangatira living nearby were invited to that hākari (festivity). Thus, it is possible that Tauhia was among those who witnessed the arrival of the Austrian officers and scientists. The Ngāti Whātua rangatira, Paora
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Tuhaere, who was to become Tauhia’s close friend and comrade, delivered the welcoming speech.\(^{67}\)

New Zealand newspapers, including *Te Karere Maori*, continued reporting the explorations of one of *Novara*’s scientist, the German geologist Dr Ferdinand Hochstetter, who was invited by the Auckland Provincial Government to stay for a further six months. A former merchant from Frankfurt am Main, Mr Haast, later knighted as Sir Julius von Haast, accompanied Hochstetter on his journey: Haast intended to pass on the expedition’s observations to his German people in order to ‘induce a large and steady stream of German immigration’ to New Zealand.\(^{68}\) *Te Karere Maori* called on its readers to help Dr Hochstetter by sharing their knowledge regarding the extinct bird, the moa, which was of special interest to the scientist.\(^{69}\) The Pākehā scientist’s interest in moa bones, shells and rocks might have been amusing for Māori; however, Haast’s mention of future streams of German immigrants was probably received with caution, especially after the *Daily Southern Cross* reported a war, ‘one of the most sanguinary of recent times’, fought between Austria on one side and Italy and France on the other.\(^{70}\)

Before Hochstetter travelled to the Province of Nelson and from there back to Austria, he was thanked for his explorations in New Zealand by Pākehā and Māori residents of Auckland at a reception at the Hall of the Mechanics’ Institute. Responding to Paora Tuhaere’s address, Hochstetter apparently uttered the following words later published in *Te Karere Maori*:

> I have seen the Pakeha and the Maori dwelling together as brethren, having one God, one Christ, one Law, and one administration of Justice; being subjects together of one Queen. You have embraced Christianity – hold fast; seek after those things of the Pakeha which will improve your
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\(^{67}\) Julius Hanf (Haast), ‘Expedition der k. k. Fregatte Novara: Der Aufenthalt der ’Novara’ in Neu-Seeland’, *Wiener Zeitung - Abendblatt*, 13 April 1859, pp. 337-38, as in Anno: Historische Zeitenungen und Zeitschriften, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek <http://anno.onb.ac.at>, [accessed 1 May 2016]; Haast’s role as German Immigration Advisor will be discussed in chapter 4.2. of this thesis.


Less than a month before these words were spoken, over 250,000 Austrian, French and Italian soldiers, most of them Christians, faced each other in the Battle of Solferino on 24 June 1859.72 *Te Karere Maori* remained silent on this battle and the Austro-Sardinian War, lest the hypocrisy of arguments linking European civilization and Christianity with the existence of peace became too obvious. In fact, it was the wars and social injustice in Austria and Europe that would trigger streams of emigration to America, Australia and New Zealand; among these streams were the Bohemian settlers of Puhoi.

The easy abandonment of so-called Christian principles of peace by the majority of Pākehā settlers and by the New Zealand government when faced with growing Māori resistance to further land sales was manifested in the outbreak of war in the Taranaki region in 1860. While in the Mahurangi region disputes over ownership of most parts of land included in the Mahurangi Purchase from 1841 had been settled peacefully, conflicting claims of ownership of Taranaki land acquired by the New Zealand Company in 1839, led to war. Despite such a breakdown of Māori-Pākehā relationships elsewhere, Tauhia held on to Christianity, and remained convinced that the British Queen and her representative, the Governor, would guarantee a peaceful co-existence of Pākehā and Māori in New Zealand with Maori rights upheld. On the basis of such beliefs, Tauhia continued building a tribally diverse, inter-ethnic neighbourhood in the Puhoi-Mahurangi region, and often he was called upon to act as a mediator to settle disputes between Māori and government officials.

72 *A Global Chronology of Conflict: From the Ancient World to the Modern Middle East*, ed. by Spencer C. Tucker, 6 vols, (Santa Barbara, California: ABC-CLIO, 2009), III, p. 1231.
5.2 Martin Krippner – Adjutant with Emigration Dreams

5.2.1 A Growing Family

The marriage of Emily Longdill and Martin Krippner was announced in August 1851 in *The Times* and in local newspapers of the county of Devon, whereby, for some unknown reason, Krippner’s name was extended to ‘Johann Martin Leonhard Krippner’ and his military rank was upgraded to ‘Lieutenant and Adjutant in the Austrian Service’. While the additional names and the rank of lieutenant were an invention for the press, Krippner might have actually been an adjutant: according to a document presented in Marjory Hurrey’s chronicle of Puhoi, in 1852 Second Lieutenant Krippner was serving as one of four adjutants attached to Major General Joseph Ritter von Schmerling, commanding officer of the German Federal Army at Frankfurt and chairman of the Federal Military Commission.

The Austrian and Catholic, Major General von Schmerling, together with the Frankfurt citizen and Protestant, Friedrich Pfeffel, acted as witnesses to Krippner’s marriage. Marriages of mixed religion were permitted in the Austrian Empire; however, the non-Catholic bride had to agree to Catholic baptism and upbringing for any children born to this marriage. According to Krippner’s son’s memoirs, Martin Krippner showed great tolerance regarding religion, and he left the religious education of his children to his wife, Emily. Nothing is known as to whether Krippner introduced his bride to his family in Bohemia and whether his parents welcomed a non-Catholic, foreign daughter-in-law.

---


75 Wahi, SFA, Marriage Certificate, Martin Krippner and Emily Longdill: Trauungs-Schein aus dem Trauungsbuche 2,4 des Infanterie-Regimentes Nr. 11 pro 1851.

76 Magdalena Krippner, p. 4.
The family was growing: Friedrich was born on 20 March 1852, Hermann on 2 February 1854, and Leopold Rudolf on 11 February 1855. None of Emily and Martin’s sons carried the names of Martin Krippner’s father, Johann, or grandfather, Michael, not even as a middle name. Perhaps this was a reflection of frictions between Martin Krippner and his father, or perhaps it simply marked the beginning of a new era. On 5 June 1856 their daughter Anna Marie Katharina Krippner was born; she, however, carried the names of Krippner’s mother, Anna, and great aunt, Katharina.

At some point, Martin Krippner’s niece Maria, the oldest daughter of Michael and Barbara Krippner, came to live with the Krippners in Frankfurt. Maria was born on 19 May 1849 in Mantov in the family’s smithy. Barbara and Michael Krippner must have decided that their oldest daughter would find a better life with their relatives in Frankfurt, especially after two of their children had died during infancy. Rudolph, Martin Krippner’s youngest son, had always regarded Maria as his oldest sister; according to his memoirs, she was integrated in the family like all the other siblings.

Maria was not the only foster child cared for by Martin and Emily Krippner. Later in New Zealand, so Rudolf’s memoirs describe, the house was always filled with children who lived for a short or long period with the Krippners, and who were treated like members of the family. Perhaps, Emily’s childhood experiences as an orphan, moving from family to family, and Martin’s childhood memories, being sent to a monastery as a nine-year-old boy, let the couple open their hearts and home to children who needed a stable place in a loving family.

The family lived off Martin Krippner’s army salary and the interest from the money locked into the marriage bond. That the pay of officers of the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army did not bear any relation to the actual costs of living was
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77 Grundbuch; Waihi, SFA, Birth Certificate, Leopold Rudolf Krippner: Geburts- und Taufschein 11 February 1855.
78 Waihi, SFA, Certificate of Baptism Anna Marie Katharina Krippner, born on 5 June 1856: Taufschein; Grundbuch.
79 Plzeň, SAPR, Chotěšov 08: Entry of Birth of Marie Krippner 19 May 1849.
80 Plzeň, SAPR, Chotěšov 16: Entry of Death of Anna Krippner, 28 June 1851; Chotěšov 15: Entry of Death of Johann Krippner, 17 March 1848.
81 Magdalena Krippner, p. 4.
82 Magdalena Krippner, p. 16.
repeatedly stated in accounts describing the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army.\textsuperscript{83} In addition, the obligation to maintain a lifestyle expected of an officer and adjutant must have put immense pressure on the family income. Being surrounded by friends and acquaintances belonging to the upper middle class of Frankfurt, the Krippners, especially Martin as the son of a village blacksmith, might have often felt inadequate and perhaps struggled to keep up their appearance as a well-to-do family. Apparently, it was not uncommon for officers to accumulate huge debts.\textsuperscript{84}

5.2.2 The Adjutant

Major General Joseph Ritter von Schmerling, who had distinguished himself as commander during the Battle at Novara crushing the Italian uprising in 1849, acted as chairman of the Federal Military Commission in Frankfurt from 1850 until the end of 1859. Before he entered his army career he had completed a law degree at the University of Vienna. Perhaps their shared educational background caused Schmerling to select Krippner as one of his adjutants. His choice might have also been influenced by recommendations of Adolph Aloys Braun, Krippner’s friend from high school and university days. In 1851 Braun had been appointed as Legation Secretary to the Austrian Presidential Embassy in Frankfurt; he remained in Frankfurt until his appointment in 1865 as Privy Councillor and Director of Emperor Francis Joseph’s Cabinet’s Chancellery.\textsuperscript{85} It is possible that Braun’s presence in Frankfurt was beneficial for Krippner and his family, and as a letter from 1890 shows, the two friends stayed in contact until the end of Krippner’s life.\textsuperscript{86}

Krippner’s duties as an adjutant included announcing Schmerling’s orders and reporting back all messages intended for Schmerling. Krippner would have also been in charge of the internal economy and organisation of the troops stationed in Frankfurt, and he acted like Schmerling’s personal clerk, looking after his correspondence, filing reports and keeping statistics. Krippner also wrote the requests for leave passes and reports back from absence for the Major General von

\textsuperscript{84} Deak, pp. 123 - 24.
Schmerling and also for Major General, Baron Heinrich von Reitzenstein, who was the Prussian representative at the Federal Military Committee in Frankfurt.\(^{87}\) Krippner probably spent most of his day either in the adjutants' office or at the military barracks checking out the quarters for the rank and file, and he would have accompanied Major General von Schmerling when and where requested. After completing his duties, often late at night, he returned to his wife and children. During the time of peace, Krippner might have regarded his role as adjutant as an easy task. With the outbreak of the Crimean War in 1853, however, his comfortable working conditions were threatened.

### 5.2.3 Crimean War and Promotion

In 1853 the Russian Tsar, Nicholas I, sent troops to the Danubian Principalities, Moldovia and Wallachia, today part of Romania; this action provoked the Ottoman Empire to declare war on Russia. In consequence, Austria mobilized troops in its south-eastern border regions, and after Russia retreated from the Danubian Principalities, Austrian troops occupied Wallachia and Moldavia. Austria did not offer any assistance to its former ally Russia whose troops had helped to crush the Hungarian revolutionary and separatist movement in 1849. On the contrary, in 1854 Austria joined an alliance with France and Britain supporting the Ottoman Empire; at the same time, Austria remained hesitant in fighting against Russia. Because of insufficient military forces and lack of money, Austria hoped Prussia and the other states of the German Confederation would support a war against Russia.\(^{88}\)

While the Austrian Major General von Schmerling pleaded for the mobilization of the German Federal Army, Otto von Bismarck, in his role as Prussian representative at the Federal Diet in Frankfurt, tried to convince the Federal Diet to declare its neutrality in the conflict with Russia. Schmerling succeeded with his campaign, and the German Federal Army was mobilized and made ready for war.\(^{89}\) However, after French, British and Turkish troops defeated Russia at the
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\(^{87}\) Berlin, Bundesarchiv (German Federal Archive, GFA), Dienstreisen, Urlaub, Stellvertretung 1851 - 1865, DB 5-11 71.  
\(^{88}\) Macartney, pp. 482-83.  
end of the Siege of Sevastopol in September 1855, Austria and the German Confederation demobilized their military forces once again. The tensions between Prussia and Austria over a dominating role in Central Europe had delayed the mobilization of the German Federal Army, and thus a war between Russia and the German Confederation was prevented. Austria’s relationship with Russia, however, remained frosty.\textsuperscript{90}

With the war scare now over, the troops of the German Federal Army returned to garrison life. Krippner continued his role as adjutant to Major General von Schmerling, and on 28 October 1855 he was promoted to Oberleutnant, lieutenant, which increased his salary to 32 Gulden (approximately £3) per month.\textsuperscript{91} The reason for his promotion is not recorded. A letter, or rather a draft of a letter from 12 October 1855, addressed to the Supreme Command of the German Federal Army stationed in Frankfurt, mentioned Krippner’s name in connection with an improvement in accounting practices.\textsuperscript{92} Instead of issuing separate invoices to the financial department of the city of Frankfurt for each of the Prussian, Austrian and Bavarian battalions, Krippner had suggested a more efficient method of combining all expenses in one general invoice. Perhaps it was this innovation in accounting that earned him his promotion.

Krippner’s service to the Supreme Command of the Federal German Army was acknowledged by both the Austrian and Prussian monarchs. In August 1856, when Krippner’s regiment was removed from Mainz and Frankfurt, the Austrian Emperor Francis Joseph gave permission for Krippner to remain in Frankfurt and continue to serve as adjutant to Major General von Schmerling. At the same time, the Emperor permitted Krippner to wear the decoration Königlich Preußischer Roter Adler Orden 4. Klasse (Prussian Order of the Red Eagle Fourth Class) awarded by the Prussian King, Frederick William IV.\textsuperscript{93} Again, the reason for his receipt of this decoration is not known.

\textsuperscript{90} Macartney, p. 483.
\textsuperscript{91} Grundbuch; Dub, p. 21.
\textsuperscript{92} Frankfurt/Main, ACF, Das Rechenamt an Hochlöbliches Oberkommando der hier garnisierten Bundestruppen, 12 October 1855, Sig. 3.765.
\textsuperscript{93} 'Ausland', Agramer Zeitung, 3 September 1856, p. 868, as in Anno: Historische Zeitungen und Zeitschriften, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek <http://anno.onb.ac.at>, [accessed 1 May 2016]; Grundbuch.
The only surviving document that provides more detailed information about Krippner’s performance in the Imperial-Royal Army is the Conduite-Liste (officer evaluation report), an appraisal of Krippner’s qualities as an officer, written by his superior Schmerling in 1855. In general, Krippner’s Conduite-Liste does not give a very flattering report. His professional skills are rated ‘in every respect only mediocre.’ Krippner showed no special military skills, knew the rifle and its parts only superficially, was an average rider, and had never served in the face of the enemy. However, he spoke German, Latin, Czech, French and English, and he was able to swim. A note regarding his state of health assessed him as being corpulent and very healthy. His intellectual abilities were judged by Schmerling as ‘sufficient’, and his personality was described as calm and easy going, strict but fair, humble, persevering, and ‘ehrliebend’, in the sense of ‘recognition seeking’. The only commendatory words refer to Krippner’s merits in his role as accountant, adjutant and commander of the school of sergeants. Perhaps this was Schmerling’s deliberate strategy to keep Krippner in Frankfurt by portraying him as a mediocre officer who only ‘shows very good results in his current position.’ Or perhaps it was Krippner’s tactic to keep a low profile and thus avoid drawing attention to his true intellectual mind, which throughout his years at grammar school and university earned him first-class grades. Nevertheless, his superiors must have regarded Krippner’s administrative service worthy of promotion and decoration. Furthermore, they may have appreciated his diplomatic skills indicated by his service to commanders of the Austrian, Prussian and Bavarian armies, forces that sometimes assisted, and at other times, obstructed and fought one another.

5.2.4 Father’s Funeral in Mantov

Shortly after Krippner’s decoration with the Prussian order, his father, Johannes Krippner, died on 11 October 1856 aged 62. The cause of death was tuberculosis. Johannes Krippner was buried three days after his passing. Whether Martin Krippner, his wife and children and his youngest brother Johann, who also served
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94 Conduitelisten, English translation by the author; ‘Conduitelisten’ or officer evaluation reports usually were issued annually, however, only this one report was found in the War Archive in Vienna.
95 Conduitelisten.
96 Conduitelisten.
97 Plzeň, SAPR, Chotěšov 16: Entry of Death of Johann Krippner (former village blacksmith), 11 Oktober 1856, p. 8.
in the Imperial-Royal Army, attended the funeral, is not known.\textsuperscript{98} Traditionally, family and friends would have joined the funeral procession from the house where the corpse laid in state to the cemetery in Chotěšov, perhaps lead by the village band. After the burial, the mourners would gather to eat, drink and tell stories from the past and present. The village elders would have remembered the time when Johannes Krippner, the farmer’s son from Miřovice, arrived in Mantov as the blacksmith’s apprentice; and they would recollect the wedding of Johannes and the pregnant Anna Pallier, granddaughter of the former village smith, Lederer. Perhaps some in the village still wondered whether Martin, the firstborn, was the blacksmith’s biological son.

Whether Martin Krippner’s rank as Lieutenant in the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army finally earned him his father’s recognition, and whether his father knew about and was proud of his son’s decoration by the Prussian King, we cannot know. Perhaps Krippner’s marriage with a non-Catholic foreign orphan had been a new disappointment in the eyes of a father who had wanted his son to become a priest. Certainly, Krippner’s career in the army and his association with Frankfurt’s world of bankers and politicians must have earned him admiration by the people of his hometown. Whenever Krippner came back to the village, he probably was asked to talk about his life as officer in Frankfurt. Being obliged to discretion, Krippner might have told many stories of his military life that bore little relation to his real duties as accountant and adjutant. The image he thus created of himself as an army officer would later in New Zealand cause a dilemma when fellow Bohemian and German immigrants asked him to form a German Rifle Corp during the Waikato War.\textsuperscript{99}

The relationship between the three Krippner brothers seemed to have been based on mutual support, judging from their joint future actions. Perhaps it was at their father’s funeral that they started discussing ways to improve living conditions for themselves and their families. Michael might have realized that there was no bright future for himself as blacksmith, having to compete against the fast

\textsuperscript{98} Johann Krippner is listed as Second Lieutenant of the 28\textsuperscript{th} Bohemian Infantry Regiment in 1858/59, see \textit{Militär-Schematismus des Österreichischen Kaiserthumes} (Vienna: K. K. Hof- u. Staats-Druckerei, 1859), p. 151, as in <https://books.google.co.nz/books?id=fbAAAAACAAJ&dq=Krippner&hl=en#v=snippet&q=Krippner&f=false>, [accessed 18 May 2016].

\textsuperscript{99} See chapter 6.4 of this thesis.
developing ironworks in the Plzeň region. His earnings were probably heavily affected by the situation of the struggling farmers, who, although no longer performing unpaid labour service for Count Thurn and Taxis, were burdened with high taxes paying off their ‘redemption’ from the robota.\textsuperscript{100} With no spare money to invest in improving their soil and farm equipment, many small farmers were being forced to sell their land and find employment in the many emergent coalmines and factories. With diminishing demands for the blacksmith’s service and products, Michael could not provide sufficiently for his growing family and his widowed mother, Anna; meanwhile the younger brother Johann, once he had completed his military service, would have to look for work somewhere else.

Among his brothers, in privacy, Martin Krippner might have expressed his concerns for the future of their sons. The recent mobilization for the Crimean War and his first-hand knowledge of growing Prussian-Austrian tensions made him realize that the long period of peace since the Napoleonic Wars had likely come to an end. So far, the Krippners had been spared the experience of battle, but they would have been worried about what lay ahead for their sons.

5.2.5 Austria and Overseas Emigration

Perhaps, the three brothers started thinking about emigrating. During the 1850s, families from neighbouring villages had left for America; for example, the Seifert family from the village Gibian/Jivjany near Miřovice had arrived in the United States in 1855.\textsuperscript{101} Although the number of emigrants from Austria was small compared to emigrants from other states of the German Confederation, the dream of the New World, where land was cheap and labour well paid, must have spread rapidly. Especially after the crushing of the 1848 revolutions, thousands of Germans left their home countries either legally or illegally. During the decade from 1845 to 1855, over 100,000 people from the German states emigrated each year.\textsuperscript{102}

The Austrian government tried to make emigration overseas as difficult as possible. While migration within the Austrian Empire, especially to its thinly inhabited south-eastern regions, was encouraged, and within the German

\textsuperscript{100} Macartney, p. 463.
\textsuperscript{101} Rippley and Paulson, p. 62.
\textsuperscript{102} Rippley and Paulson, p. 1.
Confederation tolerated, people wishing to move beyond those borders needed to apply and wait a long time for costly passports. They had to provide documents confirming the completion of, or alternatively exemption, from military service, payment of all taxes, and certificates of good character from their local priest.\(^{103}\) Emigrants sold their property and belongings to cover costs for passports, leaving tax and passages, and only a small sum remained for starting a new life across the Atlantic. The main destination was the United States of America, while some tried their luck in Brazil.

Until reports about the expedition of the Austrian naval frigate *Novara* were published in the daily newspaper *Wiener Zeitung* in 1859, New Zealand featured only sporadically in the Austrian press.\(^{104}\) In addition to lack of information about the Pacific region in general, very few would-be emigrants would have had the means to pay the much more expensive passage to New Zealand. Thus, New Zealand was not a popular destination (or even yet on the horizons) of potential emigrants from Austria or other parts of the German Confederation. It might therefore seem surprising that the Krippners chose New Zealand as their destination to start a new life.

The idea of migrating to New Zealand could very well have come about from Krippner’s wife and her brother, Pynson Wilmot Longdill, a merchant in London. Longdill likely often visited his sisters, nephews and nieces in Frankfurt. As his preserved passport shows, he travelled regularly to Belgium, France, Switzerland, Cologne as well as Leipzig and Dresden in the Kingdom of Saxony.\(^{105}\) It can be assumed also that the brothers-in-law, Friedrich Pfeffel and Pynson Wilmot Longdill, maintained a business relationship as merchants. What exactly Longdill traded with could not be established. A newspaper notice, from 1844, shows that

\(^{103}\) Rippley and Paulson, p. 30.
\(^{104}\) Hanf (Haast), ‘Expedition der k. k. ‘Fregatte Novara’; Der Aufenthalt der ‘Novara’ in Neu-Seeland’.
at that time Longdill was seeking suppliers of coal naphtha. Later in New Zealand, he traded in wine, spirits and tobacco.

When reunited in Frankfurt, surely, the siblings would discuss the latest family news. First of all, Pynson Wilmot Longdill would want to talk about his wife and children. He had married a year after Emily and Martin Krippner. His wife, Harriet née Robinson, was the daughter of George Blackiston Robinson, a factor at the London Coal Exchange and former secretary of the London Printing Society, known also as Swedenborg Society. They had three children, George, Edward and Mary. A hard blow would have been the news of the death of their youngest brother, Lieutenant Edward Benjamin Longdill, in 1851 or 1852 in India. It is not known whether Edward died in battle or as a consequence of disease. The sisters would also be keen to hear about their oldest sister, Selina Longdill. She lived as an independent woman in London and maintained relationships with merchants and artists, among them the writer Frances Trollope.

New Zealand and life in the South Pacific might have been a topic in Longdill family conversations ever since their famous grandfather, John Raphael Smith, portrait painter and mezzotint Engraver to H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, created the engraving after Benjamin West’s painting *Portrait of Mr Banks* (Sir Joseph Banks), showing Banks dressed in a kaitaka (Māori cloak) with a carved hoe (paddle) and taiaha (fighting staff) in the background. Romantic dreams of life overseas combined with realistic worries about her children’s future might have
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111 Letter to George Frederick Longdill.
112 Auckland, Auckland City Libraries, Sir George Grey Collection, Francis Trollope: Letter to Selina Longdill, 12 August 1849, GL C42.9.
led Emily Krippner to read the accessible literature about America and the British colonies. Her brother, perhaps supported by the Pfeffels, might have also pondered over expanding trading opportunities across the oceans. According to its *Cost Book*, the bank house Bethmann, of which Carl Friedrich Pfeffel was a partner, was trading in New Zealand wool products in 1856, and again in 1860.\textsuperscript{114}

\textsuperscript{114} Frankfurt/Main, ACF, Bethmannarchiv: Geschäftsbücher W1-9: B29 - Kalkulationsbücher W1-9: B14, Sig. 16.
Toying with the idea of emigration, Krippner would have discreetly sought information about possible options. He might have had access to the weekly German emigration papers *Allgemeine Auswanderungszeitung* and *Der deutsche Auswanderer*. Several handbooks for emigrants to the United States, Canada, South America and Australia existed, and in 1858, Julius Fröbel, journalist and former member of the German National Assembly in Frankfurt, published a book

---

about German emigration and its significance in the history of civilization.\textsuperscript{116} Fröbel’s justification for German emigration as a noble contribution to bringing civilization into the world might have had an encouraging effect on people still hesitant to leave behind King or Emperor and country.\textsuperscript{117} Fröbel promoted the USA as the best destination for German emigrants; he also saw possibilities in Guatemala, Brazil and Honduras if Great Britain and Prussia would agree to collaborate as to the colonizing process and thereby guarantee those new colonies their independence.\textsuperscript{118} On the other hand, he warned potential German emigrants against settling in British colonies such as Canada and Australia. In Canada, for example, ‘aliens’ would always remain ‘aliens’. In Australia, the conditions for successful settlement of poor emigrants, cheap land and expensive labour, had been artificially transformed into cheap labour and expensive land, thus making it impossible for poor emigrants to ever become independent.\textsuperscript{119} Fröbel did not mention New Zealand as an immigrant destination.

The only available literature in German about New Zealand in the context of emigration were the books published in 1842 and 1844 by John Nicholas Beit, the New Zealand Company’s agent in Hamburg.\textsuperscript{120} In his book \textit{Auswanderungen und Colonisation} published in 1842, Beit explained and praised Wakefield’s system of immigration as ‘peaceful conquest’ that would not demand sacrifices from anybody.\textsuperscript{121} New Zealand was portrayed as the perfect destination for German emigrants, and the Chatham Islands were even more suitable. According to Beit, the relations between the indigenous peoples of New Zealand and Chatham Islands and the European immigrants were mutually peaceful; Māori were described as a ‘handsome, intelligent race’ quickly learning and embracing the advantages of European civilization.\textsuperscript{122}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{116} Julius Fröbel, \textit{Die Deutsche Auswanderung und Ihre Culturhistorische Bedeutung} (Leipzig: Wagner, 1858).
\textsuperscript{117} Fröbel, p. 42.
\textsuperscript{118} Fröbel, p. 90.
\textsuperscript{119} Fröbel, pp. 45-46.
\textsuperscript{120} John Nicholas Beit, \textit{Auswanderungen und Colonisation: mit besonderem Hinblick auf die von der Deutschen Colonisations-Gesellschaft beabsichtigte Begründung ihrer ersten Colonie auf den Chatham-Inseln} (Hamburg: Perthes-Besser and Mauke, 1842); John Nicholas Beit, \textit{Briefe von Ansiedlern und Auswanderern in den Niederlassungen der Neuseeland-Compagnie} (Grimma: Druck und Verlag des Verlagscomptoirs, 1844).
\textsuperscript{121} Beit, \textit{Auswanderungen und Colonisation}, pp. I-IV.
\textsuperscript{122} Beit, \textit{Auswanderungen und Colonisation}, pp. 21-22, 43-44.
\end{flushleft}
Beit’s second book, *Briefe von Ansiedlern und Auswanderern in den Niederlassungen der Neuseeland-Compagnie*, published in 1844, included a selection of translated and edited letters apparently written by residents in the New Zealand Company’s settlements of Wellington, Nelson, and New Plymouth. Overall, the book provided the same information about New Zealand as the book published two years previously. New was the assertion that the New Zealand Company had purchased millions of acres from the British Government, and that upon arrival in New Zealand, German immigrants would immediately enjoy all rights and privileges of British subjects. In both books, prospective German emigrants were warned not to settle in the colonies of central and south America, especially not in Brazil or Guatemala, because of the unhealthily hot climate and dominance of the Catholic Church in those areas.

It is possible that Krippner got hold of these, now over ten-year-old, publications about emigration to New Zealand. However, after the failure of German settlements in Nelson made headlines in German newspapers in 1845, Beit’s books probably fell into oblivion. It is therefore more likely that the idea of migrating to New Zealand was based on information gleaned by his wife Emily and her brother Pynson Wilmot Longdill. However, there was another person in Frankfurt who knew about migration schemes to New Zealand: Johann Franz Haast, today known as Sir Julius von Haast and remembered as an explorer, geologist and founder of the Canterbury Museum.
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125 'Großbritannien und Irland', *Österreichischer Beobachter*, 22 January 1845, p. 20.
5.2.6 Haast as Advisor for German Emigration to New Zealand

The directory of the Free City of Frankfurt from 1852 lists Johann Franz Haast as a merchant living at 45 Mainzer Landstrasse – not far from the residence of the Pfeffels. Originally from Bonn, Haast arrived in Frankfurt in 1844, and in 1846 he married the daughter of the Frankfurt pianist, composer and music teacher, Aloys Schmidt. Musically gifted, Haast took singing lessons and learned to play the violin. He was also interested in geology and apparently travelled through Russia, Austria and Italy where he ascended Mount Etna during the 1852 eruption. It can be assumed that the Pfeffels and Krippners knew Haast from frequenting the same social circles in Frankfurt, or at least they must have heard of this musically talented man and his mountain expeditions.

Haast’s biographers maintain that on his travels to London, Haast met Charles Hursthouse, the author of the book *New Zealand or Zealandia, Britain of the South*, published in 1857, and Haast was asked to translate Hursthouse’s book into German. Haast never completed the translation, but extracts of the book were included in a guide to New Zealand immigration published both in English and German by the shipping company Willis, Gann and Co, in 1859. Concluding from newspaper advertisements in the *Frankfurter Journal*, the guide came on the German market mid-July 1859. Krippner and the first group of Bohemian emigrants sailed from London to New Zealand on 8 November 1859 on board a clipper owned by Willis, Gann and Co.
A closer look at the circumstances of Krippner’s departure from Frankfurt to New Zealand suggests that he and his fellow Bohemians could not have done this journey without logistical and financial assistance from some third party. There are indications that Krippner’s emigration plans had something to do with Haast’s involvement in the promotion of New Zealand as an emigration destination. Therefore, Haast’s services for the shipping company Willis, Gann and Co shall be discussed in more detail, and as a result, an interrelationship between interests of British shipping companies, the New Zealand Government, and the arrival of the first Bohemian settlers in New Zealand comes further to light.

Haast not only worked on a German translation of Hursthouse’s book, he was also asked by Willis, Gann and Co to provide an overview about reasons and routes of German emigration and suggestions how to promote New Zealand among potential German emigrants. It should be noted that Arthur Willis, director of the shipping company of the same name, used to be a director and shareholder of the New Zealand Company, and in 1859 his shipping company ran the New Zealand Colonial and Emigration Offices in London, 3 Crosby Square.

In his unpublished Treatise Upon the Emigration from Germany and the Best Means to Conduct it to New Zealand held at the Alexander Turnbull Library in Wellington, Haast identified that the main reasons for German emigration were political oppression, poverty resulting from dividing peasants’ lands, high taxes, and compulsory military service. His advertising strategy suggested the appointment of agents who themselves needed to be convinced of New Zealand as a preferred destination. As the best ports he recommended Rotterdam, Le Havre and Antwerp, all of which were reached daily by up to 500 emigrants by the Rhenish steamer or by rail. Because of competing German shipping companies based in Bremen and Hamburg, Haast advised against using those ports. In Haast’s recommendations, a general agent would operate either from Frankfurt or
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Mainz, he then employing sub-agents who were influential persons in the smaller towns and villages. The general agents were to hire conductors who accompanied the emigrants to the ports of embarkation; these men would need to have the required talents to ‘smuggle the fugitives from military or other obnoxious exactions.’

Most importantly, according to Haast, the intentional emigrants needed to be convinced that every positive description they heard about New Zealand was true. For that purpose, Hursthouse’s book should be sent to ‘the first German geographical professors’ with the request to write favourable articles about the book and New Zealand in general from a geological and climatic point of view. The opinion of scholars would create more trust than direct propaganda of immigration agents. Further, in order to procure accounts about New Zealand life from German colonists already in the country, a German scholar would travel to New Zealand and help to write such accounts for publication and distribution in the German states. This scholar would also send his own reports about his journey and travels within New Zealand to German newspapers. ‘He should also offer his services to some geographical society in Germany transmitting any new discoveries in the interior of the Islands as also meteorological observations which could be easily obtained for this purpose from the English stations.’

Haast further suggested that the Provincial Governments of New Zealand sponsor one or more German families, as chosen by the general agent, to migrate to New Zealand and attract others to follow by means of publishing their correspondence with friends and family. Finally, the New Zealand Government should be persuaded to appoint a German speaker based in New Zealand as ‘Commissioner of Emigration’, thus assisting German immigrants to settle in a country where their language is not understood. Such assistance would be made known through letters home and, again, would attract more emigrants.

The shipping company Willis, Gann and Co seemed convinced of Haast’s plan as to how best promote New Zealand as an emigration destination: they employed his services as German immigrant advisor and sent him to New Zealand.

---
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According to newly found evidence, Haast left Frankfurt for London in April 1858, leaving behind his wife, his ten-year old son and a mountain of debt.\textsuperscript{142} On 12 September 1858, he sailed to New Zealand.\textsuperscript{143} He arrived in Auckland on 21 December 1858, a day before the Austrian frigate Novara laid anchor at Auckland harbour for a stop on her world circumnavigation.\textsuperscript{144}

The scientists of the Novara were invited to dine at the Auckland home of Dr Karl Fischer, a homeopathic doctor from Berlin. At this reception, whether planned or by coincidence, Haast met the geologist of the team, Dr Ferdinand Hochstetter.\textsuperscript{145} Haast accompanied the group of scientists on their approximately two-week expedition to explore the land between Auckland and the Waikato River, especially the Drury coalfield. Under the pseudonym of Julius Hanf, Haast wrote accounts of this expedition supplemented with eulogistic comments about New Zealand as a perfect destination for German emigrants; these reports were published in the Austrian daily newspaper Wiener Zeitung from 13 to 21 April 1859.\textsuperscript{146}

The New Zealand Government asked Hochstetter to stay in New Zealand for a further six months in order to carry out geological research; Haast took on the role as Hochstetter’s assistant. Thus, just as Haast had suggested in his treatise about advertising New Zealand as a destination for German emigrants, Hochstetter became the scholar providing scientific observations of the New Zealand interior, which would find publication in the German language. A series of articles about Hochstetter’s journey through New Zealand, authored by Julius Hanf, were published in the Allgemeine Zeitung and in the Wiener Zeitung from 5 December 1859 to 14 March 1860. One cannot help but speculate as to whether or not the appointment of Hochstetter and Haast was based on a joint decision by the New

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{142} His wife, Antonia Johanna Haast, died on 14 October 1859, a day after Johann Haast’s application for divorce was granted by the Frankfurt court; the cause of her death is not stated, see Frankfurt/Main, ACF, Haast, Mathias Robert: Nachlassakten 1871, Sig. 228.
\textsuperscript{143} Harrison, pp. 148, 219.
\textsuperscript{145} Harrison, p. 148.
\textsuperscript{146} Julius Hanf (Haast), ’Expedition der k. k. „Fregatte Novara“‘; ‘Hanf’ is the German name of the cannabis plant; perhaps the choice of Haast’s pseudonym reflected the plant’s influence upon the content of his reports.
\end{footnotes}
Zealand Government and the shipping company Willis, Gann and Co for the purpose of promoting New Zealand as a destination for German emigrants.

After Haast’s successful execution of the first part of his marketing strategy, Willis, Gann and Co might have also supported his idea of sponsoring one or more German families, who would migrate to New Zealand and then attract others to follow through their letters sent home. It is certainly possible that Haast saw in Krippner – an army officer and son of a blacksmith with connection to trades people and farm labourers – the ideal German emigrant worthy of sponsoring in order to start a wave of emigration to New Zealand.

Krippner’s plan to sail to New Zealand with the intention of starting a new life as farmer was announced in October 1859 in several German and Austrian newspapers. All the announcements stated that Captain Krippner was still in active service as adjutant to the Supreme Command of the Federal German Army in Frankfurt, that he had married a wealthy woman from London, and that he would pay the passages of fellow Bohemians who would work initially as labourers on his farm in New Zealand. According to the articles, Krippner’s party of colonists counted twenty people, among them Krippner’s brother who served as Second Lieutenant in the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army.147

Questions arise as to when and how Krippner organized this venture while still serving as an adjutant? How could he afford to pay for everyone’s passages, and most perplexing of all, how did he manage to get permission to emigrate and to procure the necessary departure documents for himself, his youngest brother and two other young men of military service age at a time when the Austrian Empire had mobilized its troops for war against the Kingdom of Sardinia and France?

5.2.7 Austro-Sardinian War

Since the beginning of the year 1859, the outbreak of war between the Austrian Empire and the Kingdom of Sardinia-Piedmont supported by France appeared imminent. On 9 April 1859 Emperor Francis Joseph authorized the mobilization of Austrian troops, which then invaded Piedmont on 23 April 1859. Austria did not expect a long drawn out war, and it was convinced of the support of the Federal German Army. However, although the Federal Diet at Frankfurt agreed to mobilize the troops stationed at the federal fortresses along the River Rhine in order to be ready for a war against France, no help would come for Austria’s Italian campaign. Prussia, in particular, refused to assist Austria in its war over the province Lombardy-Venetia, which formed part of the Austrian Empire but not part of the German Confederation. Nevertheless, the federal troops stationed at Frankfurt, Mainz and Rastatt were on stand-by. A folder containing lists of all battalions ready for war at Frankfurt and Mainz, compiled in a script very similar to Krippner’s handwriting, is among the few German Federal Army documents that have survived Frankfurt’s destruction during the Second World War.

During the fighting in northern Italy in May and June 1859, Austrian troops suffered heavy losses. On 8 June 1859 Krippner was promoted to the rank of captain, probably filling the vacancies in his 11th Infantry Regiment, which had fought in Piedmont with four battalions from the 8th Army Corp. War in Lombardy-Venetia culminated in the Battle of Solferino on 24 June 1859. The Austrian troops under Emperor Francis Joseph’s personal command were defeated. During sixteen hours of fighting, the casualties on both sides comprised over 4,700 soldiers killed, over 23,200 wounded, and over 11,500 captured or missing.

Witnessing the aftermath of this battle – with thousands of wounded soldiers lying for days unattended in the hot sun – the Swiss businessman, Jean-Henri Dunant, described the suffering of the soldiers in his book *Un souvenir de Solférrino*, a publication which led to the formation of the International Committee of the Red Cross.
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Cross in 1864. Ten years after the Battle of Solferino, the remains of about 6,000 fallen soldiers were exhumed from the mass graves. Following an ancient Christian tradition kept alive in some Catholic parishes, their bones and skulls were stacked from floor to ceiling along the walls in two ossuary chapels in San Martino and Solferino. The displayed skulls grinning from the walls behind the altar are a reminder to this day of the senselessness of war.

Because of Prussia’s refusal to support Austria in its Italian campaign and because of a growing opposition to the war from liberals and financiers expressed openly in the German press despite censorship, Emperor Francis Joseph was forced to accept defeat. He met with the French Emperor Napoleon III and the King of Sardinia-Piedmont on 8 July 1859 to negotiate a ceasefire, and on 11 July 1859 a preliminary peace agreement was signed which resulted in the loss of the province of Lombardy for the Habsburg Empire. However, until the formal ratification of the peace agreement on 10 November 1859 in Zurich, an acute threat of war between the German Confederation and France continued.

5.2.8 From Frankfurt to New Zealand

On 8 November 1859, two days before the ratification of the peace agreement with France, and two days before the two Māori rangatira, who had travelled on board the Novara to Austria were presented to the crowds in Vienna, the Krippners and the first group of emigrants from Mantov and Chotěšov sailed from London to New Zealand on board the clipper Lord Burleigh, owned by Willis, Gann and Co. Among the passengers were Martin Krippner’s youngest brother Johannes, former Second Lieutenant in the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army, and two other young men of military service age.
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According to Martin Krippner’s military files, he resigned from his commission as captain on 3 October 1859 without retaining the rank of officer. However, there is evidence that Krippner left Frankfurt two months before his official resignation from the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army. The List of Aliens Arriving at English Ports shows that Martin Krippner boarded the steamer Dolphin in Antwerp and arrived in Gravesend, London, on 1 August 1859. Krippner filled out the registration form, stating as his profession, ‘Rentier’, man of private means, and as his native country, ‘Frankfurt a/M’. He therefore did not travel with an Austrian passport. Whether his wife and children travelled with him is not recorded. Based on this evidence, from a strictly legal point of view, Krippner had deserted the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army; yet, he received his certificate of resignation two months later.

Research at the Vienna War Archive revealed that Krippner’s file containing his application to resign from his commission as captain is missing. Experts at the Vienna War Archive pointed out that, occasionally, files considered unnecessary and of no value were destroyed and the paper recycled. However, it seems a rather strange coincidence that Krippner’s file would be ‘recycled’ while other officers’ resignation files, stored in numerical and chronological order immediately before and after Krippner’s missing file, have survived. It looks more like someone had an interest in Krippner’s file disappearing. Furthermore, neither was there any file regarding the resignation of Martin Krippner’s youngest brother, Johannes, who served in 1859 as second lieutenant in the 28th Infantry Regiment, stationed at the Federal Fortress at Rastatt on the Rhine.

However, one folder containing documents regarding Krippner’s marriage bond of 12,000 Gulden (approximately £1090) survived destruction. This folder holds three official letters, a copy of Krippner’s certificate of resignation, and a power of attorney appointing Imperial-Royal Court Inspector, Leopold Riedl, to
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164 Vienna, ASA, Request to transfer Marriage Bond to K.K. Hofcontroloer Leopold Riedl from 2 October 1859, KM 1859 A. 18 – 21/14/201 – 15/40 21a14 255.
act on behalf of Martin and Emily Krippner. Written by Martin Krippner to the Supreme Command of the Fortress in Mainz, the first of the three letters requested the payment of his marriage bond after his official resignation to Imperial-Royal Court Inspector, Leopold Riedl, who was also the godfather of Krippner’s youngest son. This letter was dated 2 October 1859. Judging from a different appearance of the ink, the date of the letter and also the date of Krippner’s official discharge, 3 October 1859, were inserted later in to a gap in the letter that had been left by Krippner for this purpose. Major General von Schmerling, Krippner’s superior, had sighted and signed the letter. The other two letters were written by an officer of the Supreme Command of the Fortress of Mainz supporting Krippner’s request: one letter addressed to the High Court of Appeal of the Imperial-Royal Austrian Army in Vienna, and the other to the Military Administration Office for Deposits. From these letters it can be concluded that: first, Krippner was in a hurry and not prepared to wait for the repayment of his marriage bond after his discharge; and second, Krippner’s superior, Major General von Schmerling, and other army officers – for whatever reason – covered Krippner’s absence from Frankfurt. Whether the marriage bond was actually paid to the Imperial-Royal Court Inspector Riedl, as requested, cannot be established.

To have been able to leave the territory of the German Confederation, Krippner and his first group of Bohemian emigrants may have been assisted by a ‘conductor’ who knew how to ‘smuggle the fugitives from military or other obnoxious exactions’ – just as Haast had suggested in his Treatise. 165 Such assistance might have been arranged by the shipping company Willis, Gann and Co, or by an influential emigration agent in Frankfurt. Perhaps there was a deal: in return for helping Krippner and his people to get out of the territory of the German Confederation, the emigration agent was permitted to use Krippner’s venture of setting up a farm in New Zealand for advertising purposes. This would explain how the newspaper notices announcing Captain Krippner’s plan to migrate to New Zealand were published in several German and Austrian newspapers from 15th to 26th October 1859.166 The fact that this notice even
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166 Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung 15 October 1859, p. 2096, as in Anno: Historische Zeitungen und Zeitschriften, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek <http://anno.onb.ac.at>, [accessed 1 May 2016]; Allgemeine Auswanderungszeitung, 21 October 1859, p. 170, as in Thüringer Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek und des Thüringischen Staatsarchivs Rudolstadt <http://zs.thulb.uni-
appeared in the Austrian weekly military paper Militär-Zeitung seems incomprehensible; perhaps it served as a convenient cover-up of an otherwise embarrassing incident for the Austrian and German Federal Army, or, perhaps, it corresponded with ambitious plans of Austrian colonial expansion initiated with the Novara expedition. Interestingly, the article in the Militär-Zeitung evoked a public response by a Lieutenant Friedrich Krippner: he did not want to be confused with Captain Krippner’s brother, and he expressly distanced himself from this group of emigrants whom he might have regarded as traitors.

No personal accounts of the journey to New Zealand have been preserved. Krippner’s son Rudolf, four years old at the time of departure from Frankfurt, could not remember much of the journey except staying with relatives in London and visiting a circus for the first time. All his life he never understood why his father gave up his military career in the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army so abruptly, indicating that this was not a topic the Krippner family would talk about readily.

One month before Martin Krippner arrived in London, Pynson Wilmot Longdill and his family sailed to Auckland, New Zealand, on board the Maori owned by Willis, Gann and Co. Thus, the Krippners most likely stayed in London with Emily’s oldest sister, Selina Longdill. During their stay, Krippner managed to procure a letter of introduction to the Governor of New Zealand by the Duke of Newcastle, Secretary of State for the Colonies, from 1859 - 1864. Whether Krippner obtained such a reference thanks to the assistance of Willis, Gann and
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Co, or perhaps thanks to Julius Kanné, Krippner’s high school friend who had been appointed as Queen Victoria's Courier in 1858, is not known.

The clipper Lord Burleigh was scheduled to sail on 1 November 1859, but its departure was delayed until 8 November 1859. Krippner’s party counted eight adults and six children, six persons less than announced in the newspaper notices. Perhaps someone did not make it in time for departure, or, perhaps Martin Krippner’s brother, Michael, had planned initially to join the group but decided later to stay behind in Mantov to look after their mother to the end of her days. The following are the people of the first Bohemian group migrating to New Zealand: Martin Krippner (aged 42), his wife Emily, née Longdill (41), their sons Friedrich (7), Hermann (5), Leopold Rudolf (4), and daughter Anna Marie (3), their niece Maria Krippner (11), Martin’s brother Johannes Krippner (29), Joseph Pankratz (26) from Mantov and his wife Margarethe, née Stiller (26), Martin Scheidler (32) from Chotěšov, his wife Dorothea, née Nath (25) and their baby Joseph, also Elisabeth Turnwald from Chotěšov (26).

The Krippners including Johannes occupied ‘Second Cabins’, the families Pankratz and Scheidler, ‘Enclosed Steerage’, and Elisabeth Turnwald, ‘Open Steerage’. Based on information about passage prices stated in Willis, Gann and Co’s guidebook from 1859, the cost for Krippner’s group of emigrants amounted to £234 - 10, plus costs for extra luggage; this was equivalent to 2808 gulden, or four-and-a-half years salary for a captain in the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army. That Krippner could not have covered the cost of everyone’s passage from his earnings is obvious. The money must have come from a third party investing in emigrants and a farming project in New Zealand. By paying the passages for eight adults and three children over five years of age, Krippner – or whoever sponsored the passage – was entitled to a land grant of 380 acres according to the Auckland Waste Lands Act of 1858. Whether Krippner had to pay back the money for the passages cannot be established.

Condemned to idleness in a confined space during the four-and-a-half-month journey on board the Lord Burleigh, Krippner would have had plenty of time for
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reflection on what he left behind in the ‘Old World’ and on what he might expect in the ‘New’. He might have felt great relief that he and his family had arrived safely on board this ship having escaped the current and menacing wars in Central Europe. He was probably proud at the prospect of starting a new life as a landowner, especially bearing in mind that the average farm of a ‘large farmer’ in Bohemia consisted of approximately 25 acres.\(^{176}\)

Whether he had qualms about leaving his regiment and Emperor shortly after being promoted to captain is not known. Perhaps his thoughts turned to his hometown hero and saint, Hroznata, who abandoned the Emperor’s Crusade, changed his sword for the monk’s robe, and colonized the West-Bohemian mountain regions instead. Krippner who, unlike Hroznata, had no fear of crossing the ocean, changed his sword for an axe and spade, and he would establish a Bohemian settlement on an island nation in the Pacific Ocean. Whether Krippner saw himself as a ‘colonising crusader’, a term used by the historian James Belich for the agents of the British colonisation of New Zealand, justifying his migration with a mission of spreading the so-called advantages of European civilization and Christianity into the world is doubtful.\(^{177}\) His motivations to emigrate were more likely based on wishing for a better life for his family and friends, leaving the evils of Europe’s wars behind. Trusting the promises made by emigration agents, Krippner and his fellow Bohemian emigrants did not ask themselves whether the offer of free land in New Zealand was too good to be true.

Whenever he doubted his decision, Krippner just needed to refer to Willis, Gann and Co’s guidebook for assurance. According to this guide, the year 1859 was the perfect time to migrate to New Zealand: the first hurdles of colonization had been overcome while at the same time there is still plenty of land for everybody, or, as the authors say, ‘the cream of the country’ has not been taken as yet.\(^{178}\) Repeatedly, New Zealand was portrayed as a paradise, its climate was compared to the ‘climate of England with half the cold of the English winter,’ and even the occasional earth-quake was supposedly less devastating than ‘a wet harvest or a bleak spring’ in the Old World.\(^{179}\) The book’s information about the average wage

\(^{176}\) Macartney, p. 270.
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in New Zealand would have likely convinced Krippner that he had nothing to lose: even a servant or farm labourer earned as much as a captain in the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army.\textsuperscript{180}

With regard to the indigenous people of New Zealand, the authors of the guide compared the physical appearance and the political influence of Māori to the ‘nomad Gypsies’ in Great Britain.\textsuperscript{181} Coming from Bohemia, Krippner and his compatriots were familiar with the low social status and destiny of ‘Gypsies’ in the Austrian Empire. Ever since the Romani people – that is the self-elected name of this ethnic group – arrived in the Empire’s territory, they had been persecuted and expelled, until in the eighteenth century, Empress Maria Theresa and Emperor Joseph II introduced laws to ‘assimilate’ them and force them to settle as so-called ‘new farmers’ with the status of serfs.\textsuperscript{182} Emily Krippner might have made her husband aware of the association between ‘Gypsy’ and ‘Bohemian’ in the French and English languages at the time: until the outbreak of the First World War, the settlers at Puhoi called themselves Germans, not Bohemians.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
\hline
5.3 \textbf{Summary} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

Searching for a better life away from European wars and the negative effects of industrialisation in the Plzeň region, Krippner’s family and six other Bohemians from Krippner’s home village migrated to New Zealand towards the end of 1859. The curious circumstances of their departure during the aftermath of the Austro-Sardinian War and at a time when New Zealand was still relatively unknown as a destination for German speaking emigrants point to some sort of co-operation emerging from a synergy of interests between German emigration agents and advocates, British shipping companies, the Auckland Provincial Government and, possibly also, supporters of Austrian colonial expansion plans. All four parties, each for their own reasons, shared an interest in promoting New Zealand as a dream destination for potential emigrants and capital investors from Europe and the German Confederation. Whether Krippner was aware of it or not, he and his fellow Bohemian emigrants became part of an advertising strategy developed by
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the former Frankfurt merchant, Johann Franz Haast, later known as Sir Julius von Haast, the explorer, geologist and founder of the Canterbury Museum. It is fairly certain that Krippner and the first group of Bohemian emigrants to New Zealand received financial and logistical help for their journey. In return, their plan to settle as farmers in New Zealand was used for advertising purposes in German language newspapers, and Krippner was probably expected to send encouraging letters back to relatives and friends in Bohemia and Germany in order to trigger a stream of future emigrants to New Zealand.

The land allocated to Krippner and the Bohemian immigrants according to the Auckland Waste Lands Act of 1858 was part of the Mahurangi Purchase of 1841. Te Hemara Tauhia and other members Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo and Ngāti Whātua agreed to extinguish the Native Title to these blocks of land by signing deeds of sale during the 1850s. In return for parting with this land, Tauhia and Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo expected the development of infrastructure and economy in the Mahurangi region. Tauhia must have firmly believed in the advantages of European civilization as promoted by missionaries and government officials. However, Tauhia and Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo not only provided land for Pākehā settlement, they also invited members of other hapū and iwi to live within the so-called Waiwerawera/Puhoi Reserve that had been legally recognised as land owned and occupied by Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo in 1853. The establishment of a multi-hapū and multi-ethnic neighbourhood in the Puhoi-Mahurangi region resulted not only from strategic considerations to strengthen the position of the relatively small number of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo members, it also indicates Tauhia’s belief in the advantages of a peaceful co-existence across tribal and ethnic boundaries.

In the beginning of 1860, war broke out between British Imperial and Colonial troops and Māori in the Taranaki region; this in part precipitated and was followed by the Waikato War, beginning in 1863. Tauhia’s dream of a peaceful co-existence between Māori and Pākehā and Krippner’s plan of starting a new life as a farmer were shattered. The following chapter will discuss how both Tauhia and Krippner responded to and got involved in the political events of the 1860s.

♦ ♦ ♦
6 Neighbours Between Frontiers

Pursuing their visions of providing a better life for family and friends, Te Hemara Tauhia and Martin Krippner trusted the promises made by the New Zealand colonial government or by emigration agents, the latter possibly acting on the former’s behalf. Tauhia and his hapū parted with tribal lands for the settlement of Pākehā immigrants who were to advance the process of so-called civilization. Krippner’s family and his Bohemian compatriots left their homes and crossed oceans, hoping to become independent farmers in a land praised as the ‘paradise on earth’. Under the provisions of the Auckland Waste Lands Act of 1858, the Bohemian immigrants were allocated their sections on heavily forested hilly terrain sold to the government by Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo. Thus, Tauhia and his people received their Pākehā neighbours and the Bohemians their land; however, the government’s financial and logistical support for the infrastructural development of the region was not forthcoming. Instead, the government focussed on obtaining more land in the Taranaki and Waikato regions and responded to Māori resistance to further land sales by declaring war. The preparations for military campaigns in Taranaki and Waikato also included schemes of introducing more immigrants – particularly those with military experience – who were expected to serve in the colonial forces and settle in the ‘buffer-zones’ between British settlers and ‘hostile’ Māori. How Tauhia and Krippner tackled the task of balancing personal ambitions and responsibilities for their people with obligations to assist the Crown, to which both men thought they owed allegiance, is discussed in this chapter. Instead of examining both men’s experiences and decisions during the 1860s in two parallel accounts, the narrative in this chapter will switch frequently between Tauhia’s and Krippner’s perspectives to show how the same or similar events variously affected their lives during this period.

♦ ♦ ♦
6.1 Te Hemara Tauhia: Intermediary and Native Assessor

6.1.1 Taranaki War and Kohimarama Conference

When the rangatira Wiremu Kingi Te Rangitake of Te Atiawa refused to sell a piece of land at Waitara in the Taranaki district, the New Zealand colonial government interpreted this resistance as a challenge to the Queen’s sovereignty. Subsequently, martial law was declared in Taranaki on 21 February 1860, and on 16 March, Imperial and Colonial troops and militia opened fire at Te Rangitake’s pā.¹ The government’s disrespect for the right of a rangatira to oppose the sale of land under his mana, a right guaranteed under the Treaty of Waitangi, led to the outbreak of the Taranaki War.² After the anticipated quick and definitive victory of the government forces failed to materialize, the New Zealand colonial government felt its authority threatened. In addition to the Taranaki War, the growing influence of the pan-tribal Kīngitanga movement, which demanded the right of self-government and a cessation of land sales, created further concerns.

In order to seek support for the suppression of the Māori King movement and the subjection of Wiremu Kingi Te Rangitake at Taranaki, Governor Browne invited over 200 so-called loyal rangatira to a conference at Kohimarama near Auckland in the Melanesian Mission station founded by Bishop Selwyn. The reason for holding this conference, the Governor said, was to offer an ‘opportunity of discussing various matters connected with the welfare and advancement of the two races dwelling in New Zealand.’³ Paora Tuhaere, an influential rangatira of Ngāti Whātua, chaired the conference alongside Donald McLean, the Native Secretary. The proceedings of the Kohimarama Conference, held from 10 July to 10 August 1860, were published in Māori and English over six issues of Te Karere Maori.⁴
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According to *Te Karere Maori*, many of the invited rangatira could not attend the conference because of an influenza epidemic; however, the historian Claudia Orange suspects that some simply refused to accept the invitation. Whatever the reason, the delegation from Mahurangi, among them Te Hemara Tauhia, his brother Henare Winiata, as well as Wiremu and Hare Pomare, arrived on 1 August 1860, three weeks after the start of the conference. Thus, Tauhia heard neither Governor Browne’s opening address nor McLean’s remarks justifying different laws for Māori and Pākehā. However, he might have read their speeches published in the newspaper or in pamphlets handed out to the participants of the conference.
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In his opening address, Governor Browne reminded the rangatira to be grateful that New Zealand was the first country to be colonised ‘on this new and humane system’ based on the Treaty of Waitangi. In the same breath, he warned that, should Māori end their allegiance to the Queen, they would forfeit their rights and privileges as British subjects ‘which must necessarily entail upon them evils ending only in their ruin as a race.’ Browne continued to argue that although it was the Queen’s desire that Māori ‘should be preserved as a people’, they needed to learn English. This would be the only way for Māori to participate in English councils and to overcome the barrier between Europeans and Māori because of language difference. Delivering a summary of the events that led to the war in Taranaki, the Governor and McLean emphasised that it was Wiremu Kingi Te Rangitake who provoked the war: Te Rangitake drove away the surveyors, he refused to meet the Governor, and even though he was allowed to go in peace after his pā was destroyed, he took up arms against the Queen.

After listening to the open threat by the Governor, all rangatira present at the conference expressed their allegiance to the Queen. They regarded this conference as an endorsement of the Treaty of Waitangi, with an understanding that regular future conferences would ensure an equal partnership between Māori and the Crown. Many of the rangatira stated that if the government had sought their council earlier, the war in Taranaki could have been prevented. The Governor promised that the next conference would be held in the following year. However, after Governor Browne was replaced by Sir George Grey in 1861, there were no more conferences whereby the representatives of the Crown consulted Māori rangatira.

Te Keene of Ngāti Whātua was the first speaker to address the inequality of Māori and Pākehā before the law, referring for example to the difference in prices paid

---

for land, and the prohibition on Māori to buy powder and guns.\textsuperscript{13} In response to the issue of different laws for Māori and Pākehā, Native Secretary McLean answered: ‘Children cannot have what belongs to persons of mature age; and a child does not grow to be a man in a day.’\textsuperscript{14} McLean’s patronising explanation seems to have passed by uncommented upon, perhaps because Māori had heard this argumentation many times before, and they chose to ignore the insulting comparison of Māori with children. Regarding the low prices paid by the government for Māori land, McLean argued that the profits the government made from the on-sale of land would be reinvested in roads, bridges and settlement of population; all such improvements thereby increasing the value of previously unproductive land.\textsuperscript{15}

Tauhia spoke only briefly on the day of his arrival, as the fourth speaker after the representatives of Te Uri o Hau, Paikea, Wiremu Tipene and Arama Karaka Haututu. With a few words, Tauhia explained that he owed his life to the arrival of the Gospel and the governor in New Zealand; therefore, he intended to cling to the Queen for ever and place his land under the law of the government:

\begin{quote}
Ka piri ahau ki te Kuini hei oranga moku ake ake: koia au ka tuku i taku whenua ki te Kawanatanga.

In order to live I will cling to the Queen forever, therefore I place my land in the hands of the government.\textsuperscript{16}
\end{quote}

Tauhia did not comment on the war in Taranaki or the Kīngitanga movement. But he was the fourth person to sign a petition placed before the Native Secretary requesting that government officials and Māori rangatira from all over New Zealand should meet regularly in the form of this conference.\textsuperscript{17} Tauhia’s brother and the two sons of Pomare II did not speak publicly, probably because of their junior status.

\textsuperscript{14} ‘Te Hui ki Kohimarama: The Kohimarama Conference’, p. 38.
\textsuperscript{15} ‘Nga Mahi o te Runanga ki Kohimarama: Proceedings of the Kohimarama Conference’, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{16} ‘Nga Mahi o te Runanga ki Kohimarama: Proceedings of the Kohimarama Conference’, p. 53; the English translation is slightly amended by me; the part of Tauhia’s speech regarding his following of the Gospel is quoted in Chapter 4.1. of this thesis.
\textsuperscript{17} ‘Nga Mahi o te Runanga ki Kohimarama: Proceedings of the Kohimarama Conference’, p. 68.
Another topic discussed during the conference was the individualisation of Māori land tenure. Paora Tuhaere, Ngāti Whātua rangatira and chair of the conference, was at that time in favour of subdividing tribal lands and issuing Crown grants, probably in order to avoid conflicts arising from land disputes as had happened in Taranaki.\(^{18}\) Nine years later, however, he tried to prevent the individualisation of his hapū’s land at Orakei.\(^{19}\) Tuhaere and Tauhia became life-long friends and allies in the campaign for Māori pan-tribal political unification and participation in New Zealand governance.\(^{20}\) It is possible that Tuhaere’s initial approval of the individualisation of the Māori land tenure system, which became law under the Native Lands Act 1862, may have influenced Tauhia’s willingness to cooperate with the Native Land Court.

Although the participants reached no consensus on the question of the Taranaki War, many of the rangatira present expressed their desire that the government make peace with Wiremu Kingi Te Rangitake.\(^{21}\) In the following year, after the Ngāti Haua rangatira Wiremu Tamihana initiated peace negotiations, Native Secretary McLean travelled to Taranaki, and a cease-fire was agreed on 18 March 1861. Afterwards, Governor Browne, accompanied by Tamati Waka Nene, Tamati Ngapora and two other Waikato rangatira, went to Taranaki to finalise the terms of peace.\(^{22}\)

According to Percy S. Smith’s *Reminiscences of a Pioneer Surveyor*, Tauhia was also among the ‘friendly chiefs’ who accompanied Governor Browne to mediate between the government and hostile Māori in Taranaki.\(^{23}\) In the early 1860s, Smith was surveying the Kaipara and Mahurangi region, and he often stayed at Te Muri, near Puhoi river mouth, the kāinga of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo. When Smith was there in May 1861, he recorded that Te Hemara Tauhia had just returned from Taranaki. Smith described Te Muri as a beautiful village, where he was always welcomed by the rangatira Hori Kingi (Maukino). Smith portrayed Te

---

\(^{18}\) ‘Nga Mahi o te Runanga ki Kohimarama (he roanga no tera Karere): Proceedings of the Kohimarama Conference (continued from our last’), p. 59.


\(^{20}\) See chapter 6.1. of this thesis.


Hemara Tauhia, however, as ‘a rather too much civilized man to be so pleasant as the others.’ Thus, Smith linked a higher degree of ‘civilization’ with being less pleasant. This could be understood as another example of the contradictory attitude often found among colonists: while hoping non-European people would embrace European civilization, they regretted that indigenous people became too much like Europeans.

6.1.2 Settlement of Land Dispute at Court and Sale of Komokoriki

On 13 September 1861, Tauhia was appointed Native Assessor (kaiwhakawā) under the Resident Magistrates' Courts Ordinance Session 7 No. 16. He received an annual salary of £40. The newspaper *Te Karere Maori* reported about a hearing held on 15 January 1863 in which Tauhia acted as kaiwhakawā in a dispute over land between two Ngāpuhi rangatira, Te Tirarau, of Wairoa, and Matiu Te Aranui, of Mangakahia. Sir George Grey, who returned to New Zealand as Governor on 26 September 1861, acted as referee. The dispute started in February 1862 when Te Tirarau offered land at Mangakahia Stream in the Kaipara district for sale to the government in order to pay debts. Matiu, who claimed ownership of the land, opposed the sale and the quarrel resulted in both parties and their supporters taking up arms. Paikea and Arama Karaka Haututu of Te Uri o Hau joined in the fight on Matiu’s side. The dispute was settled in court on 7 February 1863; *Te Karere Maori* celebrated this peaceful resolution: ‘Their appeal to a court of enquiry in the present instance evinces a spirit of...

25 ‘Official Notification - Panuitanga na te Kawana’, *Te Manuhiri Tuarangi - Maori Intelligencer*, 1 October 1861, p. 15, as in Niupepa: Māori Newspapers <http://www.nzdl.org/gsdlnmod?gg=text&e=00000-00---off-0niupepa--00-0----0-10-0---0---0direct-10---4------0-11--11-en-50---20-home---00-0-1-00-0-0-11-1-0utfZz-8-00&=d&c=niupepa&ci=CL1.10 >, [accessed 28 October 2016].
27 Matiu Te Aranui died in December 1862; he was represented in court by Te Hira Mura Awa, see ‘Decision of the Governor in the Dispute between Matiu and Te Tirarau’, *Te Karere Maori – The Maori Messenger*, 1 February 1863, p. 4, as in *Papers Past*, National Library of New Zealand <https://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/> , [accessed 28 October 2016].
manliness, and is a step in advance which cannot be too highly praised." In Tauhia’s eyes, Governor Grey consolidated his image as an advocate of peace. Five months later, Governor Grey declared war on Waikato.

Perhaps the recent armed conflict between Ngāpuhi and Te Uri o Hau caused Tauhia and his people to agree to a further sale of land in order to create a buffer-zone of Pākehā settlement around the Waiwerawera/Puhoi Reserve. On 29 September and 4 November 1862, Tauhia and fourteen other members of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo signed deeds of sale for the blocks Komokoriki No. 1 and No. 2, west of the Waiwerawera/Puhoi Reserve. The hapū received £3,500 for the Komokoriki blocks, comprising 35,395 acres (a little less than two shillings per acre). East-Komokoriki, being included in the Mahurangi Purchase from 1841, had already been declared Crown land before the sale; West-Komokoriki, constituting part of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo’s ancestral land in the Kaipara area, was up to this point ‘Native Land’. The Komokoriki blocks were offered to the Albertland immigrants in 1862, although this group refused to settle on the densely forested land. On 3 January 1863, the Superintendent of the Auckland Province, Robert Graham, announced that the central part of Komokoriki, containing 10,000 acres, was reserved for a special German settlement. It is possible that the plan of establishing a special German settlement at the upper end of the Puhoi River resulted from conversations between Te Hemara Tauhia, Robert Graham, the owner of Waiwerawera Hot Springs, and Martin Krippner, who together with the first group of Bohemian settlers had set up a farm between Waiwerawera River and Orewa in 1860.

---

30 ‘Decision of the Governor in the Dispute Between Matiu and Te Tirarau’, p. 2.
31 Turton, Maori Deeds of Land Purchases, pp. 262-64.
32 Turton, Maori Deeds of Land Purchases, pp. 262-64; for a map of blocks of land included in Mahurangi Purchase from 1841, see Rigby, p. 3.
33 Scott, Seven Lives on Salt River, p. 13.
6.2 Martin Krippner: Fresh Start as Farmer and Postman

6.2.1 Arrival at Auckland and First Years at Orewa

On 22 March 1860 the Krippner family and the first group of Bohemian immigrants arrived in Auckland on board the Lord Burleigh, mocked by the press as the ‘November Free Grant Vessel.’ A fellow passenger, five years old at the time of arrival, later drew from memory the Lord Burleigh entering Waitematā Harbour with the volcano Rangitoto and a red menacing sky forming the background.

![Figure 15 Lord Burleigh by E. H. Snow](image)

According to the ‘Maritime Record’ of the day, the Lord Burleigh docked at Queen-Street Wharf ‘in the heart of one of the severest squalls, accompanied with thunder and lightning, and a deluge of rain, that has been experienced for the last

---

four or five years.'

Perhaps, this storm portended the turbulent future of Krippner’s farming enterprise in New Zealand.

Shortly after arrival, the new immigrants would have heard of the war against so-called ‘rebellious’ Māori in the Taranaki region, which had started a week before. The news might have scared the newcomers, especially if they had believed in the guide books and emigration agents’ assurance that Māori welcomed European settlers and were easily disposed to parting with their land. The often misleading content of pamphlets distributed by emigration agents and shipping companies in London was criticised in an article published in the Daily Southern Cross on 27 March 1860. With explicit reference to Hursthouse’s book New Zealand, or Zealandia: The Britain of the South, the author of the article claimed that immigrants were not only misinformed about the political situation in New Zealand, but also they had false expectations in regards to arable and fertile land available and opportunities to find employment at good wages.

Apparently, the news of the Taranaki War caused Haast to request the shipping company Willis, Gann and Co to relieve him of his engagements because he no longer could recommend New Zealand as a destination for German emigrants. However, whether Haast was concerned for his fellow countrymen’s wellbeing is doubtful. He simply was no longer dependent on Willis, Gann and Co’s employ: since December 1859, Haast was paid by the Marlborough Provincial Council to lead a geological expedition along the South Island West Coast. Nothing is known as to whether Haast and Krippner ever met again in New Zealand.

Within a month after arriving in New Zealand, Martin Krippner requested his naturalization. Writing to the Colonial Secretary on 12 April 1860, Krippner enclosed a letter of introduction to the Governor by the Duke of Newcastle, and

---

41 Charles Hursthouse, New Zealand, or: Zealandia, the Britain of the South, 2 vols (London: E. Stanford, 1857).
he named two referees: T. S. Forsaith, a member of the New Zealand General Assembly, and Captain Cooper. A reply to his request arrived the following day, and on 14 April 1860 Krippner wrote again, providing information about his place and country of birth, and his service as Captain in the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army. Further, Krippner asked for the naturalization to take effect from 10 April 1860. The seeming urgency of his request for naturalization and for the completion of the formal process of approval is unusual by comparison with that of other non-British immigrants in New Zealand in this period; his brother Johann, for example, was naturalized over 20 years later, in 1881. Perhaps, naturalization was a requirement for taking up the free land grants; it is also possible that Martin Krippner wanted to make a clean break with his past.

According to the memories of Martin Krippner’s son Rudolf, the children and Emily Krippner stayed at her brother’s place in Auckland-Parnell during the first months after arrival. Pynson Wilmot Longdill and his family had arrived in Auckland in November 1859. Rudolf remembered his uncle Longdill as a ‘very elegant man’ and their household in Parnell as ‘noble and awe-inspiring.’

Judging from this description, the Longdills must have been well-off, having established an elegant household four months after arriving in New Zealand.

Martin Krippner, his brother Johann and the other five Bohemians went about 40 kilometres north of Auckland to clear the land and set up farm buildings at Nukumea Stream, between Orewa and Waiwerawera. The farm of about 43 acres formed part of the Wainui block sold to the Crown by Te Hemara Tauhia and his people in 1854. Next to the Krippners’ farm was the residence of Captain (later Major) Isaac Rhodes Cooper of the 58th Regiment. He bought land

---

46 A copy of Johann Krippner's naturalization request is held at Puhoi Bohemian Museum, Krippner File.
48 Magdalena Krippner, p. 6.
50 Turton, An Epitome of Official Documents, pp. 141, 42; the sale of Wainui block is discussed in Chapter 5.1 of this thesis.
and settled at Orewa in 1856 with his wife Rora Te Makohe, daughter of the influential Whanganui chief Te Makohe. Cooper also wrote a guide for New Zealand settlers, published in London in 1857. There is a possibility that it was Cooper’s book that sparked the Longdills’ and Krippners’ idea of migrating to New Zealand; however, Haast’s suggestion to the shipping company Willis, Gann and Co to sponsor one or two German emigrant families in order to trigger a wave of German immigration to New Zealand still would have been a deciding factor for the Krippners’ migration plans. The choice to settle at Orewa, however, might have been based on Cooper’s recommendation.

Starting a farm at Nukumea Stream was not the only venture Krippner envisaged. On 26 March 1860 Krippner and Longdill conjointly applied to be allocated 570 acres at Kaiwaka in the Kaipara region, the land being part of Te Ika-a-Ranganui block sold to the government in 1858 by Te Uri o Hau and Ngāti Whātua. The application was denied – for what reason is unknown. In January 1861 Krippner requested 380 acres at Waitakere, west of Auckland; this request was also not granted.

While Martin Krippner may not have been satisfied with the location of his farm, his children loved being so close to the ocean. Rudolf Krippner later described to his children his amazement at hearing the surf day and night. But Rudolf also remembered the isolation of the place: the navigable rivers Orewa and Waiwerawera, the only connections with the rest of the world, were far away. There was a horse track between Auckland’s north shore and the Krippners’ farm, but Waiwerawera River could only be reached on foot; this was still the situation in 1864. While helping with lighter tasks on the farm, the children would have had plenty of time to explore their surroundings. Surely they must have met and

53 Auckland, Archives NZ, Register of Applications: Cash Lands - numbers 559-3335, 1859 - 1866, BAAZ 1351/1; Turton, Maori Deeds of Land Purchases, p. 196-97.
54 Register of Applications: Cash Lands - numbers 559-3335, 1859 - 1866.
55 Magdalena Krippner, p. 6.
56 James Coutts Crawford, Recollections of Travel in New Zealand and Australia (sl: sn, 1880), p. 209.
played together with Captain Cooper’s children. However, such a friendship with children of Māori and European descent is not mentioned in Rudolf’s memoirs, written around 1943 by his daughter in Germany at a time when racism dominated contemporary discourse.

During the first years in New Zealand, Krippner would have drawn on all cash resources and probably borrowed money to pay for farm and building equipment, grass seeds, livestock, and food for his family and fellow Bohemians. Krippner also ran a business together with Longdill; however, a newspaper notice informed that the partnership dissolved on 24 May 1861. The notice did not mention what kind of business it was. Later in the 1870s, Longdill was trading in wine, spirits, tobacco, tea and groceries. On 19 August 1861 Krippner was appointed postmaster of Orewa. Whether this position provided him with extra earnings or

Figure 16 'Mr Krippner's Nukumea, January 27, 1864', by James C. Crawford

57 James Coutts Crawford, 'Mr Krippner's Nukumea, January 27, 1864', Wellington, ATL, E-125-015.
whether he performed his services gratuitously, as often was the case for local postmasters, is not known.61

Emily Krippner, who had no experience in agricultural labour, looked for other ways of contributing to the family income. A newspaper advertisement from April 1861 said that Mrs Krippner taught German at the Lyceum in Auckland.62 She also offered private music and singing lessons.63 Thus, Emily Krippner came regularly to Auckland, where she most likely stayed with her brother’s family in Parnell. It also seems that Mrs Krippner taught her children mainly herself. Her son Rudolf later claimed that he only went to school for two years.64 These two years must have been at Auckland High School; a newspaper notice mentioned Rudolf Krippner coming second in English exams in December 1865.65 Working as a teacher and earning money was a new experience for Emily Krippner. She was no longer subjected to rules of behaviour expected of an Austrian army officer’s wife, but she also could no longer enjoy the luxuries of a life among the wealthy bourgeoisie of Frankfurt. Nevertheless, she did not give up her love for music and the visual arts. Rudolf remembered her ‘studio’ in Orewa, an upstairs room where she painted and played the piano. The children regarded their mother’s room as a sanctuary.66

Whether Martin Krippner enjoyed toiling the soil and carrying bags of mail is not known. He did not shy away from hard work. However, even his youngest son described him as not suitable for a farmer’s life despite descending from generations of peasants. For example, Rudolf told the following story to his children: In order to get rid of weeds, his father had the soil of a field meticulously sifted through and every little seed or root removed. By the time

64 Magdalena Krippner, p. 13.
66 Magdalena Krippner, p. 16
they started the second field, the weeds in the first field were back in full bloom, more than ever before.67

The list of voters shows that Martin Krippner’s brother, Johann, was running his own household at Orewa River by April 1862.68 Whether Johann’s house stood on his brother’s farm or whether he bought his own land is not clear. On 15 August 1861 Johann Krippner married Elisabeth Turnwald from Chotěšov; she came to New Zealand with the Krippners in 1860. Their first child, Emily Mary Louise, was born on 3 October 1861, but died in infancy.69 To earn extra income, Johann started working as a surveyor.70 After being employed on Martin Krippner’s farm for three years, the two other Bohemian couples, Pankratz and Scheidler, moved to Matakana, north of Mahurangi, where they set up their own farms.

Sometime in early 1861, the Krippners would have received the news from Michael, the third of the Krippner brothers, that their mother Anna Krippner, née Pallier, had died on 20 November 1860 in Mantov.71 By that time, Michael Krippner would have also informed his brothers that now his family and others from villages in the Chotěšov County were preparing their departure for New Zealand.72 Surviving documents held at the Puhoi Museum and at family archives show that travel papers were issued starting April 1861, with Orewa being stated as the destination of travel.73 Encouraging letters by Martin Krippner, and the reports of Hochstetter’s explorations in New Zealand published in Austrian newspapers between 1859 and 1860, convinced a group of over 80 Bohemian farm labourers, miners and artisans to leave their homeland in February 1863.

67 Magdalena Krippner, p. 7.
68 ‘List of Persons who have Preferred Claims to Vote at Elections of Members of the House of Representatives for the Electoral District of the Northern Division’, New Zealander, 9 April 1862, p. 8, as in Papers Past, National Library of New Zealand <https://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/>, [accessed 28 October 2016]; interestingly, Johann Krippner, who was not naturalized, was eligible to vote.
69 Hurrey, p. 66.
70 Johann Krippner later surveyed the land at Puhoi where the second group of Bohemian immigrants would settle in 1863; the Puhoi Bohemian Museum holds survey maps created by Johann Krippner.
72 That Michael Krippner was literate in German is shown in a document witnessed by Michael Krippner and others, see: ‘Letter from Commissioner of Police, Auckland, 22 December 1863’, Wellington, Archives NZ, 1863/1326.
73 Waihi, SFA, Copies of Baptismal Certificates for Anna and Johann Krippner, issued 4 April 1861; Puhoi, Puhoi Bohemian Museum, Copy of Anton Turnwald’s Passport, issued 4 July 1861.
Haast, the author of the newspaper reports, repeatedly mentioned the high wages labourers could earn in New Zealand, and that Germans settlers were welcomed with open arms because of their industry and sobriety.  

6.2.2 New Zealand Government Schemes for German Immigration

In mid-1862 Governor Sir George Grey and the colonial government designed a scheme of introducing 1000 German immigrants who were to settle in the bush along the frontier between British settlers and so-called hostile Māori in the Taranaki Province. Fedor Kelling, a former Prussian living in Nelson in the South Island and elected Member of the General Assembly of New Zealand, was appointed by the New Zealand government to act as the New Zealand emigration agent recruiting emigrants in the lands of the German Confederation. Kelling, who was instrumental in developing the new immigration scheme, pointed to the biggest advantage of German immigrants: most men had military training because of compulsory military service in most German states. According to Kelling, German immigrants could be easily lured with the offer of land. To ensure that the German immigrants would remain in their allocated places, which ‘would be most likely to be assaulted by the Maories [sic]’, Kelling proposed bonded migration.

Before embarking the ship, the heads of immigrant families were to sign a legal contract binding them to reimburse the New Zealand government all the moneys paid for passage, land grants (£40 for twenty acres per man above eighteen years of age) plus costs of provisions during the first twelve months in New Zealand. They also had to agree to perform public works such as road building. Men with military training would receive their twenty acres for free if they committed to seven years’ service in the local militia. The risk that the German immigrants would ‘desert their post’ was minimal due to their lack of understanding the English language: if they wished to run away, they would not have the means and

74 See for example, Julius Hanf (Haast), 'Expedition der k. k. Fregatte "Novara": Der Aufenthalt der "Novara" in Neuseeland', Wiener Zeitung, 18 April 1859, p. 354, as in Anno: Historische Zeitungen und Zeitschriften, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek <http://anno.onb.ac.at>, [accessed 1 May 2016]; Julius Hanf (Haast), 'Wissenschaft, Kunst und öffentliches Leben: Streifzüge in Neuseeland', Wiener Zeitung, 6 March 1860, pp. 5-6, as in Anno: Historische Zeitungen und Zeitschriften, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek <http://anno.onb.ac.at>, [accessed 1 May 2016].
76 ‘Further Papers Relative to the Introduction of German Immigrants into New Zealand’, p. 1.
77 ‘Further Papers Relative to the Introduction of German Immigrants into New Zealand’, pp. 9–11.
would not know how to do so.\textsuperscript{78} The government hoped to recruit 1000 German military settlers by October 1863.\textsuperscript{79}

To carry out this German immigration scheme, the New Zealand government approached the Hamburg shipping company J. C. Godeffroy and Son, former shareholders of the German Colonisation Company, which in 1841 intended to set up a German colony on Chatham Island.\textsuperscript{80} In 1857 Godeffroy and Son had recruited and transported approximately 2,300 German military settlers to British Kaffraria ‘to the entire satisfaction of His Excellency’ Sir George Grey, who at that time was acting as governor of the Cape Colony.\textsuperscript{81} However, this time, in 1863, the Hamburg shipping company refused to cooperate under the regulations as stipulated by the New Zealand government. Godeffroy and Son considered the proposed scheme as ‘selling emigrants or sending them into slavery.’\textsuperscript{82} Besides, so Godeffroy’s argument went, the offers of the New Zealand government could not compete with the much more favourable conditions in Australia and America.\textsuperscript{83} In the end, the New Zealand government abandoned its plan and recruited military settlers for Taranaki in the Otago and Victorian goldfields.\textsuperscript{84}

While the New Zealand government was unsuccessfully negotiating its scheme of bonded German immigration, the Auckland Provincial Government announced its own plan to introduce German settlers under the free land grant scheme according to the Auckland Waste Lands Act, 1858. A newspaper article from 13 December 1862 mentioned that Martin Krippner was ‘appointed to make arrangements with the Provincial Government for suitable locations for numbers of his countrymen shortly expected to arrive.’\textsuperscript{85} According to this article, Krippner selected land at the Puhoi River as the location for the German settlement. The land that Krippner chose incorporated the Komokoriki blocks, sold by Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo to

\textsuperscript{78} ‘Further Papers Relative to the Introduction of German Immigrants into New Zealand’, p. 1.
\textsuperscript{79} ‘Further Papers Relative to the Introduction of German Immigrants into New Zealand’, pp. 4-5.
\textsuperscript{81} ‘Further Papers Relative to the Introduction of German Immigrants into New Zealand’, p. 8.
\textsuperscript{82} ‘Further Papers Relative to the Introduction of German Immigrants into New Zealand’, p. 17.
\textsuperscript{83} ‘Further Papers Relative to the Introduction of German Immigrants into New Zealand’, p. 17.
\textsuperscript{84} Waitangi Tribunal, \textit{The Taranaki Report}, p. 92.
the government and rejected by the Albertland settlers as too isolated and heavily forested.

One of the main points of critique regarding Krippner’s role in Puhoi’s history was his choice of location for this settlement. Descendants of the Bohemian immigrants still ask today what could have driven Krippner to select that heavily forested, hilly terrain, which was only accessible via the Puhoi River at high tide. Perhaps the attraction was its close proximity to the hot springs at the Waiwerawera river mouth, where Robert Graham had established a mineral bath sanatorium. It is possible that Krippner envisaged a flourishing spa town at Waiwerawera, similar to Mariánské Lázně in North Bohemia, near Teplá Abbey, where Krippner spent four years of his childhood. The value of the land allocated to the Bohemian settlers would then quickly rise, and a developing spa town at Waiwerawera would constitute a profitable market for their products. Robert Graham, the owner of Waiwerawera Hot Springs, acted as Superintendent of the Province of Auckland from 1862 – 1865. It was, of course, also in his interest if Komokoriki at the Puhoi River became the location for a German settlement, which would advance the infrastructural development near his property.

One could also speculate as to whether the Auckland Provincial Government was keen on setting up a German Special Settlement as a buffer zone between British colonists and Māori living at the Waiwerawera/Puhoi Reserve. Another explanation could be that there was no other land available. At a meeting of the Provincial Council in March 1863 it was stated that only half of the Land Orders held by the 6,943 immigrants, who came to the Auckland Province since November 1858, had been executed. There were still 117,362 acres required to satisfy these Land Orders, whereas only 56,602 acres had been surveyed and were open for selection. Some descendants of the Puhoi settlers remember their ancestors saying that land at Pukekohe was originally allocated for a German settlement. However, whether they referred to Pukekohe south of Auckland, or


88 Conversational interview with Stephen Schollum, 7 October 2014; Schollum’s research suggests that this notion was most likely erroneous.
to the block of land called Pukekohe lying between Orewa and Komokoriki, has been forgotten.89

While the Auckland Provincial Council was still discussing the location and necessary surveying of land for a German Special Settlement, the second group of Bohemian immigrants was already sailing to New Zealand on board the War Spirit, owned by Willis, Gann and Co.90 The War Spirit arrived at Auckland Harbour on 27 June 1863. It recorded one death: Lorenz Turnwald from Chotěšov died after the ship was hit by a storm on 15 June 1863 in the South Tasman Sea.91 He left behind his wife and five children. Martin and Emily Krippner took one of the Turnwald daughters into their home until the widow Turnwald remarried at the end of the following year.92 In a testimonial published in the newspaper New Zealander, Krippner thanked Captain Luckes of the War Spirit for the kindness and care shown to the German immigrants on board his vessel; whether it was a genuine gesture of gratitude or part of an arrangement to generate favourable publicity for the shipping company Willis, Gann and Co is unknown.93

***

89 See map in Rigby, p. 3.
90 The journey of the second group of Bohemian migrants from their home towns to New Zealand is described in detail by Stephen Schollum in John Schollum’s Trip from Staab to Puhoi NZ, (unpublished manuscript), loaned to the author by Stephen Schollum.
92 Hurrey, p. 66.
6.3 Te Hemara Tauhia: Kaitiaki (Protector) of the Bohemian Settlers

6.3.1 Welcoming Bohemians at Puhoi River

On 29 June 1863 Tauhia and Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo welcomed the second group of Bohemian immigrants at the Puhoi river mouth. The Bohemian men, women and children, from new-born to age 67, probably looked tired and worn after a journey of three-and-a-half months across oceans, and some were in mourning after the loss of a man on their voyage. None of the new arrivals spoke English, thus communication was only possible with Martin Krippner acting as an interpreter – apparently, Krippner spoke English fluently, and he could converse in te reo Māori. Krippner would have assured his compatriots of the friendly relationship between Europeans and Te Hemara Tauhia and his people, and that all fears concerning Māori in this neighbourhood were unfounded.

No accounts of what Tauhia and his people thought about their new neighbours have been preserved; perhaps, initially they felt sorry for them, and perhaps some wondered how these tāngata tauhou, or strangers, were supposed to advance the infrastructural development of the region. The Bohemians tell the story that, upon arrival at the Puhoi river mouth, one of their women, Elisabeth Schollum, saw the wounded leg of Tauhia’s son. She treated the boy’s leg with herbal remedies which caused the wound to heal. Whether the story is true or not, it might have been told to reflect the early relationship of mutual assistance between the Bohemians and Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo at Puhoi River. This relationship was soon to be threatened.

The last leg of the Bohemian immigrants’ journey continued in waka about four miles up the Puhoi River through thick bush to a clearing on the river bank. Two nikau whare, or palm huts, built by surveyors for an intended surveying station,
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95 Mooney, p. 17; Krippner’s English and Māori language skills are mentioned in Silk, p. 8
served as accommodation for the 81 men, women and children. The Bohemians were shocked when they saw the surroundings of their ‘promised land’. The response of one woman became legend: ‘If she could have walked the sea, she would have walked back home.’ Apparently also, according to accounts of the Bohemian settlers, the Māori paddling the waka could not understand why anyone would choose to live in the middle of the bush. It may have been there and then that the suspicion of being betrayed by Martin Krippner began to be ingrained in the Puhoi collective memory.

Based on the landscape surrounding their home villages in Bohemia, the immigrants had expected 20 or 40 acres of wide open fields, which could have easily supported a family. Here at Puhoi – that was the name the Bohemians gave their settlement – it would take years to clear the bush and to become self-sufficient. The remoteness of the allocated land made it difficult to gain any profit from the timber, initially the only source of income. Contrary to the promises made by emigration agents and presented strongly in Haast’s propaganda articles about New Zealand, there were no opportunities to earn wages as labourers. The announced public works for building parts of the Great North Road did not start until March 1865.

Without the help of Tauhia and his people, who sent waka-loads of food to the new Pākehā settlement, the Bohemian immigrants would have starved. The Māori of the Waierewera/Puhoi Reserve taught their new neighbours how to survive in the bush: which plants and berries were edible, what materials could be used for building a whare. The Bohemian settlers had no firearms to hunt pigs or birds; eels and crabs caught in the river were their only protein. Some of the single men left Puhoi to work in the gum fields of Northland or they followed the gold rush to Thames. Most of the Bohemian settlers, however, had no funds to go anywhere else. In communal effort they built more nikau whare at the clearing on the river.

---
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bank, cut tracks through the bush and helped each other to set up individual homes on their allocated sections.\textsuperscript{103}

![Figure 17 The Coastline from Orewa to Mahurangi Harbour by Charles Heaphy, 1860s](image)

### 6.3.2 Start of War in the Waikato

Less than two weeks after the arrival of the Bohemian immigrants, on 12 July 1863, the New Zealand government declared war on Waikato and the Kīngitanga movement.\textsuperscript{105} Three days later, Major Cooper from Orewa wrote a letter to the Colonial Secretary, warning that Te Hemara Tauhia and allied tribes were planning an attack on Auckland.\textsuperscript{106} Apparently, Cooper’s informants had

\textsuperscript{103} Mooney, pp. 20 - 21.

\textsuperscript{104} Charles Heaphy, The Coastline from Orewa to Mahurangi Harbour 1860s, Auckland, Auckland Libraries, Sir George Grey Special Collections, NZ Map 38; typed names added by me.

\textsuperscript{105} Waitangi Tribunal, The Taranaki Report, p. 88.

\textsuperscript{106} Major Cooper, ‘Letter to Colonial Secretary, Auckland, 15 July 1863’, Wellington, Archives NZ, 1863/1948.
witnessed a meeting at Puhoi River where Tauhia’s people together with men from Waikato, Bay of Islands and Kaipara were discussing strategies whereby ‘the northern Natives would join in attacking the northern outsettlements whenever Waikato should begin in the South.’\textsuperscript{107} Cooper expressed his opinion that ‘the northern tribes generally are not to be depended on.’\textsuperscript{108}

As a response to such accusations, on 3 August 1863, Tauhia sent an open letter to Governor Grey and the press, stating his support and protection of all Pākehā settlers in his neighbourhood.\textsuperscript{109} He urged the Pākehā to stay in the Mahurangi district, and even if the Pākehā men chose to join the militia and fight against so-called ‘rebellious Māori’, he would look after their women and children; also, if the Pākehā men wished to return, they were still welcome. \textit{Te Karere Maori} published the letter in Māori and English:

\begin{quote}
Kua oti matou te huihui ki Puhoi. Matou ko nga Pakeha ko nga tangata Maori katoa, kua rongo au i nga korero pai o nga Rangatira o Ngatirango. Kua puta ta ratou kupu ki nga Pakeha o Mahurangi, Ma noho pai ki to ratou kāinga, kaua e awangawanga ki te aha ki te aha, engari te mahi anake ki te kai mau e te Pakeha, me ratou hoki ka mahi i te kai ma ratou. Heoi, whakapai ana nga Pakeha ki runga ki enei kupu. Heoi ka puta taku kupu ki nga Pakeha, kia noho pu mau ki Mahurangi kia kaua ratou e haere atu ki te Taone, ko ahau hei kai tiaki mo ratou. Ko ratou hei kai tiaki moku. Ki te hiahia nga tane ki te haere atu, e pai ana, me haere atu. Ko nga wahine me nga tamariki maku e tiaki. Ki te hiahia nga Tane kia hoki mai e pai ana, ko aku kupu enei i runga o ta whakawa o nga Pakeha, o nga Tangata Maori.

We have had a meeting at Puhoi, the Pakehas and all the Maoris. I have heard the good talk of the Chiefs of Ngatirango. They have told the Pakehas of Mahurangi to stay quietly at their place, and to give themselves no anxiety whatever but to grow food for the Pakehas as they were doing for themselves.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{107} Major Cooper, ‘Letter to Colonial Secretary, Auckland, 15 July 1863’.
\textsuperscript{108} Major Cooper, ‘Letter to Colonial Secretary, Auckland, 15 July 1863’.
The Pakehas expressed themselves as satisfied with these words: Enough. I have advised the Pakehas to stay fast at Mahurangi, and not go to the town, that I should protect them, and they me, but that if the men chose to go, it would be well. I would protect the women and children, and if the men liked to come back it would be well. These were my words at the meeting of Pakehas and Maoris.\textsuperscript{110}

On the same day, the Pākehā settlers from the Puhoi region wrote a letter to Governor Grey, assuring him that the local Māori were loyal and peaceful and had nothing to do with the Waikato War. The settlers stated that they would remain in the Mahurangi district under the protection of the local ‘Native Chiefs’.\textsuperscript{111} This letter was printed in the same issue of \textit{Te Karere Maori}, one page before Tauhia’s letter. However, despite Tauhia’s assurance that Pākehā settlers would be safe under his protection, 26 people left the Bohemian settlement up the Puhoi River.\textsuperscript{112} Seven men enlisted in the Third Company of the Waikato Militia under Martin Krippner’s command. Krippner was commissioned Captain on 17 October 1863.\textsuperscript{113}

\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet

\textsuperscript{110} ‘Mahurangi’, p. 7; ‘Ngāti Rango’ is a spelling variation of ‘Ngāti Rongo’.
\textsuperscript{111} ‘Mahurangi’, pp. 6-7.
\textsuperscript{112} Mooney, p. 23; Jeni Palmer, Nominal and Descriptive Rolls of 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th Waikato Regiments 1863-1867 (Tauranga, NZ, Gencentre, c2007), pp. 135-210.
\textsuperscript{113} ‘Hans Krippner to be Captain’, \textit{New Zealand Gazette}, 17 October 1863, p. 509; the publishers wrote ‘Hans’ instead of ‘Martin.’
6.4 Martin Krippner – Service in the Waikato Militia

6.4.1 Captain Again

In order to increase its military force, the New Zealand government offered land grants and pay for Volunteer Militiamen; the respective conditions and regulations were announced in the New Zealand Gazette on 5 August 1863. For example, a captain of the militia was offered 300 acres, and a private 50 acres of land yet to be confiscated in the Waikato; captains would be paid eleven shillings seven pence per diem, privates two shillings six pence per diem. The Crown Grants to the allocated land would be issued after three years’ service in the Waikato Militia.

According to the Militia Act from 1858, the Bohemian settlers, being regarded as ‘aliens’, were not liable to serve in the Auckland Militia; Martin Krippner, although naturalized, was also not called out to actual service since he belonged to the ‘Third Class’ or ‘Reserve’, which included all men between the ages 40 and 55. Thus, it seems surprising that on 3 September 1863 Krippner wrote to the Minister of War, T. Russel, requesting permission to form a German Rifle Corps under his command as Senior Officer. Krippner stated that he was approached by his fellow countrymen, who wished to volunteer under the regulations giving entitlement to Land Grants in the Waikato. His request was refused on the grounds that ‘the Government cannot allow the formation of any military body compound of men of a distinct nationality’; however, if Krippner raised 50 volunteers for the Waikato Militia he would receive a commission as captain.

---

Throughout the second half of September, Krippner advertised in newspapers, calling for volunteers to join his company of Militiamen. On 17 October 1863 Krippner was commissioned Captain of the Third Company of the Third Waikato Regiment. While the formation of a German Rifle Corp had been rejected, the New Zealand government thought it now a good idea to transfer all German speakers in the Militia to Krippner’s company, which subsequently was dubbed ‘The German Company’ or ‘German Legion’.

It remains a mystery why Krippner, at age 46, returned to military service after he had quit his military career in the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army and established a farm at Nukumea Stream. It also seems incomprehensible why he asked to command a Rifle Corp when, according to his Austrian military records, he knew the rifle and its parts only superficially and never served in battle. A plausible explanation for joining the Colonial Forces would be financial reasons, a parallel to his decision to join the Austrian Army as an unemployed law graduate. Perhaps, his farm was not profitable, and Krippner saw no other way of earning a living and sustaining his family. Like many others who enlisted in the Waikato Militia, Krippner might have counted on the Militia’s pay, rations, and land grants, thinking that any other piece of land in New Zealand would likely be better than what he was allotted at Orewa and Puhoi.

---
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121 ‘Militia Movements’, *Daily Southern Cross*, 22 October 1863, p. 3, as in *Papers Past*, National Library of New Zealand <https://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/>, [accessed 28 October 2016]; interestingly, the notice about the transfer of German militiamen to Krippner’s company followed right below an article announcing the arrival of kangaroos and wallabies which were to be released on Governor Grey’s property at Kawau Island; the governor’s zoological hobbies present a revealing illustration of his priorities during the time of war, see ‘Acclimatisation’, *Daily Southern Cross*, 22 October 1863, p. 3, as in *Papers Past*, National Library of New Zealand <https://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/>, [accessed 28 October 2016].
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123 See for example, William Rysdale, ‘Letters’, Hamilton, Hamilton City Libraries Archive, William Rysdale, ca. 1830 – 1894, MSC 190; many of the volunteers joining the Waikato Militia were older than the recruitment age permitted, as was the case with Krippner’s company, see Captain Krippner, ‘Letter requesting further instructions as to dismissal of men named in the margin, 19 October 1863’, Wellington, Archives NZ, DAG1863/2461.
Silk wrote in his *History of Puhoi* that Krippner recruited all single men and five of the married men of the Puhoi Bohemian settlers for the Militia in order that he be commissioned as Captain. This statement was repeated in all subsequent published historical accounts of Puhoi. However, according to the nominal
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rolls of the Waikato Regiments, only two of the 13 single Bohemian men enlisted in the Militia, and the single and married men enlisted after Krippner had been commissioned captain.\textsuperscript{127} Perhaps, in the Puhoi collective memory, the men who went to find work in the gum and gold fields were perceived as also having joined the Waikato Militia.\textsuperscript{128} Anyhow, the departure of these people must have been a heavy blow for the Puhoi community; subsequently, the Bohemian settlers of Puhoi blamed Krippner not only for choosing a bad location for their settlement, but also for depriving the community of their strongest men.

Interestingly, while the Bohemians were struggling in Puhoi, an article was published in an Austrian newspaper on 3 November 1863, informing that the emigrants from the Chotěšov County arrived safely in New Zealand where the government had erected six huts and quickly added eight more for the settlers of the ‘first German village’.\textsuperscript{129} While the ‘fields’ are being surveyed, the settlers ‘occupy themselves with cutting wood, earning three gulden per person per day.’\textsuperscript{130} The author of this untruthful article is not known; however, according to Puhoi collective memory, Krippner wrote letters home to Bohemia containing the same lies.\textsuperscript{131} Such letters would be in line with the advertising strategy to raise awareness of New Zealand as the perfect destination for German emigrants, as suggested in Haast’s \textit{Treatise}.\textsuperscript{132}

6.4.2 Guarding Māori Prisoners of War

Just as he had advanced in the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army without having to serve in combat, Krippner and the Third Company of the Third Waikato Regiment managed to stay away from the battle field throughout the duration of the war in the Waikato. The men in his company probably did not know that he had no military training. His brothers knew, and perhaps that was the reason why they did not join the Militia until Krippner secured for his company the non-combatant task of guarding Māori prisoners of war, most of them taken after the Battle of

\begin{footnotesize}
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Rangiriri in November 1863. The prison was on board the former coal-hulk *Marion*, moored in the middle of Waitematā Harbour at Auckland. Thus, after drilling at the garrison in Auckland for three months, Captain Krippner and his company served as prison guards from 7 January 1864 to 2 August 1864.\(^{133}\)

![Figure 19 The Prison Hulk Marion - Auckland Harbour Commercial Bay 1864, by Joseph O. Hamley\(^{134}\)](image)

Captain Joseph John Dunne, who served as an officer during the Waikato War, wrote about his impression of Captain Krippner in his recollections *Here and There: Memories* published in 1896.\(^{135}\) Dunne described Krippner as one of the most ‘characteristically odd’ officers he had met during the Waikato War. According to Dunne, Krippner was ‘unfit to command’ his company, and he consumed ‘incredible’ amounts of beer and tobacco while telling stories of the


\(^{134}\) Joseph Osbertus Hamley, ‘H.M.S. Esk; stuck with the Maoris taken prisoner at Rangiriri where Capt.... R.A. was killed. [1864?]’, in Hamley, Joseph Osbertus, 1820-1911: Sketches in New Zealand [ca 1860 to 1864], Wellington, ATL, E-047-q-031

battles he had fought in Europe.\textsuperscript{136} Apparently, ‘it was impossible to make him drunk’ and ‘oceans of beer had softened him’.\textsuperscript{137} In Dunne’s opinion, Krippner was incomparable with other German officers such as Von Tempsky, who was ‘of different mettle.’\textsuperscript{138}

On 10 June 1864, the satirist Charles Richard Thatcher put on a show in Auckland anticipating the Māori prisoners escaping from the hulk Marion.\textsuperscript{139} Apparently, a hit of the show was the song Krippner’s Lament which, as Dunne claimed, could be heard all over Auckland:

\begin{center}
Krippner’s Lament
\textit{by C. R. Thatcher}
\end{center}

Ah, me, you’ve gone away;  
Tell me you will not stay;  
Come back early, I bray,  
Tell me back soons you mill come.

I cannot drink anymore  
Pottles of peer, mor’n a score,  
Mine bipe it goes out, mine heart is so sore,  
Tell me back soons you mill come.\textsuperscript{140}

Thatcher’s show must have reflected the public mood, mocking Governor Grey’s sudden turn to sympathise with the Māori prisoners held on board the hulk without trial since November 1863.\textsuperscript{141} Grey, being concerned about his reputation

\textsuperscript{136} Dunne, p. 395.  
\textsuperscript{137} Dunne, pp. 396-97.  
\textsuperscript{138} Dunne, pp. 396-97; Von Tempsky was also described as ‘sang-froid’, cold-blooded, and the ‘beau-ideal of a Forest Ranger’, see John Featon, \textit{The Waikato War: 1863-64} (sl: sn, 1879), p. 72.  
\textsuperscript{140} Text of Krippner’s Lament quoted in Dunne, p. 397.  
\textsuperscript{141} For detailed information about the situation on board the prison hulk Marion see ‘Memoranda and Reports Relative to the Maori Prisoners’, \textit{AJHR}, Session I – 1964, E-01 pp. 1-102, as in
‘in the eyes of the world,’ pleaded with his Ministers to release the prisoners on parole.\textsuperscript{142} Grey argued that detaining the prisoners, among them high ranking rangatira, would only prolong the war. The Ministers, however, were of a different opinion: they thought that holding influential chiefs in captivity could prevent worse attacks from Māori on unarmed Europeans.

In addition to the dispute between the Governor and the Ministry as to whether the prisoners should be released on parole, newspaper articles drew the public’s attention to the apparently favourable conditions on board the \textit{Marion}. According to the press, the 197 prisoners were much healthier than before being captured, they were well-fed and happy, smoking pipes, fishing snapper and playing draughts.\textsuperscript{143} Captain Krippner, commander of the guards, was described by the journalist as ‘good-humoured’, being constantly asked by the prisoners for tobacco:

\begin{quote}
Of the gallant captain we might speak in the highest terms, but it is sufficient to say he is “the right man in the right place” for once. His reception by the men, on the occasion of our visit, is a sufficient evidence of this.\textsuperscript{144}
\end{quote}

The concluding remark of the press article, however, posits that the prisoners were treated better than the colony’s ‘deserving poor’. It is such ambiguous assessments of Krippner’s aptitudes and actions that must have prompted Thatcher to portray those officers who had treated Māori prisoners with respect and human decency as fools, unable to stop the prisoners from escaping.\textsuperscript{145} At the time Thatcher wrote his ditty he could not have known that, three months after the show, the prisoners would indeed escape.

While a fellow captain and a satirist described Captain Krippner as a misfit in the Colonial Force, a journalist, and probably also Krippner’s subordinates, seemed to appreciate his lenient style of command. The few surviving documents relating to

\textsuperscript{142} ‘Memoranda and Reports Relative to the Maori Prisoners’, p. 23.
\textsuperscript{144} ‘A Visit to the Hulk’, p. 2.
Krippner’s service in the Militia and his duty on board the hulk *Marion* provide insights as to how Krippner performed his role as captain. For example, one tactic Krippner may have learned from his superiors in the German Federal Army during the Crimean and Austro-Sardinian Wars was delaying combat readiness: in a letter from 26 October 1863 to Lieutenant Colonel Balnaevis, Krippner announced that he will start training his men as of tomorrow ‘if the weather permits it.’\(^{146}\) In a letter from 4 June 1864, Krippner apologised to Colonel Balneavis for not reporting the absence without leave of Ensign Wilson. At the same time, Krippner asked that Ensign Wilson, who was now placed under arrest, should be released since he was the only officer available to him.\(^{147}\) Another surviving document is Krippner’s request for fourteen days leave of absence from the hulk because of sickness; the medical officer on board, Dr Sam, recommended going ‘into the country for a change of air’.\(^{148}\) While recovering from sickness, Krippner probably looked after his farm at Orewa.

During February 1864, one of the guards, John McGregor, asked a prisoner on board the hulk *Marion* to write down Māori love songs so he might see and learn the words. As a result, several of the prisoners wrote over three hundred songs, including waiata aroha (love songs), ngeri (action songs), haka (posture dances), patere (abusive songs) and karakia (ritualistic chants), which McGregor published in Māori in 1893.\(^{149}\) That this kind of interaction was possible aboard a floating prison could well be a reflection of the generally friendly atmosphere fostered by the officers on duty. Not all men in Krippner’s company shared such a reluctant attitude towards fighting Māori ‘rebels’: for example, Corporal Karl Liebig, from Prussia, requested to be transferred from Krippner’s company to the company of Forest Rangers commanded by Captain Von Tempsky.\(^{150}\)

There is no evidence as to whether anyone in Krippner’s company or among the Bohemian settlers realised that Krippner joined the Freemasons at the Waitemata


Lodge in Auckland on 18 April 1864 during the time he was commander of the guards of the Marion. 151 Nothing definitive is known about Krippner’s motivations for becoming a Freemason at this time. In the Austrian Empire, Freemasonry was banned from 1790 to 1867, being regarded as a threat to the Habsburg Monarchy. 152 When Krippner enlisted in the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army in 1842, he had to swear not to associate with any secret society or brotherhood. 153 Apart from the thrill of entering a society that was forbidden in his home country, Krippner would very likely have been genuinely interested in becoming part of a universal brotherhood that claimed to share an enthusiasm for liberty of thought and strove to contribute to the welfare of mankind. A further motivation for joining the Freemasons would have been the prospect of networking opportunities. Freemasonry was an accepted social forum among mainly conformist (or former) Protestant New Zealanders, counting among its members influential businessmen and government officials, for example, Governor Sir George Grey and Sir Donald McLean. 154 However, as we shall see later, Krippner did not profit from these networks.

152 After the death of Emperor Joseph II in 1790 until 1867, Freemasons were subjected to persecution in the Habsburg Empire, see Freimaurerei, AEIOU - Austria Forum, updated 11 March 2016, <http://austria-forum.org/af/AEIOU/Freimaurerei> [accessed 27 October 2016].
153 Bergmayr, p. 65.
6.5 Te Hemara Tauhia: Escape of the Prisoners of War

6.5.1 The ‘Friendly Native’ as Escape Agent

While some of the Bohemian settlers served in the Militia, their compatriots remaining at Puhoi relied almost completely on the help of Tauhia and his people. The only way the Bohemians at Puhoi could earn income was by cutting firewood and roof shingles, which they floated or carried down to the Puhoi river mouth. From there, the cutter *Prince of Wales*, owned by Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo, and other ships of Mahurangi transported the products to the Auckland market.\(^\text{155}\)

With the start of the war in the Waikato, Māori access to Auckland was increasingly hindered. The Commissioner of Police at Auckland imposed a night-time curfew on Māori, canoes were confiscated, and all ‘friendly’ Māori had to wear a ‘distinguishing badge’ in the form of a red-coloured chevron cloth sewn to the right arm of the coat.\(^\text{156}\) On 3 December 1863, the New Zealand General Assembly passed the Suppression of Rebellion Act, which permitted trials before Court Martial.\(^\text{157}\) The New Zealand Settlements Act, 1863, legitimized confiscations of land whose Māori owners were ‘deemed to be in rebellion.’\(^\text{158}\)

Unlike his predecessor in 1860, following the outbreak of the First Taranaki War, Governor Grey did not consider a Crown-Māori conference necessary or appropriate. Counting on the support of British troops and local militia, the counsel and support of loyal Māori were no longer needed by the government.

It would not have taken long for the news about the prisoners of war detained on the hulk *Marion* to have reached Tauhia and the people living at Mahurangi. Paora Tuhaere, Tauhia’s friend and kin, lived at Orakei on the Waitematā Harbour, and he closely followed the events on board the *Marion*. When two of the prisoners were released on parole in order to travel to Waikato and inform

\(^{155}\) Hurrey, pp. 44-47.
\(^{157}\) ‘Memoranda and Reports Relative to the Maori Prisoners’, pp. 84-85.
their friends and relatives about the conditions on board the prison ship, Paora Tuhaere went with them.\textsuperscript{159} After their return to Auckland, the two prisoners were allowed to stay initially at Tuhaere’s residence, and then they were placed in one of the Native hostleries with an obligation to report regularly to the Colonial Secretary’s office.\textsuperscript{160} Through the intercession of Ngāti Whātua rangatira from Kaipara, and because of his delicate health, the prisoner, Te Oriori, leading rangatira of Ngāti Koroki of Maungatautari, was permitted to leave the hulk Marion on 2 June 1864 and stay at Hori Kukutai’s residence in Auckland.\textsuperscript{161} Thus, Tauhia is likely to have received regular information about the prisoners held on the Marion from Tuhaere and other Ngāti Whātua rangatira. It is also possible that Tauhia contacted Krippner, as commander of the prison guards, directly, reminding him that the welfare of Krippner’s compatriots living at Puhoi depended on Tauhia’s help.

On 12 July 1864 Governor Grey suggested that the prisoners and their families should be allowed to settle on Kawau Island, where they would be allocated land for their sustenance.\textsuperscript{162} The government was to cover the costs of establishing the prisoners there and provide for implements, seeds and so on. What seems at first to be a generous and humanitarian offer was, in fact, not selfless: Kawau Island was Grey’s private estate. By placing the prisoners and their families on Kawau Island, his land would be cleared and cultivated by unpaid Māori labour. Perhaps, Grey also regarded the establishment of a ‘model Māori village’ on his island as a way of satisfying his ethnographic interest in Māori culture.\textsuperscript{163} Nevertheless, his offer was accepted by the Ministry, and on 2 August 1864 the Marion was towed to Kawau Island, which lay about three kilometres off the Mahurangi coast.\textsuperscript{164} Krippner’s company did not land on Kawau Island; they were withdrawn from the Marion on 2 August 1864 and transferred to Pukerimu Redoubt, at the Horotiu branch of the Waikato River, to set up Camp Cambridge.\textsuperscript{165}
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One month after being placed on Kawau Island, during the night of 8 to 9 September, the prisoners fled. Tauhia, having been seen on Kawau Island on 9 September, was interrogated by Colonial Secretary William Fox about the circumstances relating to the escape. Tauhia claimed that he was called to Kawau Island after most of the prisoners had escaped. Ten prisoners who did not flee informed him that a small group of Ngāpuhi, who were connected to Waikato through marriage, helped the prisoners to quit the island on Friday night, 8 September. However, a descendent of one of the escaped prisoners who later settled at Te Hemara Tauhia’s kāinga at the Puhoi River, remembered his ancestors saying that Tauhia provided the boats for the escape from Kawau Island. Indeed, Titus Angus White, the interpreter and superintendent of the prisoners, noted in his daily reports on 29 August 1864:

Took 22 prisoners to Mahurangi to bring over two whale-boats given by Te Hemara for the use of the prisoners, and returned at 5 p.m. Prisoners cheerful and satisfied.

On 11 September 1864 the news that the prisoners and their families had fled from Kawau Island in boats provided by ‘the friendly natives of the main’ reached Auckland. This news caused the satirist Thatcher, who had put on a show about the escape of the Māori prisoners three months before (as mentioned above), to re-write *Krippner’s Lament*, featuring now Governor Grey instead of Krippner:

---
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Grey’s Lament

by C. R. Thatcher

Oh, ka kino! Hori Grey,
For you let us get away,
And you’ll never see your Maories any more;

Much obliged to you we are,
And you’ll find us in a pa,
Rifle-pitted on the Taranaki shore.\(^\text{170}\)

The escaped prisoners found refuge and built a pā on Mount Tamahunga (also known as Mount Hamilton) in the Pakiri Ranges opposite Omaha. They received supplies of flour and potatoes from Māori of the Mahurangi region, among them Tauhia and his people. Governor Grey sent the government interpreter T. A. White and Te Oriori to ask the escapees to return to Kawau Island.\(^\text{171}\) Of course, the fugitives would not return to their prison.

On 14 October 1864 Governor Grey sent Captain Cooper from Orewa to Mount Tamahunga to sound out the intentions of the escaped prisoners. While the government agreed that the prisoners were allowed to return to Waikato, Grey expressed a new idea of how to ‘dispose of’ the prisoners: he ‘authorised Captain Cooper to offer them a safe conduct to Rarotonga.’\(^\text{172}\) Cooper travelled to Omaha on board the ship *Victoria*, owned by Paora Tuhaere.\(^\text{173}\) Whether the idea of sending the prisoners to Rarotonga was part of Grey’s ambitious plans for British expansion into the Pacific Islands, or whether the suggestion came from Tuhaere,

\(^{171}\) ‘Memoranda and Reports Relative to the Maori Prisoners’, pp. 56-60.
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who traded regularly with Rarotonga, is not known.174 Interestingly, the minutes of a Native Land Court hearing held in 1869 reveal that Tauhia also contemplated moving to Rarotonga: Arama Karaka Haututu stated that a block of land was given to Te Hemara Tauhia by Te Uri o Hau in order ‘to induce him to stay in the country and not go to Rarotonga’.175 Anyhow, the scheme of relocating the prisoners to Rarotonga was not carried out. In his report about the meeting with the escaped prisoners, Captain Cooper wrote that the fugitives wished to stay in the north: ‘they say they will remain quietly if left alone, but this is I believe only to gain time to strengthen their position and to win over other tribes.’176 Cooper was convinced of a planned attack on Auckland supported by the northern tribes who had supplied the escaped prisoners with arms and provisions. He also warned that the chiefs employed by the government could not be trusted: ‘whatever they do, either for Your Excellency or the Government, is done for love of money, not for the love of those who employ them, or [for] the Europeans.’177

Captain Cooper’s renewed attempt to denounce the northern Māori as ‘rebels’ backfired in an unexpected way: on his mission to Mount Tamahunga, Cooper was accompanied by Hare Pomare, the younger of Pomare II’s two sons. Hare was employed as a clerk in the Native Office, and he acted as Cooper’s guide and interpreter.178 Pomare’s report of the meeting with the prisoners differed from that of Cooper: according to Pomare, most of the escaped prisoners wanted to return to the Waikato region, only a few wished to stay in the north. Pomare said
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that Cooper did not inform the prisoners about the offers made by the government that they could return to Waikato, or that they could migrate to Rarotonga. Pomare also mentioned that Cooper was very scared, and since Cooper could not speak Māori very well, he did not understand what the escaped prisoners were saying. Following Pomare’s report, the comment that Captain Cooper ‘was exceedingly frightened’ appeared in an article in the Daily Southern Cross, much to the annoyance of Cooper.

6.5.2 Mediator Between Escaped Prisoners and Government

In early November 1864, perhaps in response to Cooper’s warning that Māori employed by the government could not be trusted, Tauhia spoke with Colonial Secretary, Fox, confirming that he was not involved with the escaped prisoners. At the same time, Tauhia asked whether Fox would come to see the fugitives or send along a message for the escaped prisoners. On 18 November 1864 the Daily Southern Cross reported a meeting between Governor Grey, interpreter White, Te Hemara Tauhia and a delegation of the escaped prisoners held at Puhoi river mouth. Thus, Tauhia took on the role of mediator between the government and the fugitive prisoners of war. Until the end of 1864, most of the escaped prisoners stayed at Mahurangi; the people at Tauhia’s kāinga gave them the name ‘ngā rau e rua’, ‘the two hundred’. At the beginning of January 1865, Tauhia accompanied the former prisoners to Ongarahu pā in the Kaipara region, where they stayed under Apihai Te Kawau’s protection until their return to Waikato. Some of the escaped prisoners, however, settled at Opahi Bay, also called Waikato Bay, next to Tauhia’s kāinga at the Puhoi river mouth.

The affair of the Waikato prisoners of war, who were kept for eight months on the hulk Marion and who later escaped from Kawau Island, was described by the
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press as a ‘farce’ and a ‘comedy of errors’. However, as a result of the willingness on the part of both the government and the prisoners for negotiation rather than further military action, violence or a war north of Auckland was prevented. Tauhia and the people of Ngāti Whātua, who never forgot that they had found refuge among Waikato iwi after the Battle Te Ika-a-Ranganui in 1825, had an opportunity to return the favour by offering shelter to the prisoners and later facilitating mediation. At the same time, Tauhia and the other Ngāti Whātua rangatira kept their promise to protect the Pākehā who settled on their lands.

♦ ♦ ♦

6.6 Martin Krippner: Empty-Handed Return from the War

6.6.1 Building Camp Cambridge
By the time Krippner’s company was transferred to the Waikato, fighting in that region had come to an end; this was after over 1000 Māori and 700 Europeans died and 1.3 million hectares of Waikato land had been confiscated. The Māori King Tawhiao and his followers retreated south beyond the aukati (boundary) to the so-called King Country, and the Imperial and Colonial Forces moved on to South Taranaki to fight the followers of Pai Marire, known to the Europeans as Hauhau.186 The task of Krippner’s company was to set up Camp Cambridge, the site of the Third Regiment of the Waikato Militia, between Pukerimu Redoubt and the abandoned pā at Maungatātātari on the banks of the Waikato River. As soon as the land along the aukati between conquered territory and the King Country was surveyed, the soldiers of the Waikato Militia occupied the land as military settlers. Their wives and children, who had been staying in the Albert Barracks in Auckland during the previous year, followed three months later. In December 1864 Cambridge town sections were allotted to the militiamen.187 The one-acre town sections were generally of unfertile, sandy soil. The men of Krippner’s company received their sections on the left bank (modern day Leamington) of the Waikato River.188

From March 1865 the soldiers of the Waikato Militia were allotted their farm sections and struck off pay. While relieved of consecutive duty, they were still on active duty: this meant that they could be called out for consecutive duty at any time. Therefore, they were not allowed to leave the district without the written permission from their commanding officers.189 Every first Monday of the month, the militiamen had to attend a muster parade; they received payment for that day. In the case of unauthorized absence for more than one month in a year, or from
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two consecutive muster parades in a year, the respective militiamen forfeited their land grants. On 5 December 1865 the Waikato Militia was released from active duty, however, the regulations relating to leaving the district still applied.

Krippner’s company was allotted farm sections between the Rukuhia and Moanatuatua Swamps at modern day Ohaupo. Krippner, as commanding officer and thereby allowed to choose his sections, picked 300 acres surrounding Lake Roto Manuka – perhaps, because the scenery reminded him of his Bohemian hometown with the fishponds and gardens leading to the monastery on the hill in Chotěšov. Private Michael Krippner received a 50-acre section bordering Martin Krippner’s section to the west, and Sergeant Johann Krippner was allotted 80 acres, just one section over from Michael Krippner’s allotted land.

During the time of Krippner’s service in the Waikato Militia, his wife and children stayed in Auckland, and from time to time, they came to visit him in Cambridge where he worked on his one-acre town section. The Krippners still had their property at Orewa, which they unsuccessfully tried to sell in January 1865. In order to maintain the Orewa property, Krippner needed to apply for permission to leave his station at Cambridge, even though he was discharged from active service. Krippner’s letter to Governor Grey of 3 March 1866, requesting three months leave of absence, showed his difficult financial situation:

Without pay, with no private means, and suffering under heavy and unexpected losses, I find myself unable to support my family consisting of a wife and 5 children in the town, or at present on my station on the Waikato.

I have a small farm with a good house near the Hot Springs – Orewa River – which during my absence in the Waikato Militia has been very

---
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neglected, and if I do not begin the repairs immediately the whole farm will go to ruin.

Having no means I cannot hire labourers and must do the necessary work myself with the help of my three boys of whom the eldest is only 13 years of age, that I may be able either to sell this farm or place my family on it for a time.

Under these circumstances I trust Your Excellency will allow me leave of absence for the time specified, the refusal of the same would involve myself and family in difficulties out of which I could see no way of escape.195

The letter was forwarded to Lieutenant Colonel Moule; the latter refused to grant Krippner leave because ‘Captain Krippner was absent without leave from the last muster parade and with leave from the previous one.’196 Moule also mentioned that too many requests of similar nature had been made by other officers, all of which he had refused. Krippner applied again for leave in August 1866, this time enclosing a medical certificate stating that he was unable to leave his home at Orewa because of an injury of the leg.197

Being struck off pay and not allowed to leave the district without written permission by their superiors, the militiamen had hardly any opportunity to earn money. Also, after provisioning was stopped, they struggled to sustain themselves, let alone their families. The desperate need for cash is demonstrated in Major Keddell’s letter of 23 November 1865, in which he acknowledges Krippner’s request that instead of the government providing ten pounds worth of timber for erecting houses, it issue five pounds per settler household in cash.198

In February 1866 the men of the Waikato Militia sent a petition to the government, asking for outstanding pay and allowances due to them until the date when the Militia was released from active service.199 The petition was rejected by

---
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a Government Select Committee under Haultain on 25 July 1866. In consequence, many militiamen left the Waikato district, looking for paid work, and thus they forfeited their land grants. Five of the Bohemian militiamen, including Johann and Michael Krippner, stayed and worked tirelessly to bring their lands to fruition. Their descendants still live in the Ohaupo and Te Rore region to this day. Martin Krippner did not settle in the Waikato: he was forced to sell his Land Grants at Ohaupo to cover private debts and debts to the government.

6.6.2 Forced Sale of Land Grant at Ohaupo

The circumstances of Krippner’s sale of his Ohaupo land illustrate the paradoxical situation in which many military settlers found themselves. According to the conditions and regulations relating to service in the Waikato Militia, Crown Grants were to be issued three years after enlistment. In November 1867, four years after joining the Waikato Militia, Martin Krippner applied to have the Crown Grant issued for his 300-acre section at Ohaupo. His application was rejected because of a debt to the government of £114.19.3 and a private debt of £30 plus interest. Replying to the rejection, Krippner wrote to Colonel Lyon:

By your order I cannot receive my Land Grant until my private debt is paid, which I am unable to do in my present very depressed circumstances. I can scarcely support my family with the bare necessaries of life, my children are barefoot, I do not know at the present moment where or how to get a bag of flour. If I could get my Grant I would raise a Mortgage on the land, by which means I should be enabled to pay my debt to Bahrenburg and part of my debt to the Government.

---
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During the last war I lost every thing and from a prospering settler I became a [illegible] my farm was neglected, my cattle and horses sold at an immense loss, and the final blow was given by my being unable without my fault of mine to fulfil a most advantgeous [sic] contract delivering Totara piles after having incurred great expenses on it.

I am, as above stated unable to support my family though I work from sun rise till night and often through the night, and should therefore be most thankful if your Honor could give an old officer some situation or appointment, whereby he could keep his family from starvation and maintain them respectfully.205

Krippner was not able to pay his debts unless he could mortgage his 300 acres at Ohaupo. However, he could not mortgage his land because he did not hold the Crown Grant to the land. As a result, Krippner was forced to sell his interest in this land to Samuel Thomas Seddon, an affluent settler from Auckland, who offered to pay Krippner’s debts.206 Whether Seddon paid anything in addition to the amount of the debts is not known.207

The loss of the land at Ohaupo must have been frustrating; however, Krippner still owned his farm at Orewa and land at Puhoi, which he acquired in March 1864 with his Land Orders issued under the Auckland Waste Lands Act 1858.208 Much more damaging for Krippner were the circumstances of how he accrued his private debts; the cause of his debts to the government is not known. In January 1865, Private Hinrich Bahrenburg of Krippner’s company gave Krippner £30 to be deposited in the Military Savings Bank in Auckland. After Bahrenburg was...
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struck off pay in March 1865, he needed the money back in order to develop his farm section. Krippner put off returning the money, and finally Bahrenburg found out that Krippner never deposited the money in the bank as requested. Krippner acknowledged receipt of the £30; however, he was unable to pay it back. The case was put before the Defence Minister. As a result, Krippner sold his land at Ohaupo. Bahrenburg, on the other hand, never received his money; he had left New Zealand by March 1868. The Bahrenburg incident may have provoked allegations – still maintained today by descendants of the Bohemian settlers – that Martin Krippner asked his fellow Bohemians upon arrival in New Zealand to bank their money in his name without ever paying the money back. Whether those allegations are correct or incorrect has not been ascertained. Krippner’s credibility, however, had suffered greatly among his fellow Bohemian settlers.

211 Silk, p. 39; in conversations with descendants of the Krippner family and other Bohemian immigrants it became apparent that these allegations are still maintained today.
6.7  Te Hemara Tauhia: Effects of the Native Land Court

6.7.1  Dinner at Tauhia’s Whare and First Native Land Court Hearings

In July 1865, half a year after the peaceful resolution of the prisoners-of-war-crisis, Kaipara and Puhoi rangatira met with a delegation of the government at Waiwera Hot Springs Hotel to finalise the sale of the Waitangi block in the Kaipara district and of a stretch of land intended for a road from Waiwerawera River to the Bohemian settlement at the upper Puhoi River.212 After the meeting, Commissioner Rogan, Kaipara Resident Magistrate Von Stürmer, Lieutenant Edwards and a reporter from the New Zealand Herald were invited to dine at Te Hemara Tauhia’s whare. The reporter described the dinner in detail, referring also to the dress style of Tauhia’s wife, Miriama Houkura:

A table was set in the centre with snow white table cloth, knives, forks, glasses, cruet stands, and the various paraphernalia of a first-rate dinner table; these were brought in from an adjoining whare where the cooking was going on by Mrs Te Hemara, arrayed in silken dress and head dress of remarkable hue, and two assistants, one a very tall lady with scarlet jumper on, and the other with fancy print dress and white jacket.213

According to the journalist, the food served, consisting of roasted duck, pork, potatoes and kumara, no master chef could have prepared better. Tauhia, however, did not eat with them:

Te Hemara, true to native customs and the courtesies of his race, refused to sit at the same table or eat until his guests had completed their repast, and when all had finished dined by himself on what bones and scraps remained.214

This report provides a brief glimpse into Tauhia’s way of integrating both Māori tikanga and European cultural elements into his daily life: while professing to be a

---
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Christian and enjoying European objects such as tablecloth, glasses, and cutlery in his household, he lived by Māori values. Humility and generosity were regarded as important virtues of a rangatira. When hosting honoured guests, the rangatira was expected to wait on them in order to acknowledge their mana and elevate their status above one’s self. Besides, sitting with guests who were of higher rank than the host, could be seen by wider kin as self-serving and insulting to the guests.215

On 25 January 1866, Rogan and the rangatira resident at the Waiwerawera/Puhoi Reserve gathered again at the Waiwera Hot Springs Hotel, this time for a first session of Native Land Court hearings in the Mahurangi District.216 Rogan had been appointed Land Court Judge for the Kaipara District under the Native Lands Act 1865.217 This Act made provision for waiving the Crown right of pre-emption and for the individualisation of Native Land titles, which allowed the owners to dispose of their interest in the land to any person. The Act stipulated that only land passed through the Native Land Court could be sold. The Native Land Act 1865 replaced the Native Land Act 1862, which had envisaged ‘a council of local Maori leaders working with Pakeha judge in adjudicating on land ownership.’218 Under the new law, the Chief Judge of the Native Land Court, Francis Dart Fenton, ‘imposed a formal English-style court procedure, with decision-making essentially resting with the Pakeha judge, rather than the runanga-like system of adjudication.’219 Nevertheless, the presence of two, and from 1867 only one, Native Assessors was required during the hearing.220

During the four-day hearing, the Waiwerawera/Puhoi Reserve was subdivided into twelve blocks of land and allocated to individuals or small groups of owners. According to section 23 of the Native Lands Act 1865, up to ten owners could be inserted into the certificate of title to a block of land.221 While Tauhia and the
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other claimants named 32 people asserting ownership of the relevant lands, only one or up to three names were inserted in the certificates: three certificates of title were issued in Te Hemara Tauhia’s name only; three in the name of Henare Winiata, Tauhia’s brother; one in the names of Tauhia’s father-in-law, Makoare Ponui, together with his daughters Miriama Houkura and Mere; three certificates in the names of Wiremu and Hare Pomare; one in the name of Te Hemara Tauhia and his cousin Henare Te Rawhiti, the grandson of Murupaenga; and one certificate of title was issued in the name of Te Tuna and two others from Waikato who settled at Opahi Bay in the 1850s.222

According to the minutes of the hearings, in most cases all claimants agreed to insert only one to three names of rangatira in the certificates of title, assuming that the named rangatira acted as trustees for their hapū. However, in regards to the blocks called ‘Puhoi’ and ‘Orokaraka’, one of the rangatira, Taikiamana, objected to issuing a certificate of title at all, let alone in Te Hemara Tauhia’s name only.223 The hearing was adjourned, and after Tauhia threatened ‘to dispose of the land to the Government hereafter if he is not allowed to deal with this land in his own way’, Taikiamana withdrew his opposition, and Tauhia’s name only was inserted in the certificates.224 The dispute between Tauhia and Taikiamana reflects how the workings of the Native Lands Act 1865 started to create rifts between the members of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo hapū. As Chief Judge Fenton stated, the intentional long-term effect of the Native Land Court would be ‘the conversion of the Maori nation into two classes, - one composed of well-to-do farmers, and the other of intemperate landlords.’225 According to the authors of a report for the Rangahaua Whanui Series of the Waitangi Tribunal, the Native Lands Act 1865 ‘secured to the chiefs a new-found status ... as, more often than not, sole owners of tribal land [could do so] with the legal power to alienate that land without reference to the rest of the tribe.’226 Although individual rangatira

---
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received the certificates of title on behalf of the group, such trust arrangements were not enforced by the Land Court and thus were open to abuse.227

For example, whether the proceeds of selling 26 acres at the Puhoi River for £48 to shipwright George Ryan on 11 December 1866, signed by Tauhia and his cousin Henare Te Rawhiti, were shared among all members of the hapū is not known.228 According to a comment made by Judge Rogan in 1867, Tauhia was also required to repay debts incurred by other members of the hapū.229 Perhaps, there were no profits left to share after paying off debts owing to Ryan. By 1866, Ryan played a substantial role within the local economy, working as shipwright at Puhoi River at least since 1863; for example, he built the cutter Prince of Wales, replacing the hapū’s cutter Duke of Wellington, which was lost off Mahurangi in 1863.230 The Prince of Wales was initially registered in the names of Hori Kingi, Taikiamana and Wiremu Pomare, but since 1867 in Te Hemara Tauhia’s name only. He sold it to an Auckland merchant in 1868.231

In his report about the effect of the Native Lands Act from 1865, Judge Rogan stated that Arama Karaka Haututu and other Kaipara chiefs had been creating annual incomes from the leasing of lands. He also mentioned Te Hemara Tauhia’s progress:

Te Hemara of Mahurangi has improved his property recently by fencing, and building a neat house with verandah [sic] and brick chimney, which may be said to have resulted from the sale of some of his land after certificates were obtained.232

In 1871 the government asked Wiremu Pomare, who was then studying to become a minister in the Anglican Church, to evaluate the workings of the Native Land Court. Pomare criticised the ten-owner rule, and he referred to Te Hemara Tauhia

227 Daamen, Hamer, and Rigby, pp. 244, 50.
228 Auckland, Auckland War Memorial Museum, Dufaur, Lusk, Biss & Fawcett (Firm) Dufour Folder 31: Conveyances, MS 93/67.
229 Rigby, p. 133.
230 Locker, pp. 373-78.
231 Hurrey, p. 45.
232 Report by Mr. Rogan as to the Working of "The Native Lands Act, 1865," in the District of Kaipara, p. 3.
as an example for rangatira selling land without consulting and sharing the
proceeds with others:

There is a block of 2,537 acres of land at Puhoi Mahurangi, near the Hot
Springs, belonging to Te Hemara and thirty-one others; it was heard in
Court in January, 1866, and Te Hemara got the Crown grant in his own
name; he has sold some portions of the land and mortgaged other parts, but
the other owners have never received any portion of the money and have
received no redress.233

Pomare did not mention in his evaluation that he also received three certificates of
title over approximately 1,220 acres of land at Puhoi in his and his brother’s name
only. By June 1871 he too lived in a five-roomed cottage next to a
wheatherboarded church at Te Muri.234 According to the local historian Locker,
the Pomare brothers had sold their interests in two of the three blocks at Puhoi to
Pākehā settlers by 1873.235 Whether they shared the proceeds from the sale with
other members of the hapū is not known. The Pomare brothers were also
registered as owners of the schooner William & Julia, which was sold to owners
in Noumea in 1878.236 However, while Te Hemara Tauhia was not the only one
selling or mortgaging land belonging to Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo, Pomare’s
remarks about Tauhia profiting from the new land tenure system were quoted in
subsequent texts, and thus became ingrained in collective memory.237

A mystery remains as to Tauhia’s sale of 70 acres north of Waiwerawera river
mouth – including Mihirau, the ancestral burial place on Mount Maungatauhoro –
to Robert Graham in May 1868 for £50.238 According to the minutes of the
Native Land Court hearing in January 1866, the sale had already been arranged by
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Tauhia prior to the subdivision of the Waiwerawera/Puhoi Reserve. The members of the hapū agreed to it, however, some with reluctance as can be seen, for example, in the statement made by Makoare, Tauhia’s father-in-law:

This land had been disposed of and no matter what number of persons stood up to speak against it that the talk would all be in favour of Te Hemara’s statement.239

The motivations to alienate the land on which Murupaenga and other ancestors were buried are difficult to perceive, especially after Tauhia had fought for its inclusion in the Waiwerawera/Puhoi Reserve in 1853. However, a deed of mortgage signed by Te Hemara Tauhia in 1875 reveals that Maungatauhoro and the surrounding land was still owned by him at that time.240 Perhaps, the arranged ‘sale’ of Maungatauhoro to Graham was part of a strategy to keep the sacred place under Tauhia’s direct guardianship. According to historian Graeme Murdoch, between 1876 and 1877 Maungatauhoro was sold by Tauhia to Graham, who made sure that the sacred place Mihirau would be protected and never developed; today, Mount Maungatauhoro forms part of the Wenderholm Regional Park.241

6.7.2 Land Court Dispute about Tiritiri Matangi Island

In December 1866 Te Hemara Tauhia and others of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo addressed the Native Land Court to clarify who held the ownership of Tiritiri Matangi Island to the east of Whangaparaoa.242 This island used to belong to Tauhia’s ancestors, but since 1861, the government had leased it out as a sheep run, and in 1864 the Marine Board constructed a lighthouse.243 The government claimed that the island was sold by Ngāti Pāoa in 1841 as part of the Mahurangi Purchase. Tauhia, as he did over twenty years earlier, stated that Ngāti Pāoa had no right to sell the Mahurangi block and the offshore islands: although Ngāti Pāoa and other tribes used to stop-over on Tiritiri Matangi Island on fishing and war
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expeditions, they were not the rightful owners. Tauhia compared the ownership structure to that of Auckland: ‘It is normal for the war parties of every tribe to land at Tiritirimatangi in the same manner that every tribe comes to Auckland.’

After a postponed and protracted trial, Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo lost their claim in June 1867. The island was declared property of the government even though the original deed of the Mahurangi Purchase was never found, and it has never been proved subsequently that the island was actually included in the purchase deal. Apparently, the construction of the lighthouse demonstrated that the government was in possession of the island, whereas the seasonal fishing trips of Tauhia and his hapū were not regarded as proof of ownership. The historian Vincent O’Malley described this ‘curious case of Tiritiri Matangi Island’ as an example for the government’s ‘land grab thinly veiled by convenient legal doctrines and racialised ideologies of what constituted legitimate ownership.’ The loss of Tiritiri Matangi Island might have made Tauhia aware that tikanga and Māori customary ownership would play a minor role in the Native Land Court’s task of determining ownership.

♦ ♦ ♦
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6.8 Summary

The government’s declaration of war in Taranaki in 1860 and its failure to develop the local infrastructure in the Waiwerawera/Puhoi region likely signalled to Tauhia and Krippner that their respective visions of a peaceful coexistence of Māori and Pākehā and of a care-free life as land-owners in New Zealand would prove illusory. However, still believing that the present situation was safer and more prosperous than the times and places they had left behind, both Tauhia and Krippner agreed to cooperate with the New Zealand government in order to pursue their dreams. At the Kohimarama Conference in 1860, after Governor Browne openly threatened to extinguish Māori ‘as a race’ should they resist British sovereignty in New Zealand, Tauhia confirmed his allegiance to the Crown. In the following years, Tauhia assumed the roles of intermediary and Native Assessor in order to resolve conflicts both among Māori and between Māori and the Crown.

Krippner, who was denied the chance to redeem his land grants at locations of his choice under the Auckland Waste Lands Act 1858, tried with his family and the first group of Bohemian immigrants to develop their farm on unfertile land between the Waiwerawera and Orewa Rivers. He also arranged with the Auckland Provincial Government the settlement of a second group of Bohemian immigrants on land at the upper Puhoi River. Whether the location of this settlement on heavily forested and nearly inaccessible terrain was Krippner’s choice or whether it was based on a strategic decision by the provincial government or strongly influenced by the private economic interests of the Auckland Superintendent who owned the nearby Waiwerawera Hot Springs, is not known. However, it was Krippner who got blamed by his compatriots for choosing the wrong location. During their first years at Puhoi, the Bohemian immigrants depended on donations of food and other help from Tauhia and his people. It was local Māori generosity and a sense of responsibility for their new neighbours that enabled the Bohemian settlers at Puhoi to survive; that Pākehā settlement would advance the infrastructural development of the region was an outright false claim echoed by colonisation agents.

Within two weeks of the arrival of the second group of Bohemian immigrants in New Zealand, the government declared war on Waikato and the Kīngitanga movement. Krippner, who was commissioned captain once again, and nine of the
Bohemian men joined the Waikato Militia. Here they saw an opportunity to support themselves and their families by receipt of the regular pay, provisions and grants of Waikato land offered by the government to volunteer militiamen. Perhaps, right from the start, the Auckland Provincial Government intended to place the Bohemian settlers on land where they would not last long. Sooner or later, the Bohemians would sign contracts binding them to serve for three years in the Militia and settle along the aukati as a buffer between Europeans and ‘hostile’ Māori. Thus, the government obtained German military settlers without ‘bonded migration’, which was originally planned by the New Zealand government but was criticised by a representative of a German shipping line, with a clear financial interest in the scheme, as selling emigrants into slavery.

In an interesting parallel to his service in the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army, Captain Krippner managed to stay away from armed combat during the Waikato War. Both Krippner and Tauhia, whether in consultation with each other or each on his own, contributed to peacefully resolving the crisis of the Māori prisoners of war: Krippner as commander of the prison guards on board the hulk Marion, and Tauhia helping the prisoners to escape from Kawau Island and later acting as intermediary between the fugitives and the government. Tauhia’s and Krippner’s diplomatic and at times crafty skills were gratefully acknowledged by some, and labelled as resistance to the Crown and sabotage of the war by others. However, both men’s efforts to keep violent conflicts away from their people were soon forgotten because of Krippner’s allegedly dubious money affairs and Tauhia’s sales of hapū land.

Krippner, like many other militiamen, returned from the war empty-handed, having been forced to sell his Waikato land grants in order to repay debts. Tauhia and Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo cooperated with the Native Land Court, which led to the fragmentation of the Waiwerawera/Puhoi Reserve after the issue of individual land titles. As a consequence, Tauhia, his brother and the Pomare brothers mortgaged and sold hapū land without necessarily consulting the whole group. Towards the end of the 1860s, both Tauhia and Krippner had every reason to be disillusioned with the political and economic situation in New Zealand, and they may have believed they had been exploited for the sake of the government’s land grabbing agenda. Surprisingly, in 1867 both Tauhia and Krippner received an invitation from Governor Grey to the Queen’s Birthday Ball held at the
Government House in Auckland. This invitation might have given both men the impression that they belonged to the social elite of the Province of Auckland. Despite Krippner’s inglorious career in the Waikato Militia and Tauhia’s defeat in the Native Land Court dispute over Tiritiri Matangi Island, both were still confident that they would be able to influence and direct matters to the advantage of their people in the Puhoi region and beyond. How they continued to pursue their visions and how they dealt with on-going setbacks and loss will be discussed in the following chapter.


7 New Responsibilities

Throughout the 1860s, Te Hemara Tauhia and Martin Krippner experienced first-hand how the New Zealand government broke promises of shared sovereignty with Māori and of infrastructural development of Māori and immigrant settlements – assurances that were provided in the Treaty of Waitangi, during the Kohimarama Conference, by emigration agents and in contracts with volunteers of the Waikato Militia. With the beginning of the 1870s, the New Zealand government borrowed around twenty million pounds, which it invested in the construction of roads, railways, bridges and telegraph lines; government plans also included the introduction of thousands of assisted immigrants and the purchase of more Māori land.¹ These changes in government policy opened up opportunities for Krippner and the Puhoi-Bohemians, while Tauhia and his people had to come to terms with new phenomena, such as the Puhoi District Highway Board, succession hearings at the Native Land Court, and the pitfalls of mortgages.

Over the next two decades, Tauhia became increasingly active on a trans-regional level. He saw the need for pan-tribal political organisation of Māori in order to win back power within the political system set up by Pākehā in New Zealand. Tauhia’s presence and speeches at hui of the Kotahitanga Māori Parliament were recorded by government translators and reporters. From Native Land Court minute books, we learn about deaths of Tauhia’s relatives and subsequent land transactions. Tauhia’s support of the process of reconciliation between the government and the Māori King is documented in contemporary newspaper articles.

Not long after his return from the war in the Waikato, Martin Krippner was accepted back into the affairs of the Puhoi-Bohemian community, probably thanks to his wife’s initiative of setting up a school in Puhoi and incoming news of recent wars in Europe and Bohemia. Published accounts of Puhoi’s history, Krippner’s letters to New Zealand government officials and their responses, records of the Puhoi District Highway Board, Rudolph Krippner’s memoirs, and contemporary articles

¹ King, pp. 228-29.
newspaper articles offer valuable information about how Krippner gave up his farming venture and settled down as a teacher among his former Bohemian neighbours, who he had left more than 40 years before.

7.1 Te Hemara Tauhia: Participation in Trans-regional Political Life

7.1.1 Māori Political Activist and Loyal to Queen and Gospel

On 4 March 1868 Tauhia took part at a hui at Otamatea, Arama Karaka Haututu’s kāinga, discussing the issue of Māori representation at the New Zealand General Assembly. The original purpose of this hui was to nominate and elect a representative for the Northern Māori Electoral District under the Māori Representation Act 1867, which provided for four Māori representatives to be elected by Māori and ‘half-caste’ men over 21 years of age. However, the men present at the meeting at Otamatea refused to vote. Instead, they decided to write to Governor Grey, demanding an equal number of Māori and Pākehā representatives at the General Assembly. They also asked that the seat of government should return to Auckland; in July 1865 the General Assembly had moved to Wellington – ‘that place of earthquakes,’ as Paora Tuhaere referred to the new Capital. The petition being without success, Frederick Nene Russell, son of a Pākehā timber trader and a Māori woman from Hokianga, was elected unanimously as representative for the Northern Māori Electoral District, one month after the Otamatea hui. However, the demand for a common law and
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4 ‘Maori Representation: The Meeting at Kaipara’, p. 3.
equal representation of Māori and Europeans in Parliament continued to be a main
top of Paora Tuhaere’s and Te Hemara Tauhia’s future political involvement; it
started with hosting a meeting of the Māori and European Reform Association in
April 1868, and led to the establishment of the Orakei Parliament in 1879.6

Tauhia became more and more interested in nationwide Māori political affairs; at
the same time, he expressed his loyalty to the Queen and embraced the Christian
religion. By 1871, a weather-boarded church was built at Te Muri, and five acres
were set aside for an urupā (cemetery) next to the chapel.7 The urupā at Te Muri
became the final resting place for Māori and Pākehā living in the
Waiberawera/Puhoi Reserve; about one hundred people are buried at Te Muri.8
Whether Bohemians were buried here as well, before a cemetery at their
settlement up the Puhoi River was consecrated, is not clear.

On 30 January 1872 Tauhia and his wife Miriama hosted a hākari in order to
commemorate the ordination of Wiremu Pomare as a priest of the Anglican
Church. Māori and Pākehā were invited and gathered for a delicious dinner that,
according to the Daily Southern Cross correspondent, ‘would have put to the
blush the best restaurant in Auckland.’9 The dinner was followed by speeches and
dancing till late at night. Although the journalist reporting the event was not
conversant in Māori, he provided a summary of the speeches as he understood
them; to what extent the report reflected the actual words said is difficult to
ascertain. Te Hemara Tauhia and other speakers expressed their joy to see Māori
and Pākehā ‘united in friendship’.10 Tauhia apparently pointed to the ‘blessings
they enjoyed through their knowledge of the white man’, and he urged those who
had followed the creed of ‘Hauhauism’ to return to Christianity.11 Further, Tauhia
announced that from now on consumption of waipirau (alcohol), which he
regarded as the cause of land sales and wars in New Zealand, was prohibited at his

6 ‘The European and Maori Reform Association’, Daily Southern Cross, 20 April 1868, p. 4, as in
October 2016].
7 Ashwell, Benjamin Yates, Reverend, ‘Letter to Sir George Grey, 30 June 1871’, Auckland,
Auckland City Libraries - Sir George Grey Special Collections, GLNZ A13.10, p. 3.
8 Ngati Rongo o Mahurangi Hikoi, Ngati Manu, <http://www.naumaiplace.com/site/ngati-
manu/home/welcome/> , [accessed 26 July 2016].
9 ‘Great Native Festival at Puhoi’, Daily Southern Cross, 12 February 1872, p. 3, as in Papers Past,
10 ‘Great Native Festival at Puhoi’.
11 ‘Great Native Festival at Puhoi’.
pā; those who could not abstain from waipirau should go to the public houses.\textsuperscript{12} Wiremu Pomare spoke after Tauhia; the journalist praised Pomare as a ‘good and honest pastor’ and a role model for ‘his Pakeha brethren.’\textsuperscript{13}

Tauhia was also committed to keeping cordial relationships with Pākehā officials in Auckland. On New Year’s Eve 1872, Tauhia attended a reception to which the government had invited ‘distinguished native chiefs’.\textsuperscript{14} Among the guests were Paora Tuhaere, who after Apihai Te Kawau’s death in 1869 became leading rangatira of Ngāti Whātua; Wiremu Te Wheoro, the intermediary between King Tawhiao and the government; and also a high-ranking woman with her husband from Rarotonga.\textsuperscript{15} The report in the \textit{Auckland Star} rendered highlights of the after-dinner speeches held by the invited guests. When toasts were proposed to the members of the New Zealand Parliament, Tauhia pointed to the important work of the Māori members in Parliament who helped with their knowledge to dispel ‘many of the clouds which had hung round about their horizon.’\textsuperscript{16} Tauhia also showed his charming side by proposing a toast to Māori and Pākehā women with special reference to the guest from Rarotonga and to Mrs Brown, probably the host of the reception.\textsuperscript{17}

Tauhia was among the invited rangatira attending an assembly in October 1873 at the Government House to welcome Governor Sir James Fergusson.\textsuperscript{18} In a formal address, Tauhia, Paora Tuhaere and two other rangatira expressed the wish to live in peace together with their ‘white brethren and with one another.’\textsuperscript{19} Over the following years, Tauhia’s name was always among those considered ‘influential chiefs’ being presented to new governors at a reception.\textsuperscript{20} However, in 1881

\textsuperscript{12} 'Great Native Festival at Puhoi'.  
\textsuperscript{13} 'Great Native Festival at Puhoi'.  
\textsuperscript{14} 'Interesting Native Re-Union', \textit{Auckland Star}, 2 January 1873, p. 2, as in Papers Past, National Library of New Zealand <https://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>, [accessed 28 October 2016].  
\textsuperscript{16} 'Interesting Native Re-Union'.  
\textsuperscript{17} 'Interesting Native Re-Union'.  
\textsuperscript{19} 'Native Address to the Governor', \textit{Auckland Star}, 24 October 1873, p. 2, as in Papers Past, National Library of New Zealand <https://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz>, [accessed 28 October 2016].  
Tauhia, Tuhaere and others were prevented from attending the full dress reception at the Government House because they did not wear dress coats.\textsuperscript{21} That was the last time, that Tauhia was invited to a formal reception by the Governor.

7.1.2 Deaths of Family Members and Succession Hearings at Native Land Court

In August 1870 Tauhia’s brother, Henare Winiata Te Kahu, died. He had no wife or children. Three years after his death, the succession of title to the three blocks of the Waiwerawera/Puhoi Reserve vested in Te Kahu’s name was decided at the Native Land Court.\textsuperscript{22} Tauhia and his sister, Makareta Kotare, each inherited one block, and the third block, called Te Akeake at the Puhoi river mouth, was sold to the shipwright George Ryan with whom Te Kahu had made an agreement shortly before his death. The Ryan family now owned land on both the north and south banks of the Puhoi river mouth, including the sand spit; subsequently, George Ryan built a jetty and operated a ferry across the river.\textsuperscript{23}

In 1876, Tauhia’s father-in-law, Makoare Ponui died and was buried at Te Muri urupā.\textsuperscript{24} In 1877, Tauhia’s sister died; she and her husband, Arama Karaka Haututu, also had no surviving children.\textsuperscript{25} At a succession hearing in March 1877, both Tauhia and Haututu claimed to inherit Kotare’s interest in a block of land called Waihakari. Members of Te Uri o Hau gave this land to Tauhia in the 1860s as an incentive not to go to Rarotonga; back then, Tauhia asked that the land be vested in the names of his sister, his brother and himself.\textsuperscript{26} During the succession hearing in 1877, Haututu’s claim was dismissed in favour of Tauhia. Three months later, the two brothers-in-law came to an agreement that Haututu should

\textsuperscript{23} Wenderholm Regional Park: Our History.
\textsuperscript{24} Locker, p. 83.
\textsuperscript{26} Waihakari Succession Hearing: 8 and 13 March 1877, pp. 238-39; the gifting of land to Tauhia so that he would stay in Aotearoa New Zealand is mentioned in Waihakari Hearing: 20 May 1869; see also chapter 5.5 of this thesis.
inherit Tauhia’s late brother’s share in this land, while Tauhia held on to his sister’s interest.27

Also in 1877, Hori Kingi Maukino, Tauhia’s cousin of more senior line of descent, died.28 Maukino and his whānau had moved from the Waiwerawera/Puhoi Reserve to Makarau, Te Kawerau/ Ngāti Rongo’s ancestral land at the south-eastern banks of the Kaipara Harbour, in 1861.29 At the Native Land Court succession hearing regarding the Makarau block, Tauhia waived his claim, and the certificate of title was issued in the names of Maukino’s two daughters, Hiria and Ani Whatawhata.30

On another occasion, Tauhia and other members of Te Kawerau/ Ngāti Rongo waived their claims to land in order to resolve disputes that arose out of Native Land Court title investigations. During a four-day hearing in March 1875, two parties claimed ownership based on ancestry to the Tuhirangi block at Kaipara: one party was represented by the Te Taoū rangatira, Te Otene Kikokiko and Te Kerei; the other party by Te Hemara Tauhia and further eleven members of Te Kawerau/ Ngāti Rongo. At the end of the hearing, the block was vested in the name of Tauhia and his party.31 Two years later, Te Kawerau/ Ngāti Rongo ‘tuku’d the land’ to Te Taoū ‘through aroha’: the land was gifted to Te Taoū to consolidate friendly relations between the two hapū.32 A newspaper notice said that Paora Tuhaere, of Te Taoū, was appointed trustee of the Tuhirangi block.33 The block of land was then leased for 21 years; however, in 1885, the block was subdivided, and one of the two parts sold to the Auckland solicitor, Edmund Thomas Dufaur.34

29 NLC, Araparere Hearing: November 1901 - Part 1, Kaipara Minute Book 9, p. 286.
30 Makarau Succession Hearing: 8 March 1877, p. 218.
The above mentioned land transactions and Native Land Court hearings show how Tauhia initially asserted the rights of land ownership for himself and his hapū, but in the end he aimed to settle any disputes by sharing or withdrawing from claims. These tactics contradict observations made by historian Goldsmith, who portrayed Tauhia as a selfish rangatira, desperately on the ‘hunt for new blocks’ which he later sold.35

7.1.3 Sale of Land to Cover Private Expenses

Tauhia did sell land in which he was vested the title of owner. The question whether he shared the proceeds from sale with other members of his hapū is difficult to answer. For example, in 1873 Tauhia sold the remaining land of the Okahu block – part of the former Waiwerawera/Puhoi Reserve – to the government for £500.36 After the sale, the land lay ‘waste’ for four years, until Krippner wrote to the Waste Lands Board, asking that this land be allocated to 45 Bohemian immigrants who arrived in New Zealand in 1875 and 1876.37

In May 1876 various newspapers reported that Te Hemara Tauhia paid a doctor’s fee by transferring one hundred acres of land near Waiwera Hot Springs to Dr Mohabeer, following a tradition called ‘utu whenua ki nga Tohunga.’38 Dr Mohabeer, originally from India, had set up a practice at Waiwera Hot Springs, and he was supposed to have cured Tauhia, or his son, who contracted an ulcer on his leg. The truth or accuracy of this information is questionable: since the beginning of May 1876, Dr Mohabeer was under attack by the press, being called a quack who charged unreasonable prices for his drugs, apparently coming from India. The notice about Tauhia’s payment with land might have served the purpose of illustrating Dr Mohabeer’s outrageous fees. However, another article from December 1876 informs that ‘Rata (Doctor) Mohabeer’ was highly respected among Māori and considered a great tohunga (healer).39 Perhaps because of a lack of medical services in the Mahurangi region, Māori were consulting any doctor

35 Goldsmith, The Rise and Fall of Te Hemara Tauhia, p. 74.
who was available. Anyhow, in March 1877, Dr Mohabeer left New Zealand and was later fined in Australia for practising without a licence.40

Another story about Tauhia covering private expenses by selling tribal land has been recorded by historian Locker. In order to pay college fees for his adopted son Wiapo, Tauhia took out a mortgage with Dufaur against four hundred acres of the Puhoi block in 1875.41 He was not able to repay the loan, and subsequently Dufaur sold the land to Ryan. This story might be linked to a Deed of Mortgage issued on 10 December 1875; the deed shows that Te Hemara Tauhia took out a mortgage with Dufaur for £67-15 against the Puhoi block containing 2,351 acres. This block, stretching between the Waiwerawera River and Tungutu Beach, included Maungatauhoro, the hapū’s ancient burial place.42 Maungatauhoro was sold to Robert Graham between 1876 and 1877.43 The potential pitfalls of mortgages became a topic discussed at the Orakei Parliament in 1879, the third annual pan-tribal meeting of the Kotahitanga or Māori parliamentary movement.44

The two described cases show that Tauhia sold tribal land in order to cover private expenses; they also indicate how Tauhia valued education and medical treatment offered by Pākehā. These so-called ‘fruits of civilisation’ were promised to him and his hapū by the government when he and others signed the deeds of sale of his ancestors’ land in the 1850s. However, back then, Tauhia and his people would not have imagined how many additional costs these achievements of civilisation would incur. By 1875, three primary schools existed in the Mahurangi district: a school each at Mahurangi East and Mahurangi West sharing one teacher, and a school at Puhoi where Martin and Emily Krippner were teaching since 1872.45 Whether the children of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo went to these schools, and

41 Locker, p. 93.
42 Deed of Mortgage from 10 Dec 1875: Te Hemara Tauhia to Edmund Thomas Dufaur.
43 Murdoch, p. 49; see also chapter 6.7 of this thesis.
44 'Paora Tuhaere’s Parliament at Orakei', p. 28.
45 Locker, pp., 199-200, 267.
whether anyone else apart from Tauhia’s whāngai son, Wiapo, and his nephew, William Sullivan, attended colleges in Auckland is not known.\footnote{For a biographical sketch of William Sullivan, see Locker, pp. 267-69.}

\subsection*{7.1.4 Workings of the Highway District Boards}

Tauhia accepted paying for education and medical treatment; however, when the Highway District Boards were established in order to collect rates to cover the costs of road building, Tauhia’s patience was challenged. In 1874 and 1876, Martin Krippner, elected chairman of the Puhoi Highway District Board, compiled Assessment Lists containing the names of landowners, acreage and the value of their land, and the amount of rates to pay.\footnote{Martin Krippner, ‘Puhoi, 21 November 1874: Copy of Assessment Roll and Notice of Final Settlement of Same’, Wellington, Archives NZ, 83/75; Wellington, Archives NZ, 83/75, Puhoi Highway District: Assessment Roll 1876 - 1877, 2840/76.} Krippner’s Assessment Lists were based on Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo’s land ownership in 1866, and they did not reflect recent land sales. Further, Henare Winiata Te Kahu, who died four years previously, was still recorded as owner of three blocks at Puhoi river mouth.\footnote{Krippner also included the names of Bohemian settlers who had either died or settled elsewhere, see chapter 7.2 of this thesis.} All land was valued at one pound per acre, and one penny per acre per annum had to be paid as road tax. According to Krippner’s list, Tauhia would have to pay £10-7-2 in rates per year, and he could count himself lucky that Krippner erroneously listed the Pomare brothers as owners of the Puhoi block, which saved Tauhia an additional £9-13-11.\footnote{Martin Krippner, ‘Puhoi, 21 November 1874: Copy of Assessment Roll and Notice of Final Settlement of Same’; Puhoi Highway District: Assessment Roll 1876 - 1877.} Whether Tauhia paid the rates remains unknown. It cannot be ruled out that the workings of the Puhoi Highway District Board soured the relationship between the Bohemian settlers and the hapū, who had supported the Bohemian settlers during their first struggling years. The operations of the road boards and the discrepancy between the low value of Māori owned land when Pākehā wished to buy (six or seven pennies per acre), and the high value of Māori owned land for tax purposes (one pound), became another issue discussed at the Orakei Parliament in 1879.\footnote{Paora Tuhaere’s Parliament at Orakei’, p. 28.}

Tauhia did not reject the building of roads; on the contrary, he and Ngāti Whātua readily provided land for road construction. During a meeting at Te Rurunga pā on the banks of the Kaipara harbour in May 1874, Tauhia stressed the importance
of building a road in this region. All Ngāti Whātua members present agreed to provide land for a road if the government would employ and pay local Māori to carry out the necessary works. The *New Zealand Herald* reported this meeting, stating that Mr De Thierry, the negotiator of a recent land deal, urged the local Māori to allow the building of roads 'to join those already made by the Government and Pakeha settlers.' This twisting of facts caused Arama Karaka Haututu, Tauhia and others to write an open letter to the *New Zealand Herald* in order to rectify wrong details about this meeting. Haututu and the others wished to clarify that it was actually the other way round: local Māori asked the government to keep their promises of investing in road building in Māori districts. The signatories of the letter criticised the press for publishing incorrect information provided by correspondents who did not understand the Māori language.

In August 1876, Krippner and the Bohemian settlers at Puhoi asked the Auckland Provincial Government to ascertain whether Tauhia agreed to the construction of a road cutting through his land in order to connect the Bohemian settlement with the Waiwerawera River. A note written by Tauhia confirmed that he had no objections to such a road. Actually, the land for that stretch of road was already sold to the government in 1865. The correspondence regarding the Puhoi-Waiwerawera road shows, first, that eleven years after buying the land from Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo, the government still had not started the construction of this road; second, that Krippner and Tauhia obviously did not communicate directly about such matters, unless, of course, the government or the former law student Krippner insisted upon a written consent from Tauhia.

### 7.1.5 Representative at the Orakei Parliament

Throughout the North Island, hapū responded to the workings of the Native Land Court, Highway District Boards, and the increasing political marginalisation of Māori by organising pan-tribal hui. Parallel to the Kīngitanga movement, the
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political leaders and prophets, Te Whiti-o-Rongomai and Tohu Kakahi, organised regular meetings at Parihaka in Taranaki from the late 1860s; the Repudiation Movement founded by Ngāti Kahungunu held hui in the Hawkes Bay; Ngāpuhi facilitated parliamentary meetings called ‘Te Tiriti o Waitangi’ as a reminder of the Treaty signed in 1840. Ngāti Whātua invited representatives of all iwi to the Māori Parliament held at Otamatea in 1877 and 1878.\textsuperscript{57} The realisation that hapū and iwi needed to unite under one rūnanga (committee) in order to make their voices heard by the General Assembly led to the third and biggest meeting of the Māori Parliament at Orakei in Auckland from 25 February to 8 March 1879.\textsuperscript{58}

About 300 representatives from various hapū and iwi gathered at Orakei; the meeting hall built for that assembly was called ‘Kohimarama’ in commemoration of the conference held in 1860. Like nineteen years previously, Paora Tuhaere acted as president of the assembly. Civil Commissioner H.T. Kemp represented the government, and among the Pākehā guests at the opening ceremony were the captain and officers of the German man-o-war \textit{H.I.M. Ariadne} and the consul for the German Empire, probably satisfying their curiosity about Māori people.\textsuperscript{59} The proceedings of ‘Paora Tuhaere’s Parliament’ were recorded and translated into English by a government interpreter and a short-hand writer and presented to the General Assembly in Wellington; the newspaper \textit{Auckland Star} also published summaries of the speeches and resolutions passed during the ten-day meeting.

Tauhia spoke on the second day of parliament, immediately after Paora Tuhaere’s opening address. In his speech, Tauhia advocated adhering to the Treaty of Waitangi and the Gospel:

\begin{quote}
It is not through Maori law that we are enlightened today; it is through the Gospel. After the Gospel came the Treaty of Waitangi, and subsequently the Treaty of Kohimarama. These are the great treasures that have been given to us since the Gospel came, and, even though they have been broken, they remain still.\textsuperscript{60}
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{58} ‘Paora Tuhaere’s Parliament at Orakei’, p. 1.
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All members of the Orakei Parliament agreed to honour the words of their ancestors who had advised them to be kind to the Pākehā, to adhere to the Treaty of Waitangi and to be loyal to the Queen.\footnote{‘Paora Tuhaere’s Parliament at Orakei’, p. 30.}

When the speeches of the first two days focussed too much on the Gospel, Paora Tuhaere pushed for a more political debate. Thus, Tauhia steered the debate towards the discussion of what led to the unsatisfactory state of New Zealand despite the Gospel and the Treaty of Waitangi:

I will speak now as to the disadvantages arising from the treaty. The disadvantages began with the Gospel; they came from the ministers. I will explain that to you. The word of that old lady the Queen was clear. The word of the ministers was, “Worship God.” The whole Island then turned to worship God. The people turned their eyes up towards heaven. None of them looked down. Let the faults of the Maoris and Pakehas be made known. The pakeha ministers said, “Be strong in worship for eight years.” The Maori then all turned to the faith of the ministers. But the ministers did not bear in mind the words of the Queen. They said to the Maoris, “What is the price of these lands?”

The Maoris had their eyes turned towards heaven; but they just looked down and saw the iron pots, the fish hooks, the packets, needles, blankets, and white shirts. These were the articles that were paid for this Island. That is the cause of our grievances to-day. They did not know what use to put their lands to at that time. That is the cause of our misfortune. ... The Divine Law was taught, but the law in regard to man was not taught.\footnote{‘Paora Tuhaere’s Parliament at Orakei’, p. 17.}

After criticising the clergy for misleading Māori by preaching the Gospel but not educating about secular laws of Pākehā society, Tauhia pointed to the damage the Native Land Court has caused:

Then we perceived our misfortunes when it was decided that pakehas should be Judges of the Court. What did the pakehas know of Maori customs that they should be appointed Judges? Sometimes in these Courts a chief would get up and claim the land; but a man of inferior birth would
also claim. The land was awarded to the chief, and the man of inferior
birth got nothing.63

Tauhia concluded his speech by stating that Māori themselves are partly to blame
for their misfortunes; what he accused Pākehā of was disregarding and
systematically destroying the mana of the rangatira:

But, listen. The pakehas are not to blame; all the Natives in this Island
committed part of the fault. The only fault of the pakehas is that they have
taken the mana of the whole Island. They do not leave any mana over the
land or the sea to the chiefs. There was no reason for depriving the chiefs
of their mana.64

Tauhia’s speech set the debate at the Orakei Parliament rolling. While Tauhia still
believed in the goodwill of the British Queen and Sir George Grey, who acted as
Prime Minister from 1877 to 1879, others underlined in their speeches how the
Queen and her representatives were responsible for the breaches of the Treaty of
Waitangi.65 For example, the Queen consented to the Native Lands Act 1862
which, according to Ngāti Whātua rangatira Te Keene, caused the Crown Grants
and subsequent misfortunes.66 Tare, a representative from Ngāpuhi, stated, ‘The
treaty said that no foreign nation would be allowed to destroy the Maoris, but she
[the Queen] has injured them herself.’67

Arama Karaka Haututu demanded that the government should pay back to Māori
parts of the profits the government made from buying land from Māori for six or
seven pence, but selling the same land for one pound.68 Most speakers requested
that the government should pay compensation or return land, which the
government had either: bought from persons who were not the rightful owners;
paid for with ‘needles, iron pots, blankets, and tobacco;’ acquired through
incorrect surveys or through straight out confiscation.69 Tauhia also pointed to the
hypocritical policies of the government: on the one hand, the government wanted

63 ‘Paora Tuhaere’s Parliament at Orakei’, p. 17.
64 ‘Paora Tuhaere’s Parliament at Orakei’, p. 17.
Māori to keep reserves of land for future generations; on the other hand, the government allowed District Highway Boards to tax native lands and threaten to sell the lands if the taxes were not paid. He also warned that the government might introduce taxes on houses and cattle, and he called for resistance to such taxes.70

Some of the speakers at Orakei Parliament brought up the issue of Māori rangatira selling large tracts of land. Henare Reweti, in particular, accused Te Hemara Tauhia, Arama Karaka Haututu and Paora Tuhaere of causing the loss of his land at Kaipara.71 While some of the representatives called for an immediate, complete end to land sales, Tauhia and others agreed that land already under negotiation could be sold. Tauhia also voted against an immediate end to the workings of the Native Land Court. Such an inconsistency might have jeopardised Tauhia’s political credibility; however, Tauhia explained his position: he wanted to have the unlawful Mahurangi Purchase from 1841 investigated at the Native Land Court.72

At the conclusion of nine days of discussions, the members of the Orakei Parliament passed eighteen resolutions, which included, for example: to restore the mana of rangatira in the whole of New Zealand; to restore Māori rights to fish, gather seafood and hunt without having to pay for licenses; to stop the District Highway Boards’ and County Councils’ authority over Māori lands; to stop the sale of parts of Māori reserves; and it condemned mortgages and payments of deposits on Māori land not surveyed.73 The members of the Orakei Parliament also decided not to send representatives to the General Assembly at Wellington: a Māori Parliament would represent the interests of Māori.74

---
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Figure 20 Participants at the Orakei Parliament 1879, Photograph by Samuel Stuart
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75 Stuart, Samuel (photographer), Maori Parliament at Orakei, Auckland, Auckland Libraries, Sir George Grey Special Collections, 661-176.
At the conclusion of the Orakei Parliament held in 1879, a photo of the participants was taken by the photographer Samuel Stuart. It can be assumed that Te Hemara Tauhia is pictured in this photo, however, it is not known which one is Tauhia. He was then 64 years old; the Bohemian settlers described him as a six-foot-tall, lean man with fine features. In the photo, the man sitting in the centre in the front in an armchair is Paora Tuhaere, chair of the parliament. Since Tauhia was the first person to speak after the opening address of Paora Tuhaere, he might have taken a seat at the table. The person sitting at the table in the middle is Tauhia’s brother-in-law, Arama Karaka Haututu. The two men sitting at the left and right end of the table are R. De Thierry, interpreter, and C.O. Montrose, short-hand writer. Perhaps Tauhia is the second person from the right at the table, next to Arama Karaka Haututu. This group photo is the only surviving image of Te Hemara Tauhia.

7.1.6 Supporter of Reconciliation with Kīngitanga Movement

Another important issue discussed at the Orakei Parliament in 1879 was an upcoming meeting between Premier Sir George Grey, Native Minister John Sheehan and King Tawhiao. Although Grey and Sheehan did not attend the Orakei Parliament, they sent a letter to Paora Tuhaere, asking the rangatira present to accompany them to meet with King Tawhiao at Te Kopua in the Waikato. Tauhia, who placed great importance on such a meeting, suggested that all representatives from Ngāti Whātua, Ngāti Pāoa, and Ngāpuhi should go and support mediation between the King and the government. When the Ngāti Whātua rangatira Te Keene refused to accompany Sir George Grey, with the excuse of being tied up building a new whare parameta (parliament building) at his kāinga at Kaipara Harbour, Tauhia answered impatiently: ‘Listen. Ngati Whatua. I represent the whole tribe. I will go up myself if the rest of the tribe do not so. I will be the representative for the whole.’ With such remarks uttered in anger, Tauhia might have made himself unpopular with other Ngāti Whātua rangatira. Te Keene openly criticised Tauhia’s reaction: ‘I do not see, Te Hemara,
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that you should be angry at what I said. You are wrong in doing so.'\textsuperscript{80} This exchange of words offers a glimpse into Tauhia’s character; he certainly was persistent in implementing his agenda.

On 28 April 1879, about twenty rangatira present at the Orakei Parliament, among them Te Hemara Tauhia, Paora Tuhaere and Arama Karaka Haututu, and a large group of Ngāpuhi travelled to Waikato and awaited the start of the meeting at Kopua in the beginning of May 1879.\textsuperscript{81} The meeting between Grey and King Tawhiao, however, brought no reconciliation. While Tawhiao wished the end of all fighting, he claimed his mana over the whole North Island and refused to come to any arrangements with the Pākehā government.\textsuperscript{82} Grey, in turn, cut his visit to Te Kopua short, being disappointed that Tawhiao did not accept Grey’s offers of returning parts of confiscated lands at the west bank of the Waipa River, ‘gifting’ town acres in newly established towns in the Waikato, and building a railway through the King Country.\textsuperscript{83}

One month later, in June 1879, Paora Tuhaere, Wiremu Pomare, Tauhia and other Ngāti Whātua rangatira welcomed Rewi Maniapoto and Native Minister John Sheehan at Orakei.\textsuperscript{84} According to the \textit{New Zealand Herald}, Rewi, who came to this meeting without Tawhiao’s approval, discussed the possibility of him taking office as Māori Minister if the parliament returned to Auckland. At the conclusion of the meeting, Tauhia laid a pounamu mere (greenstone weapon) in front of Rewi as a sign of good faith and respect.\textsuperscript{85}

In March 1880 the Māori Parliament met again at Orakei. The newspaper \textit{Auckland Star} reported summaries of the speeches, which covered issues such as the government’s discontinuance of salaries for Native Assessors, taxes levied by the District Highway Boards, the introduction of a dog tax, the spread of

\textsuperscript{80} ‘Paora Tuhaere’s Parliament at Orakei’, p. 40.
\textsuperscript{85} ‘Maori Feast at Orakei’, p. 5.
pleuropneumonia, a disease affecting cattle, and the recent events at Parihaka in Taranaki. Unlike the previous year, the new government under the Hall ministry did not officially recognise the meeting and dismissed the assembly’s resolutions with the words, ‘Very few of those who took part in the meeting knew anything about the subjects upon which they deliberated. They simply wanted something to talk about ...’.

According to the press, Tauhia delivered a ‘very sagacious’ speech claiming that the government had used and then dropped Māori rangatira. Tauhia called on the rangatira to refuse to offer any further advice or assistance to government officials. Māori should have their own parliament and road boards. In regards to the stopped salaries for Native Assessors, Tauhia, whose annual allowance of £40 was also cut, appealed to the rangatira present, ‘Had they not sixpence left in their pockets? Let Government keep their money.’ Miriama Hemara, Tauhia’s wife, also spoke at the meeting, raising issues in connection with sales of land that had not been properly surveyed. Arama Karaka Haututu informed about recent events at Parihaka, where over 200 Māori, who in peaceful protest ploughed confiscated lands, were arrested and sent without trial to the South Island. All those assembled at the Orakei Parliament condemned the government’s actions and demanded that the Parihaka prisoners should be tried before a court at once.

Until the end of his life, Tauhia was actively involved in the Kotahitanga parliamentary movement. Annual Māori Parliament sessions organised by Ngāti Whātua were held either in the Kaipara region or at Orakei. Tauhia and other Ngāti Whātua members also travelled to the annual pan-tribal hui at Waitangi facilitated by Ngāpuhi. The main demand at these meetings was the government’s recognition of a Māori Parliament operating alongside the Pākehā

Parliament. In his speech at Waitangi in 1881, Tauhia stated, ‘We should have a Parliament of our own. We have tried your Parliament, and have found it wanting.’

In addition to his commitment to a unified political movement across tribal boundaries, Tauhia attached great importance to reconciliation between the government and the Kīngitanga. At the beginning of the year 1882, Tauhia and Tuhaere travelled to Waikato to invite King Tawhiao and his followers, who had laid down their weapons in front of Major Mair as a formal act of peace between the Kīngitanga and the government, to the next Māori Parliament held at Kaipara. Accepting this invitation, on 16 January 1882 King Tawhiao visited Auckland for the first time since the Waikato War. Tawhiao stayed at Orakei, where, according to the *New Zealand Herald*, Tauhia addressed him with the words, ‘Come, my brother, bring the sunshine with you. Your coming is a sign that the Maoris and the Pakehas must live together.’ A few days later, King Tawhiao, accompanied by Paora Tuhaere, Tauhia and many others, travelled to Auckland, where he was officially welcomed by the mayor, councillors, and citizens of Auckland.

From then on, regular exchanges took place between the Kotahitanga and the Kīngitanga movements. In May 1882, Tuhaere, Tauhia and other northern rangatira attended the hui at Whatiwhatihoe, near Pirongia, facilitated by the Kīngitanga. At this meeting, Tuhaere expressed his support for the joint Māori newspaper *Te Korimako*. In 1884 King Tawhiao travelled to England, hoping to meet with the Queen and to demand a form of Māori self-governance in accordance with the Treaty of Waitangi. Before his departure, Tawhiao visited

---
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Auckland and stayed with Wiremu Pomare and Te Hemara Tauhia. Tuhaere, who was invited to join in the overseas journey, was too unwell to travel.

After Tawhiao’s return from England, he attended the Māori Parliament held in 1884 at Aotea (Shelley Beach) at the south head of Kaipara Harbour. Extracts of Tauhia’s speech at this session of the Māori Parliament are recorded in a document preserved by George Graham. Although Tawhiao had been prevented from having an audience with the Queen in London, Tauhia expressed his continuing belief in a unity between Māori and the Queen:

Kotahi ano ture ma te Kuini ma Tawhiao. Ko taku kupu tenei e whakaae ana ahau ki ta raua kotahitanga. Koia ahau i mea ai, ko te tika tena, ko te ora tena, mo tenei motu.

The Queen and Tawhiao will be under one law. I favour their unity.

Therefore I say this will be right, this will be beneficial for this island.

Tauhia’s role in the Kotahitanga movement and his efforts to facilitate reconciliation between the government and Kīngitanga were not mentioned by Locker in his biographical sketch of Te Hemara Tauhia. Goldsmith briefly discussed Tauhia’s involvement in pan-tribal political affairs under the chapter heading ‘Coping with Irrelevance’; he identified Tauhia’s motive for political activism as a turn to multi-tribal hui after having ‘little land left to sell’. Goldsmith’s presentation of Te Hemara Tauhia as a selfish, money oriented rangatira ignores Tauhia’s tireless work to realize his vision of a peaceful coexistence of Māori and Pākehā in New Zealand.

---

99 George Graham, Memo from 28 February 1941; translation from Māori to English by me.
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7.2 Martin Krippner: Joining the Puhoi Bohemian Settlement

7.2.1 Emily Krippner Secures Family Income and Reputation

After returning from the war in the Waikato with a damaged reputation and financially troubled, Krippner, his wife and five children tried to make their farm at Nukumea Stream in Orewa work. Emily Krippner provided the only steady income working as a teacher and performing in concerts. For example, on 14 December 1866 a concert was held at the Mechanics Institute in Auckland ‘for the benefit of Mrs Krippner.’ Emily Krippner also organised a first concert and ball on 25 March 1867 in The Wade (modern Silverdale) to which she transported her own piano.

While Mrs Krippner was away from home earning money, Marie – who preferred to live with her foster parents instead of joining her birth parents Barbara and Michael Krippner in Ohaupo – looked after the household. Rudolf Krippner remembered his ‘sister’ Marie sowing clothes from old flour bags. The Krippners’ sons also contributed to the family income; in 1866, the eleven-year-old Rudolf was in sole charge of a river ferry, probably on the Waiwerawera River, and he helped Captain Smith, who operated a coastal shipping enterprise. At some point, Rudolf stayed at a Māori village somewhere inland, working as a trading agent; he did not mention the name of the village.

Despite Krippner’s inglorious career in the Waikato Militia, he and his wife were invited to the Queen’s Birthday Ball, held at the Government House in May 1867 and 1869. Perhaps it was Emily Krippner’s charm and musical talent that secured such an invitation; according to Rudolf Krippner, a New Zealand governor once called his mother ‘the most educated woman he ever met.’ It is
possible that Rudolf referred to Governor Grey, who also invited the Krippner family to a Christmas picnic on Kawau Island in 1871.107 There is no evidence whether the Krippners attended the ball and supped and danced till half-past two in the morning together with, for example, Gustav von Tempsky or Te Hemara Tauhia.108 Although, it is hard to imagine that Martin Krippner would have missed the opportunity to mingle with the social elite of the Province of Auckland. That he still wished to belong to the circles of the Colonial Forces shows in his letter from 12 December 1867 to the Minister of Defence, Colonel Haultain, expressing his desire to keep his rank as Captain in the Militia.109

In 1869, Emily Krippner saw that the Bohemian children of Puhoi needed an English teacher. Their number had grown, especially after the arrival of another group of 32 Bohemian immigrants in March 1866.110 She moved to Puhoi and set up a school in one of the two original nikau whare that served as shelter when the first group of Bohemians arrived six years ago. When the whare became too crowded, Mrs Krippner moved to a hut built for an occasionally visiting priest and held the classes in the house of a Mrs Russek. Soon after, an Irishman settled in Puhoi, and he offered to take over the English classes so that Mrs Krippner could return to her family at Orewa.111

Emily Krippner’s willingness to take on responsibility for the welfare of those who had followed her husband’s call to New Zealand probably laid the foundations for reconciliation between Martin Krippner and the Puhoi community. The news about the ‘fraternal war’ between Austria and Prussia in mid-1866 might have also contributed to accepting Krippner back into Puhoi affairs. Hearing of the Austro-Prussian War, which resulted in Austria’s defeat and the dissolution of the German Confederation, must have reassured Krippner and the Bohemian settlers that they made the right decision by migrating to New

110 ‘Shipping Intelligence’, New Zealand Herald, 7 March 1866, p. 4, as in Papers Past, National Library of New Zealand <https://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/>, [accessed 28 October 2016]; this group travelled via London on board the Liverpool owned by G. Marshal; upon arrival in New Zealand, the Provincial Government tried to convince the Bohemian immigrants to settle in the Waikato, but they preferred to go to Puhoi, see Mooney, p. 26.
111 Mooney, p. 37.
Despite economic hardship and never-ending hard labour, the Puhoi settlers might have felt grateful for having escaped a war in which tens of thousands Austrian soldiers, among them relatives from Bohemia, died.113

7.2.2 Application for the Position as Emigration Agent in Germany

In December 1869, an article in the Daily Southern Cross informed that a delegation from Puhoi met with the Superintendent of the Auckland Province to discuss whether any help could be given to fellow Germans who wished to migrate to New Zealand but were without necessary means. Martin Krippner acted as interpreter and spokesperson for the petitioners.114 The Superintendent stated that the 40-acre-scheme under the Auckland Waste Lands Act was discontinued, and the government was not giving any other assistance for immigration at the moment. However, if the settlers of Puhoi could convince single German women to come to New Zealand, it might be possible that the government would support their immigration. Krippner, after consulting his fellow Bohemians, responded:

Single women could certainly be obtained; and it was to be remarked that German women worked hard in the field and the bush – as hard as the men, almost.115

Krippner thus saw women primarily as strong, ‘almost’ equal participants in the workforce, rather than referring to women’s reproductive and care giving domestic roles, which the Superintendent most likely had in mind when requesting the immigration of single women.116 Krippner’s appreciation of women as hard workers must have developed under the circumstances in his own home.117 At this meeting with the Superintendent, Krippner also pointed out that

---
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six years ago the Bohemian settlers came to New Zealand without any means, and now, Puhoi was a ‘thriving and prospering’ community, with about ‘600 acres under cultivation, and 200 head of cattle in very good condition.’\textsuperscript{118} What was missing in Puhoi, Krippner continued, was a post office, and he urged the Superintendent to do something about it.

The Puhoi settler’s enquiry about assisted immigration for relatives and friends indicates, first, that many more people in Bohemia wished to leave their home country, and second, they regarded the living conditions in New Zealand as a lot better than in Bohemia. The years of hardship following their arrival in New Zealand must have paid off, and nobody wanted to ‘walk back home over water’ anymore.\textsuperscript{119} Half a year after the meeting with the Superintendent, a post office opened in Puhoi, and the local Irish settler, Michael Meaney, was appointed as postmaster.\textsuperscript{120} Thus, the Bohemians may have realized that Krippner’s linguistic and negotiation skills and his persistent appeals to government officials benefited the Puhoi community.

In September 1870, the General Assembly passed the Immigration and Public Works Act.\textsuperscript{121} Under this law, the New Zealand government invested heavily in the nationwide construction of roads, railways and water supplies, and in the recruitment of immigrant labourers and domestic servants – true to E.G. Wakefield’s principle of securing a surplus of labourers in order to keep wages low.\textsuperscript{122} The Bohemians did not let the chance of assisted passages to New Zealand slip: on 29 October 1872, seventeen immigrants from Bohemia, among them four single women, arrived in Auckland on board the \textit{Queen Bee}.\textsuperscript{123}

\begin{flushleft}
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The government’s goal of recruiting tens of thousands immigrants in Great Britain and on the European continent encouraged Krippner on 12 April 1871 to apply for the position of emigration agent for New Zealand, based in Germany.\textsuperscript{124} To underline his suitability for such a role, Krippner referred to his successful recruitment of German immigrants who settled in Puhoi and were known for their ‘industry, perseverance and sobriety.’\textsuperscript{125} Krippner’s application was supported by a written petition to the Minister of Immigration, Maurice G. O’Rorke, signed by 38 Puhoi settlers, asking for Captain Krippner to be sent to Germany as emigration agent.\textsuperscript{126}

Whether Krippner’s application for this role was based on a genuine wish to help fellow Germans and Bohemians move to New Zealand, or whether he hoped for a paid passage back to Europe, is not clear. In the early 1870s, when many Germans and Bohemians wished to leave their home country, Martin Krippner and his family toyed with the idea of returning to Europe. Their oldest son, Friedrich, left New Zealand in 1870, spending time with his god-father and uncle, Friedrich Pfeffel, in Frankfurt.\textsuperscript{127} On 18 April 1872 the Krippners’ youngest son Rudolf left for London, working as a surplus deck-hand on board the barque \textit{Ka Moi}.\textsuperscript{128} On his way to London, he caught up with his brother Friedrich in Hawai’i. Friedrich advised his brother Rudolf not to visit their uncle in Frankfurt because the Krippners were in uncle’s bad books: While living under Uncle Pfeffel’s roof, Friedrich had fallen in love and tried to elope with Pfeffel’s youngest daughter Harriet. Uncle Pfeffel intervened and threw the poor New Zealand relative out. Friedrich left Frankfurt broken-hearted, leaving behind not only his love, but also large debts.\textsuperscript{129}

After Rudolf Krippner stayed for a short time with Aunt Selina Longdill in London, he trained to become a captain in the merchant marine based in Bremen in the German Empire. In 1888 he married Magdalena Siegener, the daughter of a
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captain from Bremen, and they had three daughters.\textsuperscript{130} Although, as a captain, Rudolf constantly travelled around the world, he never set foot on New Zealand soil again.\textsuperscript{131}

In September 1872, five months after Rudolf’s departure, Martin Krippner accompanied his niece and foster daughter Marie to Sydney from where she travelled to Calcutta in India, joining her future husband Hugh de Burgh Miller, who had been appointed Private Secretary of the Maharajah of Burdwan.\textsuperscript{132} How the young couple met is not known; perhaps Hugh was related to Thomas Tracey de Burgh Miller who served as Lieutenant in Krippner’s company of the Third Waikato Regiment.\textsuperscript{133} Marie and Hugh might have made each other’s acquaintance while visiting Camp Cambridge in the Waikato. According to Rudolf’s memoirs, Marie and Hugh were happily married and lived in financial security until Hugh’s premature death shortly before the birth of their third child. After Hugh died, Marie lived with her three children in Brighton, England, where Rudolf visited her in 1891.\textsuperscript{134}

By the time Krippner applied for the position as emigration agent, the German Empire had been formed under Prussian leadership after France was defeated in the Franco-Prussian War (1870 – 71). The Prussian King William I was crowned German Emperor at Versailles; Otto von Bismarck was appointed Chancellor. The German Empire, characterized by militarism and absolutism, had swallowed up 26 German States as well as the French provinces of Alsace and Lorraine. It was now the main power in Europe, while Austria lost its hegemony in the German territories. After being defeated by Prussia in 1866, the Habsburg Empire, now a Dual Monarchy called the Austro-Hungarian Empire, saw a period of liberalisation: Hungary was granted its own parliament under the rule of the Emperor of Austria and Apostolic King of Hungary; censorship was abolished; all citizens were to enjoy their civil and political rights regardless of religion.\textsuperscript{135} In
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Bohemia, however, Czechs were not granted the same linguistic and administrative concessions as the Hungarians. As a result, the relationship between the Germans and Czechs in Bohemia deteriorated. The economic liberalisation lifted the bans on division and alienation of peasant holdings; many farmers became dwarf-holders or landless, which led to a steady increase of their migration to cities or overseas. Because of the development of the coal mines in the region of Plzeň, the hometowns of the Bohemian settlers of Puhoi increasingly lost their originally agricultural character. Former farmers worked in the mines, and many Czech miners and their families moved into the region. The impoverishing effects of the rapid industrialization and the rising tensions from Czech and German nationalism caused many Bohemians to seek a new life overseas, mainly in America.

Krippner might have personally met both the German Emperor and the Chancellor while stationed in Frankfurt/Main: Bismarck was appointed Prussia's envoy to the Diet of the German Confederation in Frankfurt from 1851 to 1859, and William I, before becoming Prince Regent, acted as Governor of the Federal Fortress of Mainz from 1854 to 1859. His former connections to Germany’s leading statesmen, the weakened influence of Austria in Europe, and the liberal reforms in the Austro-Hungarian Empire must have given Krippner the confidence that he would not face any difficulties when returning to Germany twelve years after his semi-legal retirement from the Austrian and Federal German Army.

Krippner would have followed closely the events regarding the newly formed German Empire, an interest he shared, for example, with Sir George Grey. A letter written by Krippner to Grey on 2 July 1872 reveals that Grey asked Krippner to obtain the original musical score of the unofficial national anthem of
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the German Empire Die Wacht am Rhein for Grey’s collection of manuscripts.\textsuperscript{141} The Krippners might have personally known the composer of this anthem, Carl Wilhelm, from their time in Frankfurt. However, Krippner did not succeed in obtaining the requested manuscript; he could send Grey only a printed copy of Die Wacht am Rhein autographed by Carl Wilhelm.\textsuperscript{142} By 1872, the composer was gravely ill, and he died the following year.\textsuperscript{143}

If Krippner hoped that his favour to Grey would help in his effort to be accepted as New Zealand’s emigration agent in Germany, he was mistaken. By February 1872 the New Zealand government, represented by the Agent-General Featherston, had already signed an agreement with the Hamburg shipping company Louis Knorr & Co to transport two thousand German emigrants to New Zealand.\textsuperscript{144} The New Zealand government assumed that the shipping company would carry out the recruitment of suitable emigrants, and thus the appointment of an emigration agent was not necessary, especially since emigration agents in Germany had to apply for a special licence and were required to furnish security up to £3,336.\textsuperscript{145} When the shipping company Louis Knorr & Co faced difficulties because of the German Empire’s opposition to emigration, the New Zealand government on 7 December 1873 employed the service of the Queensland emigration agent in German speaking countries, Mr Kirchner, paying him one pound per emigrant.\textsuperscript{146}

Krippner repeatedly sent in vain application letters to the Colonial Secretary, Henry Sewell, and Colonial Treasurer and Postmaster-General, Julius Vogel.\textsuperscript{147} While those letters did not lead to an appointment as emigration agent, they
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\textsuperscript{147} Martin Krippner, ‘Letter to the Hon. the Colonial Secretary, September 1872’, Waihi, SFA.
constitute a valuable source for Krippner’s biography. Outlining his qualification and experiences, Krippner wrote about his studies at the Prague University and his service as aide-de-camp to the Chief Commanding Officer of the United German Forces in Frankfurt on the Main.148 Unfortunately, the certificates apparently enclosed in his application letters have not survived. Writing on 14 August 1873 to the New Zealand Governor, Sir James Ferguson, Krippner mentioned his personal connections with Mr Kanné, Queen Victoria’s ‘travelling Intendant’, and Baron Adolph von Braun, President of the Austrian Emperor’s Privy Council; both men were Krippner’s friends from high school and university times.149 Krippner also referred to His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, who recommended Krippner as emigration agent. The Prince of Wales apparently met Krippner when visiting Frankfurt in 1857. A copy of a letter of recommendation for Captain Krippner by Mr Knollys, the secretary of the Prince of Wales, is preserved by Krippner’s descendants:

Dear Sir James,

The Prince of Wales is much interested in Captain Krippner’s case, and if you should be able to forward Capt. Krippner’s wishes, His Royal Highness would be greatly obliged.150

Despite drawing on his relationships with influential persons in the British, German and Austrian Empires, Krippner did not succeed in his attempt to return to Europe as New Zealand’s emigration agent. Perhaps suspecting that Krippner’s lack of success in this matter had something to do with his past, another resident at Puhoi applied for the position as emigration agent. On 1 December 1873 Charles Krohn, a German from Schleswig-Holstein who moved to Puhoi in 1863 and married one of the Bohemian women, wrote to the Superintendent of the Province of Auckland.151 Like Krippner, he included with his letter of application a petition signed by both English and German speaking settlers of Puhoi. The petitioners explained that many Germans wanted

148 Martin Krippner, ‘Letter to the Honourable Mr Vogel, 8 July 1872’; Martin Krippner, ‘Letter to the Hon. the Colonial Secretary, September 1872’.
149 Martin Krippner, ‘Letter to the Governor, 14 August 1873’, (fragment), Waihi, SFA.
150 Francis Knollys, ‘Letter to Sir James: 15 April 1873’, Waihi, SFA.
151 Charles Krohn, ‘Correspondence 2 December - 31 December 1873: For position as emigration agent to represent Puhoi County’, Auckland, Archives NZ, 3910/73; Hurrey, p. 124.
to migrate to New Zealand, but because they lived too far away from German ports, they needed the help of emigration agents. The settlers of Puhoi also emphasised the great benefit of increased German immigration for Puhoi, the Auckland Province, and entire New Zealand.\textsuperscript{152} Krohn’s application was also without success; on 19 December 1873 the Immigration Minister informed both Krippner and Krohn that at the moment New Zealand was not appointing emigration agents in Germany.\textsuperscript{153}

Nevertheless, some relatives and friends of the Puhoi settlers managed to come to New Zealand under the assisted emigration scheme. In August 1875 twelve Bohemian immigrants arrived in New Zealand on board the Friedburg, and in January 1876 a group of 30 Bohemians arrived on board the Shakespeare. Two more Bohemian families reached New Zealand on board the Terpsichore in March 1876.\textsuperscript{154} All three ships brought government assisted immigrants to New Zealand.\textsuperscript{155} In March 1876 the New Zealand government discontinued the assisted immigration scheme from the European continent; as a result, about five hundred German emigrants, hoping to sail to New Zealand in April 1876, were left stranded at the port of Hamburg.\textsuperscript{156}

\textbf{7.2.3 Great North Road and Puhoi Highway District Board}

The passing of the Immigration and Public Works Act from 1870 helped not only relatives and friends in Bohemia who wished to migrate to New Zealand. The funds provided for road construction under this act also became an important source of income for the Puhoi settlers. In 1872, Charles Krohn and his team from Puhoi won the contract to build the Great North Road between The Wade and

\textsuperscript{152} Krohn, ‘Correspondence 2 December - 31 December 1873’.
\textsuperscript{153} Krohn, ‘Correspondence 2 December - 31 December 1873’.
\textsuperscript{154} Immigrant Ships Arriving in New Zealand.
Mahurangi, being paid £153 by the government. Krippner’s offer to build a bridge across the Puhoi River for £100 was accepted in March 1872.

While the Great North Road was greatly needed for the public convenience, its construction would impact the owners of land through which the road would pass. In 1867 plans for the course of the Great North Road were amended, so that the road cut right through Krippner’s property at Nukumea Stream in Orewa. Krippner asked for £40 as compensation for the land rendered useless by road construction. His claim was ignored by the government; in 1873 Krippner threatened to obstruct the road if he did not receive the requested payment. The Wainui Highway District Board regarded Krippner’s demand as reasonable, especially since this very important road was cutting through his property, very close to his house. The chairman of the road board also mentioned that Krippner had already cleared parts of the land, which would reduce the cost of construction considerably. However, Purchase Commissioner D.A. Tole feared that Krippner’s case would set a precedent and encourage others to demand compensation in similar situations.

After the government finally agreed to pay Krippner twenty pounds as compensation, Tole still found a way of resisting the payment. When investigating the title to the land at Nukumea Stream, it became apparent that Krippner had mortgaged a part of the land to Friedrich Pfeffel in Frankfurt, probably in order to cover his son’s debts recently incurred in Frankfurt. Although Pfeffel had signed a letter of authority instructing Mr Leers, an accountant, auditor and arbitrator in Auckland, to sign any documents regarding this mortgage, the transfer of the land for the road could not go ahead unless the deed was signed by Pfeffel or a duly authorised attorney. How this matter ended is not known. The unsigned deed of dedication regarding right of way through Krippner’s property is held at the

160 H. Lloyd, ‘Correspondence re Compensation to be paid to Captain Krippner for Road through his Land, 12 August - 20 November 1873’, Wellington, Archives NZ, 3385/73.
161 Lloyd, ‘Correspondence re Compensation to be paid to Captain Krippner for Road through his Land’.
National Archives in Auckland. The road eventually opened in 1876; by then, the Krippners had moved to Puhoi, working as teachers at the Puhoi Public School.

As told in chapter 6.6, in 1867, the government refused to issue the Crown grant for Krippner’s entitlement of 300 acres at Ohaupo in the Waikato because of Krippner’s unpaid debts to Bahrenburg and the government. If the government had paid Krippner the requested amount of compensation for granting right of way through his property at Nukumea Stream, Krippner might have been able to repay his debt or parts of it. But this was not the case: Krippner had to sell his land at Ohaupo in order to cover his debts, while the government reduced and delayed payment of compensation for the road for at least five years.

On 11 July 1874 Krippner, the ‘obstructor’ of road construction, was elected chairman of the Puhoi Highway District Board at the annual meeting in the Puhoi school house. At this meeting it was decided that all land in the district was to be valued at one pound per acre, and a highway rate of one penny per acre should be raised. Krippner read out a letter by a ratepayer who protested that the rate of one penny per acre was too high. However, the members of the road board found that unless they charged such an amount, there would not be enough funds to carry out the necessary road works.

In November 1874 Krippner sent the completed assessment roll of landowners and rates payable in the Puhoi district to the Superintendent of the Auckland Province. Interestingly, the roll included the names of deceased former residents, for example, the Bohemian Joseph Wlach, who died in an accident in 1863, and Te Hemara Tauhia’s brother, Henare Winiata Te Kahu, who died in 1870. Further, Krippner calculated the rates payable by Tauhia and the other
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162 ‘Correspondence re Compensation to be paid to Captain Krippner for Road through his Land’.
163 See chapter 5.6 of this thesis.
166 Martin Krippner, ‘Puhoi, 21 November 1874: Copy of Assessment Roll’.
Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo land owners based on the ownership structure from 1866; Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo’s land sales to the government and private persons during the period elapsed were not taken into account. The reason for Krippner’s ‘errors’ might be the regulation under the Payments to Provinces Act 1871, which provided that the government distributed ‘Colonial Contribution Money’ to the works of the Highway District Boards ‘in proportion to the amounts respectively raised by such Boards by local rates.’ The more rates the highway district could raise, the more money the government would have to contribute. Thus, Krippner must have manipulated the accounts in order to increase the government contributions. However, it is difficult to comprehend how Krippner and the members of the Puhoi Highway District Board intended to collect with a clear conscience the wrongly calculated rates from Tauhia and other Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo land owners. The rates assessment roll from 1876 compiled by Charles Krohn, then chairman of the Puhoi Highway District Board, featured the same erroneous rate calculations.

It is also possible that Krippner and the members of the Puhoi Highway District Board simply did not know about Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo’s sales of land to the government. That would also explain why in 1876 Krippner asked the Superintendent of the Province of Auckland to ascertain whether Tauhia and his people gave permission for building a road between Waiwerawera River and the Bohemian settlement, cutting through Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo’s land. That Tauhia provided the land for such a road eleven years ago, in 1865, had been kept quiet by the government. As if to cover up the government’s failure to build this important road, an article in the Weekly News from 1 July 1876 identified local Māori opposition to road construction as the only reason why by 1876 there was still no road connecting the Bohemian settlement and Waiwera Hot Springs. Unless the Puhoi Bohemian settlers and Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo communicated directly with each other in order to clarify misrepresentations by the press or

169 Puhoi Highway District: Assessment Roll 1876 - 1877.
170 Puhoi - Waiwera Road, August 1876: Correspondence Concerning Proposed Construction of a Road, Wellington, Archives NZ, 1995/76
171 Quoted in Silk, p. 66.
deliberate distortions of the assessment rolls, the building of the Great North Road must have hurt neighbourly relations.

When the funds for road works were discontinued, the settlers of Puhoi needed to find new ways to supplement the income received from their bush farms. It was Krippner who thought of a new business to which also the children could contribute: collecting and selling fungus for the Chinese market. For many years, the sale of fungus is supposed to have saved many families in the district from starvation.172

7.2.4 Teachers at Puhoi Public School

In 1870, under the leadership of the Bohemians Johann Schollum and Johann Wenzlick, the people of Puhoi petitioned the government to open a public school in their community.173 The government agreed to contribute £80 towards a school building if the Puhoi people raised another £80. It took eighteen months to collect the money, and only after relatives from Bohemia donated the outstanding fifteen pounds did the construction of a school go ahead, completed in 1872. Martin Krippner became the head teacher and Emily Krippner the assistant teacher. The Krippners initially lived in the school building until a few years later a teacher’s house next to the school was built by the community. Local folklore has it that Mrs Krippner used her ‘elegant frocks to stuff up the cracks and crevices to keep out the draughts’ in the newly built house.174 The Krippners sold their property at Orewa to the Grut family, who lived on the south side of the Nukumea Stream.175

After Krippner dismissed the idea of returning to Europe as emigration agent, he seemed to have found his place and purpose in working for the Puhoi community. He was also involved in setting up the Masonic Rodney Lodge No 1711 in Warkworth in May 1871.176 Krippner resigned from the Rodney Lodge in 1881;

172 Silk, p. 61.
174 Mooney, p. 39.
176 Warkworth, Rodney Lodge No 1711, Register of Rodney Lodge No 1711, 3 May 1877 to Present
the reason is not known. However, he continued to attended meetings of the Rodney Lodge as a visitor until at least 1889.177

As an example of Krippner’s commitment to his role as head teacher in Puhoi, his letter from 4 November 1874, soliciting the Superintendent of the Auckland Province for assistance towards the costs of a school trip to Auckland, shall be quoted in full:

Sir,

The children of this place born by parents of little or no education at all, brought up in the bush without any opportunity of a domestic education are destitute of the knowledge of the most commonst [sic] things in life. Although these poor children are very anxious to learn, and although I spare neither time nor pains in teaching them, the endeavours of both of us are attended with only little success, their ideas being surprising limited. I therefore intend to take the older ones – about 12 or 14 – in the coming Christmas holidays for five or six days with me to Auckland, conscientiously convinced, that a stay of a few days there would enlarge their notions more than a years teaching is able to do.

I humbly apply to the kindness of Your Honor to help me in my undertaking either by providing for the passages and the maintenance of those children during their stay in town, or by granting me kindly a small sum for this purpose.178

Krippner had not forgotten how exposure to life in the city had broadened his mind when he entered the Plzeň Grammar School as a thirteen-year-old. His request was successful; the Superintendent forwarded Krippner’s letter to the Education Board, which contributed five pounds towards the school trip to

177 Warkworth, Warkworth Museum, Meetings of Rodney Lodge No 1711, C12/6; according to current Rodney Lodge members, it is possible that Krippner resigned from the Rodney Lodge because he could not afford to pay the membership fees.
Auckland. The planned school trip was even announced in the *New Zealand Herald*.179

Krippner’s holistic approach to teaching also became apparent in his engagement in the committee for the Annual Sports Day held in Puhoi every Boxing Day since the opening of the public school. According to a report in the *Daily Southern Cross* in 1876, between three and four hundred people gathered in Puhoi on Boxing Day to watch the settlement’s children, youth, and also elders competing in various disciplines, including quoits, boy’s race, maiden race, wheelbarrow race, high jump, hopping race, greasy pole and hunting the pig.180 Krippner must have been completely in his element, organising such a competitive and fun event. Perhaps he was reminded of his time in Frankfurt when he was commander of his regiment’s sergeant school, and where he pushed for the construction of the military swimming facilities on the River Main.181

It was an ironic twist of fate that Krippner, the blacksmith’s son who studied law, rose to the rank of captain, and moved to the other side of the world to become – according to Bohemian standards – a large landowner, was now teaching the children and grandchildren of his former home village neighbours. Had Krippner followed his father’s wish and joined the clergy, he might have taught the same children at the Trivialschule in Chotěšov, which, like all schools in Bohemia, were under the direction of the Catholic Church. However, in New Zealand he had the opportunity to take his pupils on school trips and organise sports events, and, most important, he was supported by his wife Emily and his daughter Anna Marie working as assistant teachers.182

7.2.5 Additions to and Departures from the Krippner Household

Receiving now regular salaries as teachers, the Krippners might have regarded living and working in Puhoi during the 1870s and early 1880s as their happiest

---

181 See chapter 5.2 of this thesis.
time in New Zealand.\textsuperscript{183} In 1871 they adopted Agnes, the one-year-old daughter of Charles Krohn, whose wife died in childbirth.\textsuperscript{184} The little girl Agnes offered solace when the Krippners were missing their son Rudolf and their foster daughter Marie, whom they never saw again after their departure from New Zealand in 1872. Rudolf mentioned in his memoirs that his mother sent him many longing letters, calling him her ‘sailor-boy’, and his father begged him to return to New Zealand, which now offered many opportunities to get ahead.\textsuperscript{185}

\textsuperscript{183} In 1881 the annual salaries of Martin and Emily Krippner were £150 for the head teacher and £50 for the assistant teacher, see ‘Education: Fifth Annual Report of the Minister of Education’, \textit{AJHR}, Session I - 1882, E-01, p. 10, as in \textit{Papers Past}, National Library of New Zealand <https://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/parliamentary>, [accessed 29 October 2016].

\textsuperscript{184} Hurrey, p. 85.

\textsuperscript{185} Magdalena Krippner, p. 23.
Such opportunities, however, did not open up for the Krippners’ two older sons. Hermann Krippner worked as a surveyor. In 1880 he married Minnie Woods at the Anglican Christ Church in Warkworth. Shortly after their wedding, the young couple moved to Gisborne, where on 8 July 1881 their first child was born. Friedrich Krippner, who, after returning from Europe stayed for some years on a remote Pacific Island, joined his brother Hermann in Gisborne, working as a surveyor assistant. Both brothers were soon declared bankrupt: Hermann in 1882 and
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186 Waihi, SFA, Krippner Family in Puhoi, ca. 1877.

Figure 21 Agnes, Martin, Anna Marie and Emily Krippner ca. 1877

"Figure 21 Agnes, Martin, Anna Marie and Emily Krippner ca. 1877"
and Friedrich in 1883. In 1887 Hermann Krippner, his wife and three children moved to Australia. In Australia, Hermann continued working as a surveyor, and his wife gave birth to four more children. Friedrich followed his brother to Australia, where he was declared bankrupt on 20 July 1889. In 1900 Friedrich’s wife Florence gave birth to their first and only child, Lance. Friedrich ended up digging for diamonds. At a reunion of the Krippner siblings in Sydney in 1910, Friedrich gave his brother Rudolf a large sapphire, which Rudolf had worked into two pieces of jewellery, still worn by his descendants today.

To top-up his income as head teacher, Martin Krippner worked as Puhoi’s postmaster from 1875 to 1878. For three years, the over 58-year-old Krippner carried sacks of mail from The Wade to Puhoi, being paid six pounds annually.

It would be interesting to know whether he ever thought and laughed about the fact that, when he was an officer in the Austrian Army, regulations forbade him to carry even the smallest package, unless ‘it contained chocolate or candies.’ The post office was set up in the teacher’s house. In 1878 John Schollum took over as postmaster, and the post office moved to Schollum’s store.

The school building was also used as a church, where occasionally visiting priests held Mass. The first resident priest, Father Adelaar, settled in Puhoi in 1877. He moved into the presbytery, which the Puhoi community had built for £130.

---


192 Magdalena Krippner, p. 70.

193 Roll of Persons in Government Employ at or near each Post Office in the Colony, AJHR, Session 1 - 1881, H-02, p. 79, as in Papers Past, National Library of New Zealand <https://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/parliamentary>, [accessed 29 October 2016].

194 Deak, p. 125.

195 Mooney, p. 57.

196 Mooney, p. 51.
Puhoi’s first church, Saints Peter and Paul, was blessed and opened in July 1881. Emily Krippner painted the altar piece; four years later, it was replaced with a copy of an original altar painting from the Saints Peter and Paul church in Litice (Littitz) in Bohemia.

The first wedding held at the Puhoi church was the marriage of Krippner’s daughter, Anna Marie Katharina, and Wilhelm Pulham from Warkworth in January 1882. The ceremony was performed by the Anglican Reverend W. Tebbs from Auckland. The record of this marriage was later torn out of the Puhoi Parish Register – not everyone in Puhoi approved of the Anglican service being held at the Puhoi church. Nevertheless, according to the Auckland Star, 160 guests enjoyed the Pulham-Krippner wedding, feasting and dancing until twelve o’clock the next day. Among the guests would have been the Longdills from Auckland: Emily Krippner’s sister-in-law, and nieces and nephews. Her brother, Pynson Wilmot Longdill, died on 16 May 1875 in Auckland, aged 63, after a short illness.

Emily Krippner’s oldest sister, Selina Longdill, who lived in London, died on 27 March 1876, aged 66. A family anecdote has survived regarding the inheritance Emily Krippner received from her sister. When Martin Krippner went to Auckland to pick up the inheritance money – the amount is not known – he returned to Puhoi with no penny left in his pocket. Apparently, after paying debts, he could not resist giving money to people who begged him for a loan. His son Rudolf commented that his father ‘loved to see himself as a benefactor and great lord’, and for his mother ‘nothing came as a surprise anymore in her marriage.’

Emily Krippner’s other sister, Mary Adele, who lived in Frankfurt, died in 1884.

---

198 Silk, p. 123; Mooney, p. 52, unfortunately, none of Emily Krippner’s paintings have survived.
202 Wilmot, ‘Letter to George Frederick Longdill’.
203 Magdalena Krippner, pp. 9 – 10.
aged 69. Her husband and Martin Krippner’s friend, Friedrich Pfeffel, died in 1888, aged 76.204

7.2.6 Krippner as Puhoi’s Administrator and Representative

Martin Krippner’s familiarity with administrative procedures was of great help to the Puhoi settlers. For example, he facilitated the bureaucratic formalities so that the Puhoi Bohemians would become British citizens and could exercise their rights as such. In November 1874, Krippner wrote twice to the Colonial Secretary, requesting the necessary forms for 24 applications to be naturalized.205

In the 1876 New Zealand General Election, John Sheehan, Native Minister and Minister of Justice from 1877 to 1879, was elected as representative for the Rodney district, which included Puhoi. The defeated candidate, Mr Moat, contested the election on the grounds that a large number of Sheehan’s supporters were the German settlers from Puhoi who, according to the Constitution Act, were aliens and therefore not eligible to vote.206 Moat did not succeed in his petition; many of the Bohemian settlers of Puhoi had already been naturalized by then.

The Bohemians and other Germans who settled in Ohaupo during and after the Waikato War overlooked seeking naturalization and, therefore, were struck from the electoral roll as aliens in 1881.207 After serving in the Waikato Militia and receiving Crown grants of land in the region, the Bohemians of Ohaupo assumed that they were automatically regarded as British subjects. When the government asked the Ohaupo settlers to undergo naturalization formalities before they were eligible to vote in the 1881 general election, Johannes Krippner and the other Bohemian and German settlers of Ohaupo petitioned the General Assembly to be refunded the money charged.208

On 13 February 1877 the Waste Lands Board held a meeting at Auckland. The members of the board, among them Waste Lands Commissioner D.A. Tole,
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204 Pope, Pfeffel, Friedrich: Magdalena Krippner, p. 42.
205 Captain M. Krippner, ‘Letter to Colonial Secretary, 21 November 1874’, Wellington, Archives NZ, 1874/3354.
208 ‘The Ohaupo German Settlers’, p. 2.
discussed a letter received from Martin Krippner. Krippner asked on behalf of the Puhoi settlers that a part of the Okahu block, sold by Tauhia to the government in 1873, should be divided into 160 acre sections and made available for the Bohemian families who had arrived in 1875 and 1876. Krippner’s request was granted, and the board decided to open up the Okahu block for settlement under the homestead system. Thus, sections of the former Okahu block were allocated to the Schischka, Stiller, Heilder and Schollum families.

In 1877 and 1878 Krippner was one of two councillors representing the Puhoi electoral district at the Rodney County Council. On 1 January 1878, the newly appointed Native and Justice Minister, John Sheehan, who represented the Rodney District in the General Assembly, visited Waiwera Hot Springs. At the official reception, Te Hemara Tauhia read an address on behalf of the local Māori; Robert Graham, owner of the Waiwera Hotel and former Superintendent of the Auckland Province, read an address on behalf of the Pākehā residents of the district. Krippner had signed the address on behalf of the Puhoi people. Both Māori and Pākehā of the district expressed their ‘most cordial esteem’ for Sheehan and their hope that ‘the neglect and injustice with which they [the residents of the district] have so long been treated may be a thing of the past.’

While the event is of no great significance from a historical perspective, the article about this reception at Waiwera Hot Springs in the *New Zealand Herald* is the only contemporary record mentioning Te Hemara Tauhia and Martin Krippner being present at the same location at the same time. It also shows that Tauhia and Krippner agreed on supporting the same member of the General Assembly representing their region.

In 1878 39 Puhoi-Bohemian settlers were convicted for neglecting to register the birth of ‘about sixty children.’ However, the government showed consideration
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210 Mooney, p. 28.
213 ‘Visit of the Native Minister to Waiwera’, p. 6.
214 Wellington, Archives NZ, Resident Magistrate, Wade, 2 October 1878: Regarding Non Registration of Children at Puhoi German Settlement, 1878/3245; ‘Puhoi’, *New Zealand Herald*, 14 February 1877.
for the ‘unforeseen and unavoidable circumstances’ at Puhoi. Instead of summoning the Puhoi parents to court at The Wade, the Resident Magistrate, H.T. Kemp, visited Puhoi, imposed a nominal fine of one shilling on each parent, and issued special certificates under which the parents could complete the registration of their children. According to the *New Zealand Herald*, Krippner helped Kemp to carry out his duty in Puhoi; whether the Puhoi parents owed the government’s indulgence in this matter to Krippner’s diplomatic talent is not known. Krippner might have reminded the Attorney General that eight years ago, in May 1870, the settlers of Puhoi asked for Justices of the Peace to be appointed for the district. Back then, the request was denied with the explanation that there were already two Justices of the Peace living in The Wade, and several magistrates resided at Auckland’s North Shore.
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7.3 Summary

Throughout the 1870s and early 1880s, Tauhia continued his role as leading rangatira of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo, and Krippner started to assume responsibility for political, social and economic matters concerning his compatriots who followed him to New Zealand. In addition to settling disputes among relatives arising from Native Land Court decisions, Tauhia focussed his actions on establishing a pan-tribal Māori parliament. Together with his friend and relative, Paora Tuhaere, Tauhia pushed for the recognition of a Māori parliament operating alongside Pākehā government in accordance with the Treaty of Waitangi. In his speeches during the Māori parliament meetings, Tauhia pointed to the breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi through the workings of the Native Land Court, District Highway Boards, and deceiving actions of missionaries who bought Māori land with ‘needles, blankets, and white shirts’. Tauhia also blamed Māori – including himself – for selling land well under its value and for taking out mortgages without calculating the risks involved. Most of all, he accused the government of taking away all mana of Māori; the government had used and misled Māori rangatira who should now, argued Tauhia, refuse to give any advice to Pākehā government officials. However, at the same time, Tauhia continually expressed his loyalty to Gospel and Queen, and he supported the reconciliation process between the government and King Tawhiao. Occasionally, Tauhia acted as spokesperson for all of Ngāti Whātua in order to pursue his political agenda. Other rangatira of his hapū and iwi might have perceived Tauhia’s political enthusiasm as overstepping the boundaries of his mana. It is possible that such underlying tensions between Tauhia and Ngāti Whātua rangatira residing in the Kaipara region have influenced the image of Te Hemara Tauhia until today.

After the Bohemian settlers established small bush farms and built their own boats, they no longer depended on the help of the local Māori. While still struggling financially and looking for any opportunity to earn an income, the Puhoi-Bohemian settlers were now concerned how to help more relatives and friends to migrate from Bohemia to New Zealand. Encouraged by the government’s new scheme of introducing thousands of immigrants, Martin Krippner applied for the role as German emigration agent for New Zealand. However, despite being supported by a petition of the Puhoi-Bohemics and with
references written by high-ranking officials in Europe, his application was rejected. Eventually, Krippner and his wife gave up their farm at Nukumea Stream, and they became head and assistant teachers at the Puhoi State School. Judging from Martin Krippner’s commitment to the children of Puhoi and his resourcefulness in securing income opportunities for his compatriots, he found joy and contentment among his former Bohemian neighbours. The Krippners’ three sons, however, left home and country, searching for better living conditions overseas – just like their parents had done two decades earlier.

How the diverging interests and increasing independence of the Puhoi-Bohemian settlers affected the relationship between the Bohemians and Tauhia and his people is not recorded. While Tauhia kept a consistent focus on a peaceful coexistence with Pākehā, the lack of references to local Māori in recorded histories of the more prosperous years of the Bohemians in Puhoi may indicate a disinclination to interact with Māori. Although the help of Tauhia and his people during the first years in Puhoi was always remembered, the social boundaries between the Puhoi Bohemians and local Māori were upheld.²¹⁹

²¹⁹ Mooney, p. 22; intermarriages between local Māori and Bohemian descendants did not take place until the beginning of the twentieth century, see Locker, p. 268.
8 Reaching Limits

According to a census of the Māori population taken in 1881, only 25 members of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo lived in the Puhoi region and 39 at the Kaipara Harbour. The Pākehā population at Puhoi – most of them Bohemian immigrants – had grown to 261 by 1878. It must have been disheartening for Te Hemara Tauhia to see his hapū’s population decline. Nevertheless, until the end of his life, Tauhia fought for his hapū’s rights over ancestral land at the Native Land Court, he represented his hapū at the Supreme Court and he supported the pan-tribal parliamentary movement Kotahitanga. In the end, Tauhia could not prevent further loss of his hapū’s land resulting from Native Land Court judgements and the necessary sale of land to pay fines imposed by the Supreme Court; in vain he hoped for the government’s official recognition of a Māori Parliament operating alongside the General Assembly.

Puhoi evolved as a successful Bohemian settlement with a school, church, general store, post office, and, at some stage, three pubs. Martin Krippner and his wife, however, were not granted to spend their retirement years in this prospering community. When both Krippners reached age 66, the Puhoi settlers demanded their retirement from teaching. With no house of their own and no longer receiving any income, the Krippners moved to Warkworth to live with their daughter and son-in-law. Over the last years of his life, Martin Krippner repeatedly petitioned the government for some form of remuneration for having introduced German immigrants to New Zealand. Krippner’s petitions were rejected; also his last application to be admitted to a ‘Home for the Aged Poor’ was declined.

Detailed information on the last decade of Tauhia’s and Krippner’s lives is scarce. Newspapers reported about their legal battles and petitions; however, Te Hemara

---

1 In this census, Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo are called ‘Ngatirango’; the name ‘Te Kawerau’ refers to Te Kawerau a Maki – a hapū residing at Waitakere, west of Auckland (36 members), see ‘Census of the Maori Population: 1881’, AJHR, Session I - 1881, G-03, pp. 12-13, as in Papers Past, National Library of New Zealand <https://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/parliamentary>, accessed 29 October 2016.
3 Silk, p. 78.
Tauhia’s and Martin Krippner’s deaths and funerals away from Puhoi were hardly noticed by the press.

8.1 Te Hemara Tauhia: Last Battles

8.1.1 Hauturu Land Court Hearing and Re-hearing

During the Orakei Parliament in 1879, Tauhia mentioned that he had asked the government to return parts of the land included in the Mahurangi Purchase of 1841 to him and his hapū, or alternatively to pay an appropriate compensation. As part of his demand he filed a claim to Hauturu (Little Barrier Island) at the Native Land Court. The New Zealand government wanted to buy this island for defence purposes; Tauhia, however, made clear that he intended to sell Hauturu to whomever he wanted, not necessarily the government:

I will then sell them [the lands at Hauturu] to the Government, if they will give me a fair price for them; but if they will not give me a fair price, I will sell to private purchasers.

At the first hearing in July 1880, Hauturu Island was awarded to Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo and other representatives of Ngāti Whāitu. Eighteen names were inserted in the memorial of ownership, including Te Hemara Tauhia, his wife Miriama, Arama Karaka Haututu, Paora Tuhaere, and Wiremu Pomare. After the decision was made, Paora Tuhaere stated that ‘in the event of this land being sold, all arrangements should be left to him.’

In May 1881, the people who lived on Hauturu Island – none of whose names were included in the Deed of Title – requested a re-hearing. This group of claimants was represented by Rahui Te Kiri, the daughter of the rangatira Te Kiri who shared kinship ties with Te Kawerau and Ngātiwai, by Rahui’s husband,

---

4 ‘Paora Tuhaere’s Parliament at Orakei’, p. 36.
5 ‘Paora Tuhaere’s Parliament at Orakei’, p. 36.
Tenetahi, and by Paratene Te Manu and Henare Te Moananui of Ngātiwai and Ngāpuhi. Instead of acknowledging a shared interest in Hauturu based on whakapapa, intermarriage and occupation, claimants and counter-claimants insisted on exclusive ownership rights. As an argument for her exclusive right of ownership, Rahui Te Kiri stated, for example, in her evidence during the fourth re-hearing:

I have been cultivating and cutting timber and firewood on Hauturu. My husband and I had a vessel. We brought firewood to Auckland and sold it. Tenetahi and I distributed the money. Hemara never asked for any, and we never gave him any. We kept our wealth ourselves.  

The fact that Tauhia and other Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo members tolerated Rahui’s and Ngātiwai’s occupancy of Hauturu without asking for a share of their profits was now applied to Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo’s detriment. Realising how the workings of the Native Land Court tended to divide iwi and hapū, Tauhia noted:

Ancestors in olden time divided the lands amongst their children. They were first divided among the different hapus when the pakehas came. Formerly, there were no definite boundaries. Our ancestors did not consider occupation a ground of claim to the land. These are not maori laws. They are pakeha laws and constitute a ground of complaint among us.

The dispute resulted in a drawn-out battle at the Native Land Court, ending with the Little Barrier Island Purchase Act passed by the General Assembly in 1894, declaring Hauturu Island as Crown land.

Tauhia did not live to witness the passing of the Little Barrier Island Purchase Act and the forced eviction in 1896 of Rahui, Tenetahi and the other occupants, who refused to leave the island and never accepted the compensation paid under the Act. As historian Angela Ballara writes, the winners of the Hauturu ownership

---

9 An Act to Vest the Little Barrier Island in Her Majesty, 24 October 1894, No 27, New Zealand Acts As Enacted, as in <http://www.nzlii.org/nz/legis/hist_act/lbipa189458v1894n27408/> , [accessed 16 August 2016].
Another positive outcome of the Hauturu case is the recording of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo’s and Ngātiwai’s history in the form of Native Land Court minutes. In their witness statements, Tauhia and others told the story of the hapū’s eponymous ancestors Maki and Mataahua, Maki’s younger brother. It was at the first Hauturu hearing in July 1880, that Tauhia recited his father’s whakapapa, showing his direct descent from Maki’s youngest son Korotai. The witnesses referred to the events before and after the Battle Te Ika-a-Ranganui, to the time when Tauhia and his people were in exile under Pomare II’s protection, and to the events leading up to the days of the Land Court Hearings.

The records of the Hauturu hearings reveal some of the dubious and unfair practices of the court. During the first re-hearing from 10 to 13 May 1881, the Commissioner of Crown Lands, Daniel Austin Tole, acted as legal representative for Ngātiwai. Tauhia objected to lawyers appearing at the Native Land Court; however, his objection was overruled. Whether planned, or by coincidence, three days before the first re-hearing, Tauhia was assaulted by two young men called Pikake and Piripi. The two men had invited Tauhia for a drink at a pub in Mechanics Bay in Auckland, and after provoking Tauhia by referring to his mother as a slave held at the Bay of Islands, a scuffle ensued. The case was brought before the Police Court on 6 May 1881, and the same Mr Tole appeared as counsel for Piripi. The case was dismissed with costs to be shared between Tauhia and the two young men. The question arises whether that assault at the pub was an attempt to intimidate Tauhia and to cast doubt on his credibility by reporting this incident in Auckland’s leading newspapers.

At the first re-hearing in May 1881, Chief Judge Francis Dart Fenton made no judgement; at the second re-hearing in June 1881, Hauturu was awarded to Rahui, Tenetahi and Ngātiwai. Subsequently, Tauhia and other members of Ngāti

---

10 Ballara, Tenetahi, Rahui Te Kiri and Tenetahi, Wiremu Te Heru; Ngāti Manuhiri and the Crown, p. 23.
11 See chapter 1.1. of this thesis.
15 It is interesting to note that it was the same Crown Lands Commissioner, D A Tole, who eight years previously had refused to pay compensation to Krippner for the Great North Road cutting through Krippner’s property at Nukumea Stream; see chapter 6.2. of this thesis.
Whātua petitioned the government to acknowledge the Land Court judgement from 1880.\textsuperscript{16} As a result, Hauturu was classified as ‘under negotiation’, which allowed any sale of the disputed land only to the government.\textsuperscript{17} This regulation suited the government perfectly; already at the beginning of the first re-hearing, Tole had stated that: ‘the Government are under the belief, that the island, from its possible importance for military purposes, should be inalienable except to the Crown.’\textsuperscript{18}

A third re-hearing took place in February 1884 which resulted in Hauturu being vested again in the names of members of Ngāti Whātua, this time including Rahui Te Kiri.\textsuperscript{19} Two weeks after the court’s decision, the Auckland Star reported again a petty crime involving Te Hemara Tauhia. Apparently, Tauhia argued over payment for a meal with Thomas Brister, the owner of a coffee stall at Queen Street in Auckland. After a ‘wordy warfare’ Tauhia was ‘removed by his friends.’\textsuperscript{20} Why that incident was regarded news-worthy is difficult to comprehend, unless, like the assault in the pub three years earlier, it served a purpose to damage Tauhia’s reputation and credibility.

At the fourth re-hearing in October 1886, former Chief Judge Fenton represented Ngātiwai as their counsel; he declared ‘Te Kawerau’ as ‘extinct at least 200 years.’\textsuperscript{21} Hauturu was awarded to Ngātiwai with Rahui Te Kiri and Tenetahi listed as owners. Interestingly, on the same day of judgement in the Hauturu case, the Austrian naturalist Andreas Reischek presented a paper about the birds on Hauturu Island at the Auckland Institute.\textsuperscript{22} Fenton, who was present at Reischek’s lecture, suggested that Hauturu Island should be bought by the government as a refuge for native birds.

The Hauturu claims process, which incurred large sums in court fees, was not only a battle between members of the former enemy tribes of Ngāti Whātua and

\textsuperscript{17} Ballara, Tenetahi, Rahui Te Kiri and Tenetahi, Wiremu Te Heru.
\textsuperscript{18} Hauturu Re-Hearing: 10 - 13 May 1881, p. 404.
\textsuperscript{19} NLC, Hauturu Re-Hearing: February 1884, Kaipara Minute Book 4, p. 218.
\textsuperscript{22} Ballara, Tenetahi, Rahui Te Kiri and Tenetahi, Wiremu Te Heru.
Ngāpuhi. Tauhia, Tuhaere, Arama Karaka Haututu and Wiremu Pomare, who appeared as claimants for Ngāti Whātua, were also instrumental representatives of the Orakei or Māori Parliament. The determination of land title with respect to Hauturu was also therefore, on the part of the Ngāti Whātua claimants, a showcase challenging the government’s disrespect of Māori mana and tikanga regarding land ownership. As Tauhia and the other signatories of the petition from 1881 warned, ‘the Parliament should not make any more laws affecting Maori lands, for they will be the cause of wars between the races.’

The first-hand experience of the operations of the Native Land Court and the arrogance of Pākehā lawyers in making judgements over their hapū’s past and present would have intensified Tauhia’s and the other claimants’ support for the Kotahitanga movement and the demand for Māori self-governance.

In 1885, the Kotahitanga movement lost one of its ardent supporters: Arama Karaka Haututu, Tauhia’s brother-in-law; he died on 21 September. According to the obituary note in the Auckland Star, Haututu was 75 years old; he had been married twice, and all his five children had predeceased him.

8.1.2 Alleged Abduction Case

The following case brought before the Supreme Court in Auckland in 1889 is mentioned here as an illustration of how particular circumstances forced Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo to sell parts of their land. This court case was also the last report about Te Hemara Tauhia’s actions in contemporary newspapers. On 17 September 1889, eight members of Tauhia’s hapū were arrested at their kāinga at the Puhoi river mouth and accused of abducting a nineteen-year-old woman and assaulting her father, Kahimo Houngariri. Father and daughter were of Ngāti Tamainupō; they came from Waikato and had recently settled south of The Wade at Dairy Flat. Apparently, the young woman had been fetched by Tauhia’s people to be questioned about her father, who was suspected of practising witchcraft; she

23 ‘No. 98 of 1881: Petition of Hemara Tauhia and 32 Others’, p. 5.
was to return to her father’s place the following day. Nevertheless, Kahimoungariri reported the case to the police. The police immediately dispatched a steamer from Auckland, and ten armed police officers and detectives went to arrest the alleged offenders: four men and four women. After the court found the case to be only a minor offence, the defendants were not convicted but were bound over for twelve months to keep the peace. Tauhia, as chief of the defendants, was called to court and asked to guarantee payment of £50 sureties for each of the defendants plus court costs of £22 10s. Tauhia initially refused payment. According to the press, he said, ‘the prisoners would have to earn the money before it could be paid.’

While the police concern about the life of an abducted young woman is very laudable, Sergeant Gamble, who was in charge of the police detachment at the time of arrest, considered the whole operation out of proportion to the gravity of the case. Gamble said that such a case ‘a few years ago would have been settled in a few hours by a native magistrate.’ The defence lawyer, Mr Earl, labelled the case ‘a newspaper prosecution, or a storm in a teapot’, while the press praised the police for this successful mission: ‘They seemed to have managed it uncommonly well, and it should produce very wholesome effects upon the Maori mind.’

According to a Pākehā settler from Mahurangi, Tauhia and his people mortgaged the land between Mahurangi River and Te Muri Stream in order to pay for the sureties and court costs. After they failed to pay the interest on the money borrowed, the mortgage foreclosed, and the land along the Mahurangi coast was sold.

8.1.3 Burial Place at Te Rurunga

Te Hemara Tauhia died on 30 October 1891, 76 years old. He was survived by his wife, Miriama Houkura, and their whāngai son and nephew, Te Hemara Te Huia. Miriama, also Tauhia’s cousin, Henare Rawhiti, and others of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo decided to bury him at Te Rurunga on the eastern bank of

30 Locker, p. 92.
31 Earl and Kent, ‘Letter to the Under Secretary, Native Department, 21 November 1907’, Wellington, Archives NZ, 1906/1324.
the Kaipara Harbour. Te Rurunga was an ancient pā site of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo, overlooking Kaipara harbour and Aotea (Shelly Beach) on the opposite shore. Nearby, at Paekotare, was the birth place of the leading rangatira Murupaenga and presumably also of Tauhia’s maternal grand-father, Murupaenga’s older brother, Te Urungatapu.

No one else was buried at Te Rurunga; ‘He is there by himself,’ stated Paora Kawharu as a witness during the Araparera Native Land Court hearing in 1901. The fact that Tauhia was buried in isolation was interpreted by the historian Goldsmith as a loss of ‘the affection of his people’ because Tauhia was a ‘cantankerous and sometimes autocratic chief.’ Goldsmith based his argument on stories he heard from Pākehā and Māori residing at Kaipara Harbour in the 1990s; however, even Goldsmith admitted that those stories were far-fetched and had nothing to do with reality. The artist and historian, Malcolm Ross (1948-2003), whose unpublished research papers on Te Hemara Tauhia are deposited at the Auckland Museum, offered another explanation: perhaps the location of Tauhia’s final resting place is linked to the whare rūnanga (meeting house) of the Kotahitanga movement, which stood just across the water at Aotea.

Nikora Te Mui, an orphan who came to live at Tauhia’s kāinga at the Puhoi River as a young adult (‘my moustache had grown, but not my beard’), stated during the Araparera hearing in 1901: ‘According to Maori custom, persons are sometimes taken for burial to places where their tupuna was born, but sometimes they are buried elsewhere.’ Perhaps it was Tauhia’s wish to be buried at Te Rurunga near the birth place of his tūpuna, Murupaenga and Te Urungatapu. It was also at Te Rurunga pā in 1843 that the Te Uri o Hau rangatira, Taikiamana, appointed Tauhia in his ōhaki to take on a leading role in looking after the hapū’s affairs.
At the Araparere Native Land Court hearing in 1901 and at a succession hearing in 1912 it was mentioned that Te Hemara Tauhia left a will and that probate was granted. However, the search for a copy of Te Hemara Tauhia’s will has not been successful to this day.

Figure 22 Te Hemara Tauhia’s grave at Te Rurunga Pā, Kaipara Harbour

Figure 23 Inscription on Te Hemara Tauhia's gravestone

40 Araparere Hearing: November 1901 - Part 2, p. 76; NLC, Hearing no. 159 Te Hemara Tauhia: August 1912, Kaipara Minute Book 12, p. 305.
41 Photograph by Anne Eddy.
42 Photograph by Anne Eddy.
Tauhia’s people erected a memorial stone on his grave. It is made of marble, and the inscription is written in Māori:

He Whakamaramatanga no
Te Hemara Tauhia
Rangatira o Mahurangi
me Kaipara

I Mate i 30 Oketopa 1891
- ♦ -

E Aku Tamariki Kia Aroha
Ki te Iwi
- ♦ -

Na te Atua Ahau e Hangā
A na te Atua Ahau i Tango.

Translation:
In Memory of
Te Hemara Tauhia
Chief of Mahurangi
and Kaipara

Died 30 October 1891
- ♦ -

My Children, Love Your People
- ♦ -

The Lord Gave
And the Lord Has Taken Away

Five months after Te Hemara Tauhia’s death, Paora Tuhaere died, 67 years old. The New Zealand Herald reported about Tuhaere’s tangi (funeral); Tauhia’s death is mentioned only in a sub-clause: Miriama Houkura, ‘the widow of the late chief Te Hemara, of Mahurangi’ sat in mourning next to Tuhaere’s coffin.43

Tauhia’s whāngai son, Te Hemara Te Huia, sold the whānau’s remaining land at the Puhoi River to Joseph Schischka, one of the Bohemian immigrants. After Te Huia’s death in 1896, the family home also passed to Schischka, apparently in payment of a debt.44 According to a note by the Auckland solicitors, Earl and Kent, Miriama Houkura died some time before 1900; the exact date and place of her burial is not known.45

44 Locker, p. 94; Locker confused Te Hemara Te Huia with Te Hemara Tauhia, stating that Tauhia sold the remaining land at Puhoi River in 1895; this was four years after Tauhia’s death. He also describes Te Hemara’s tangi in 1896, however, it must have been Te Hemara Te Huia’s funeral, see Locker, pp. 94-95.
45 Earl and Kent, ‘Letter to the Under Secretary, Native Department, 21 November 1907’. 
When local historian Locker visited Tauhia’s burial site in 1990, he found the grave overgrown by thistles, the column of the memorial stone, missing, and the iron railings, collapsed. The land at Te Rurunga had been in Māori ownership at least until 1900. When and how it was sold to Pākehā farmers goes beyond the scope of this thesis. In an interview, Margaret Kawharu, social anthropologist of Ngāti Whātua, expressed her belief that Tauhia’s kōiwi (bones) might have been removed from the grave and taken to a hidden final resting place. Such a practice was also described by Paora Kawharu at the Araparere Native Land Court hearing in 1901: when land is sold or abandoned ‘people do not wish their dead to remain on land belonging to other persons’, and thus the kōiwi of their tūpuna are exhumed and taken to a ‘rua whakautu’, a final resting place.

Today, the multi-millionaire businessman, Alan Gibbs, owns the land at Te Rurunga. He has turned the grounds into an impressively landscaped sculpture park, populated with exotic animals. It must have been under Gibbs’ instruction that Tauhia’s memorial stone was restored and the burial site kept tidy. In 1996, Gibbs commissioned Ralph Hotere, one of the most acclaimed New Zealand artists, to create a sculpture commemorating the rangatira, Te Hemara Tauhia. The intertwined number eight-gauge stainless steel wire mounted on an arcing colonnade leading from the grave site to Gibb’s house reminds viewers of a cloud floating in the air. Perhaps it symbolises Tauhia’s last breath, or his wairua (spirit) returning to this wāhi tapu (sacred place) steeped in his hapū’s history.

---

46 Conversational interview with Margaret Kawharu, 24 October 2014.
47 Araparere Hearing: November 1901 - Part 2, p. 137.
8.2 Martin Krippner: Denied Recognition

8.2.1 Krippner’s Last Petition

According to the minute book of the Puhoi School Committee, in January 1884 the school committee asked the Krippners to resign from their positions as headmaster-teacher and teacher owing to their advanced age and their ‘inability to attend properly to their duties.’ While the Krippners, both 66 years of age, and the Board of Education hoped to postpone the retirement, the Puhoi School Committee insisted that their employment terminate on 14 May 1884. On 24 May 1884 a new headmaster, Mr. J. Daly, was appointed for the Puhoi School. After Daly assessed the school and teacher’s residence in Puhoi as ‘unfit for human habitation’, new and larger buildings were constructed in the following year. According to Silk, Daly was remembered as ‘a second-rate teacher; cruel to the children and an undesirable member of society.’

After their retirement from teaching, Martin, Emily and their fourteen-year-old adopted daughter, Agnes Krippner (Krohn), moved to Warkworth to live with their daughter Anna Marie and her husband and children. Silk recorded that the people of Puhoi assisted in building a house for the Krippners on the property of their son-in-law, William Pulham, a logger and manager of the Kauri Timber Company. No longer receiving any income, in October 1884 Martin Krippner petitioned the General Assembly for some form of financial compensation for his services in connection with the immigration of the German-Bohemian settlers. His petition was turned down by the Public Petitions Committee. Krippner sent the same petition every year until 1892.

In July 1888 the New Zealand Herald reported about Krippner’s petition being supported by the Bohemian settlers of Ohaupo (not Puhoi), by the former Deputy

49 Quoted in Silk, p. 92.
50 Silk, p. 93.
51 Silk, p. 94.
52 Silk, p. 11.
53 ‘Reports of Public Petitions Committee (Mr. R. Turnbull, Chairman)’, AJHR, Session II - 1884, I-01, p. 17, as in Papers Past, National Library of New Zealand <https://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/parliamentary>, [accessed 29 October 2016].
54 ‘Reports of Waste Lands Committee (Mr. R. Thompson, Chairman)’, AJHR, Session I - 1892, I-05, p. 4, as in Papers Past, National Library of New Zealand <https://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/parliamentary>, [accessed 29 October 2016].
Superintendent of the Auckland Province, Joseph May, and by a former surveyor in the Puhoi region, Christian Blücher. All supporters stated that although Krippner had been promised some sort of remuneration for his services in connection with the Bohemian immigration, he never received any such payments. The article about this petition described Krippner’s financial circumstances as ‘very reduced’ and mentioned that Emily Krippner had been crippled and bedridden for a long time.55

In September 1891, the former and current parliamentarians, Sir George Grey, Patrick Dignan and Jackson Palmer, gave evidence in support of Krippner’s petition before the Public Petition Committee at the House of Representatives.56 Still, Krippner’s petitions for remuneration were rejected by the committee with the words ‘the petitioner has no claim against the colony.’57

How Krippner dealt with being denied recognition for his services for the Auckland Province is not known. Perhaps he thought sometimes with envy of the late Sir Julius von Haast, who had received two honorary doctorates and was knighted by the Austrian Emperor and Queen Victoria for his contributions to the natural sciences and for his discoveries in New Zealand.58 However, Haast migrated to New Zealand leaving his first wife and son behind in Frankfurt; thus, Haast was free to pursue his career and adventures without having to look after a family, let alone support the German immigrants who had left their homes following his glowing reports about New Zealand in German and Austrian newspapers.59 Nevertheless, Haast’s success as the founder of the Canterbury Museum may have inspired Krippner to develop an interest in ethnographic

57 ‘Reports of the Public Petitions Committee (Mr. R. Turnbull, Chairman)’, AJHR, Session I - 1885, I-01, p. 22, as in Papers Past, National Library of New Zealand <https://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/parliamentary>, [accessed 29 October 2016]; ‘Reports of Public Petitions, A to L, Committee (Mr. Seymour, Chairman)’, AJHR, Session II - 1887, I-01, p. 6, as in Papers Past, National Library of New Zealand <https://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/parliamentary>, [accessed 29 October 2016].
59 Haast’s wife, Antonia née Schmitt, died a year after Haast left for New Zealand; their only son, Mathias Robert Haast, was placed under the guardianship of Dr Aloys Schmitt and Dr Reinganum, see Haast, Mathias Robert: Nachlassakten 1871.
studies, now, that all his children had become adults. In 1886 Krippner delivered a lecture on marriage customs in Bohemia at a meeting of the Mahurangi Literature Society in Warkworth. Unfortunately, no manuscripts of this lecture or of other possible studies have survived.

Krippner also supported his friend from high school and university times, Baron Adolph von Braun, in the latter’s quest for meteorites from New Zealand. Braun, knighted by the Austrian Emperor for his services as Privy Councillor and Director of His Cabinet’s Chancellery, kept up his interest in mineralogy sparked at Plzeň Grammar School. He asked Krippner whether he could obtain meteorites for his mineral collection, parts of which Braun had already donated to the Imperial-Royal Natural History Court Museum in Vienna. In a letter to the Auckland Museum written in 1890, Krippner inquired whether the museum could help him to satisfy the wish of Baron von Braun.

8.2.2 Selling of Last Assets

In January 1889 the Krippners’ son-in-law, William Pulham, sent to Sir George Grey a package containing autographed letters by the Romantic writers, S.T. Coleridge, Charlotte Smith, William Wordsworth, Frances Trollope, Charles Lamb and Samuel Rogers. These letters had formerly been in Emily Krippner’s possession and were addressed to her uncle, Charles Aders, and to her sister, Selina Longdill. Emily Krippner must have asked Pulham to give these letters to Sir Grey assuming that he would value and preserve them for his collection of manuscripts. In an accompanying letter to Grey, Pulham wrote:

I am glad that you value these letters and if you will accept them I should like to make you a present of them. Thank you very much for your autographed letter which I will prize more than I did the others.

---

Although the letters were offered as a gift to Grey, the Krippners and their son-in-law were probably very grateful and relieved when Grey enclosed a cheque of ten pounds in his letter of thanks.64

Emily Krippner died on 16 December 1890 aged 72. She is buried at the Anglican Cemetery in Warkworth. The New Zealand Herald wrote an article about her funeral, which was attended by a great many people from Warkworth and Puhoi.65 Her coffin was ‘literally covered with wreaths and bouquets,’ and ‘business on the day of the funeral was suspended at the Puhoi, and the public school was closed.’66 The great number of people paying their last respects to Emily Krippner shows how well known and loved she was in the Puhoi and Mahurangi region. An envelope containing a lock of Emily Krippner’s hair and a clipping of the newspaper article about her funeral is kept in the Krippner family archive in Germany. Anna Marie Pulham must have sent these memorabilia to her brother Rudolf Krippner, who received the news about his mother’s death on Easter Day 1891.67

On 25 October 1891 Krippner’s brother Michael died at Ohaupo, aged 68, five days before Te Hemara Tauhia’s death.68 Whether Martin Krippner was able to attend his brother’s funeral, and whether he took notice of Tauhia’s passing is not known.

Martin Krippner survived his wife by a little over three years. He was cared for by his daughters Anna Marie and Agnes in Warkworth. Wishing not to be a burden to Anna Marie, who gave birth to her seventh child in 1892, and to Agnes, who worked as a servant at the Warkworth Hotel, Krippner applied to be admitted to Costley Home for the Aged Poor in Auckland on 27 February 1893. As the cause of his application Krippner stated: ‘Unable to work – homeless and friendless.’69 His application for admission was declined on the grounds that he was not

---

65 ‘Our Mahurangi Correspondent Writes’, New Zealand Herald, 19 December 1890, p. 4, as in Papers Past, National Library of New Zealand <https://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/>, [accessed 28 October 2016]; according to this newspaper article, Emily Krippner’s date of death is 15 December 1890; on the gravestone her date of death is given as 16 December 1890.
66 ‘Our Mahurangi Correspondent Writes’, p. 4.
67 Magdalena Krippner, p. 66.
68 Puhoi Bohemian Museum, Krippner File.
69 Auckland, Archives NZ, Costley Home Committee Minute Book 1890 - 1896, YCAB 15251/1/a.
Krippner apparently received a monthly income of three pounds. Krippner’s failed application for admission to the Costley Home was publicly discussed in articles in the *Auckland Star* and *New Zealand Herald*; this must have been a great embarrassment for Krippner’s family and friends. However, Krippner’s wish to move into a home for the ‘aged poor’, instead of being dependent on his children, shows that right to the end of his days, Krippner did not give up trying to determine his own path in life.

Half a year before his application, Krippner gave his son-in-law authority to sell the last piece of land he owned at Puhoi. The information stems from Anna Marie Pulham’s diary, which contains fragments of an entry written by her husband William Pulham:

Warkworth, Oct. 9 1892

At home. Mollie [Anna Marie] in bed sick. Capt. Krippner in his room writing an authority for me to sell his last bit of land at Puhoi. Agnes here. Going to Auckland tomorrow to try and get ... .

It is interesting to note that William Pulham called his father-in-law ‘Captain Krippner’. Whether he used the title ‘Captain’ out of respect or sarcasm or simply habit is difficult to ascertain.

Martin Krippner died on 1 February 1894, aged 76. He is buried next to his wife in the Anglican Cemetery in Warkworth. The headstone erected on the Krippners’ grave bears the following inscription:

---


72 Waihi, SFA, Anna Pulham, (Mollie), ‘Diary’.
Figure 24 Emily and Martin Krippner’s grave at Warkworth, Anglican Cemetery

In Loving Memory

of

Capt. Martin Krippner, KRE

Late of the Austrian Army

Founder of Special Settlements

at Puhoi and Ohaupo

Who died February 1\textsuperscript{st} 1894

Aged 75\textsuperscript{75}

Also of his wife

Emily

who died December 16\textsuperscript{th} 1890

Aged 72

\textsuperscript{73} Photograph by Anne Eddy.

\textsuperscript{74} KRE = Knight of the Red Eagle, a Prussian decoration Krippner was awarded in 1856, see chapter 5.2 of this thesis.

\textsuperscript{75} The age of Martin Krippner is incorrect.
Nothing has been reported about his funeral or how many people came to pay their last respects. Only a short death notice of three lines published two weeks later in the *New Zealand Herald* informed about his passing.\(^76\) Both the death notice and the inscription of the headstone relate his rank as captain to his service in the Austrian Army; his service in the Waikato Militia is not mentioned. Perhaps, his relatives and contemporaries hoped that this part of Krippner’s life would soon be forgotten.

\[\star\star\star\]

8.3 Legacies

Te Hemara Tauhia’s and Martin Krippner’s existence left almost no material traces. Tauhia’s whāngai son and Krippner’s son-in-law sold their fathers’ last remaining assets at Puhoi village and Puhoi river mouth. While the newspapers took every opportunity to bring Tauhia’s and Krippner’s names into disrepute, their deaths seemed not to have been newsworthy.

It was Tauhia’s mission to restore his hapū to its former strength and independence after they were defeated at the Battle Te Ika-a-Ranganui. Instead of seeking utu by force for the deaths of his ancestors killed in battle with Ngāpuhi, Tauhia chose the laws of the British Queen and the Christian Gospel as his allies. As he said at the Orakei Parliament in 1879: ‘My revenge was, that the pakehas and the Ngatiwhatua should be more closely united than ever.’

Tauhia cooperated with Pākehā by acting as Native Assessor, and he invited Pākehā to settle among his people in the Waiwera-Puhoi region. However, after realising that the Pākehā government of New Zealand was denying Māori equal rights and using rangatira solely for the Pākehā’s colonizing agenda, Tauhia sought unity with other Māori hapū and iwi as the only way to reach his goals. Perhaps at the first formal session of the Kotahitanga Parliament in 1892, the attending representatives from both Aotearoa and Te Waipounamu (North and South Island) remembered and honoured Te Hemara Tauhia as a forerunner of the Māori parliamentary movement.

Among Tauhia’s people living at the Kaipara Harbour, however, the memories of the Kotahitanga movement and its representatives have faded. The whare rūnanga of the Kotahitanga movement, opened in 1884 at Aotea, was barged to Tanoa, the former Methodist Mission Station at Otamatea in 1887. The carvings that used to adorn the meeting house were sold in order to buy bibles. The building still stands there today, serving as wharenui at the Otamatea Marae.

Martin Krippner emigrated to New Zealand in search of a better life away from Europe’s wars. His dream of becoming a well-to-do landowner and his quest for
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recognition were not realised. Krippner’s move to the other side of the world could also not prevent his descendants from being drawn into the First and Second World Wars. At least five of Martin and Emily Krippner’s grandsons and two of their granddaughters served in the Allied Forces; the Krippners’ son, Rudolf, who returned to Europe and became a captain of the German merchant fleet, was kept under arrest on board his ship off the coast of Sardinia during the First World War. Rudolf had three daughters who were not drafted into the German Army; thus, cousins did not have to fight cousins. The scenario repeated itself during the Second World War: Rudolf Krippner’s only grandson, also a captain of the German merchant fleet, was arrested and held prisoner of war in Australia. Remarkably, none of Martin Krippner’s children, grandchildren or great-grandchildren were killed in action or died of wounds in twentieth-century wars. It seems as if they had learned from their ancestor, Captain Martin Krippner, how to get safely through a war. Other Puhoi-Bohemian descendants were not so lucky: out of 43 Puhoi men serving during the First World War, seven died; during the Second World War, three out of 42 men from Puhoi died.

Today, a four-lane motorway cuts through the hills of the Waiwerawera-Puhoi region. The population of Puhoi is declining; however, the village comes to life every year when descendants of the Bohemian settlers gather for the annual celebration of their ancestors’ arrival. Tauhia’s kāinga at the Puhoi river mouth and at Te Muri are part of the Te Muri and Wenderholm Regional Parks open to the public. Krippners’ former farm at Nukumea Stream has been a Scenic Reserve since 1960. Nature has reclaimed parts of the terrain that Tauhia, Krippner and their people attempted to turn into profitable forestry and agricultural enterprises. ‘Grass has grown over it’ is an old German proverb referring to an unpleasant matter of the past that has long been forgotten. Perhaps, as the Mahurangi historian R. H. Locker said, the establishment of public parks where people regardless of ethnicity, class, and religion can enjoy the beauty of the Puhoi River
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and the Mahurangi Coast are the best possible outcomes of Tauhia’s and Krippner’s dreams and visions.85

♦ ♦ ♦
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9 Conclusion

The two nineteenth-century Puhoi leaders, Te Hemara Tauhia, rangatira of the Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo hapū, and Martin Krippner, captain in the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army and Waikato Militia, are presently not held in high regard by descendants of their respective groups. Tauhia is blamed for having sold most of his hapū’s land while leading a ‘high life’ from the proceeds of the sales.¹ Krippner is accused of mercenary motives in initiating a Bohemian settlement in New Zealand. To ascertain whether or not these accusations are justified was one of the central goals of this thesis. By reconstructing Tauhia’s and Krippner’s life narratives in the form of a cross-cultural dual biography, I aimed to reveal both men’s actions and the choices open to them and to the people they led, and I explored plausible motivations for their decisions.

Searching for surviving pieces of evidence, I visited archives in New Zealand, Austria, Germany and in the Czech Republic. Thanks to the digitisation and online publication of official documents and nineteenth-century newspapers, I was able to access archives in London, study parish registers in Bohemia, and search in German, English and Māori newspapers for clues that help to trace Tauhia’s and Krippner’s life paths. It may well be a coincidence, but I found that three crucial documents relating to Te Hemara Tauhia and to Martin Krippner, and currently listed in archives’ catalogues, are missing.² Whether some people had an interest in letting these records disappear or otherwise removing them is not known. No self-revealing documents such as personal letters or journals written by Tauhia or Krippner survive. In order to better understand both men’s actions and decisions, I reconstructed the world as they might have seen and experienced it by exploring a wide range of primary and secondary sources.

² The missing documents are: Te Hemara Tauhia’s letter from 1839, in which he tried to stop Pomare II from selling parts of Mahurangi, listed in the catalogue of Archives New Zealand in Wellington, see chapter 4.1; Te Hemara Tauhia’s will and probate, mentioned in two separate Native Land Court hearings, Araparere Hearing: November 1901 - Part 2 and Hearing no. 159 Te Hemara Tauhia: August 1912, see chapter 8.1; and Martin Krippner’s file relating to his resignation from the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army, listed in the catalogue of the War Archive in Vienna, Austria, see chapter 5.2.
This cross-cultural dual biography in the context of nineteenth-century Aotearoa New Zealand and the Austrian Empire cannot completely reveal Tauhia’s and Krippner’s personalities; many aspects of their personal lives remain hidden. However, what is offered here by way of juxtaposing the parallel life narratives of the two men – only two years apart in age – are comparative insights into two societies existing simultaneously but situated almost 18,000 kilometres apart: the Kaipara-Mahurangi region in Aotearoa New Zealand and the Kingdom of Bohemia, then forming part of the Austrian Empire. A second major aim of my research was to utilise this cross-cultural dual biography of two relatively obscure nineteenth-century leaders as a tool to uncover forgotten or repressed aspects of the history of Aotearoa New Zealand and the Austrian Empire. An investigation of the circumstances surrounding Krippner’s and his Bohemian compatriots’ migration to Aotearoa New Zealand – at that time still an unusual destination for German speaking emigrants – and the resulting interactions between Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo and the Bohemian settlers, reveals a surprising degree of political and social connection between two geographically and culturally distant groups.

The exploration of Tauhia’s and Krippner’s family origins and childhood experiences brings to light the distinct histories of the Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo hapū and the German-speaking peasants in Bohemia, reaching back to the seventeenth century – the time when both men’s first mentioned ancestors lived. Tauhia’s whakapapa, as recited by him at Native Land Court hearings, indicates that Tauhia was the second child and oldest son of a rangatira lineage. Extracts from Bohemian parish registers, obtained by Krippner’s grandchildren in order to prove their ‘Aryan’ descent in the 1930s, show that Krippner was the first-born son of a German speaking, Catholic blacksmith with the hereditary status of a peasant serf. Published accounts about the natural and social environment of the two geographical regions and recorded stories about Tauhia’s ancestors, Bohemian heroes and significant local historical events – mainly wars and migrations – provide information to better understand the factors that influenced both men’s personal development and identity formation. Both Tauhia and Krippner lived in war-torn societies: while Tauhia’s tūpuna had usually returned from battles as winners with war hostages and slaves in tow, Krippner’s maternal grandparents and grand-uncles fell during the Napoleonic Wars, and the
peasantry, including his parents, had to carry the increased tax burdens resulting from these wars.

Both Tauhia’s and Krippner’s life courses changed drastically early on. At the age of about ten years, Tauhia became a prisoner of war, after Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo was defeated at the Battle Te Ika-a-Ranganui in 1825, while the young Martin Krippner was sent to a monastery to study for the priesthood in 1826. Reconstructing Tauhia’s traumatic childhood experiences provides insights into the cause, course and aftermath of the so-called Musket Wars led by the Ngāpuhi rangatira, Hongi Hika, and his allies. Krippner’s path of formal education – which, at that time, was unusual for a blacksmith’s son – illuminates the so-called Pre-March Era, the period preceding the European revolutions of March 1848, in which members of oppressed social groups started to question and cross social boundaries set by the Austrian Empire’s feudal system.

During their adolescent years, both Tauhia and Krippner were exposed to thinking and behaviour that was challenging officially accepted norms and rules. Kinship ties with his Ngāpuhi captors, and his value as a hostage for peace negotiations with Ngāti Whātua, secured favourable treatment for Tauhia during his stay as a prisoner of war at the Bay of Islands. From his Ngāpuhi captors, notably Te Whareumu and Pomare II, Tauhia learned strategies for balancing political and economic advantages with the demands of custom, thereby encouraging a less strict observance of custom in regards to tapu and utu in favour of establishing and maintaining good trading relationships with Pākehā. Tauhia also attended the mission school at Paihia where he acquired the skills of reading and writing, and where he heard about a religion that – in principle at least – condemned violence and took away the stigma and feeling of shame attached to living in captivity. Peace negotiations between Pomare II and Ngāti Whātua rangatira in 1839, and the signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi/The Treaty of Waitangi in 1840, encouraged Tauhia to lead his hapū back to ancestral lands at the Puhoi River and to restore his and his hapū’s mana.

After a challenging time of four years at Teplá Abbey, Krippner entered the grammar school and subsequently the philosophical institute in Plzeň, Bohemia’s second largest city. In Plzeň, Krippner was encouraged by his Premonstratensian teachers to question the ethnocentricity and religious intolerance of both the Austrian state and the Catholic Church; he encountered cosmopolitan life,
becoming friends with fellow students of different religions and social classes. As a result, Krippner abandoned his plan to enter the clergy, deciding to study law instead. Despite completing his legal studies with high grades, Krippner was denied access to the legal profession because of his inherited status as a serf and his lack of personal income. Rather than return to his father’s blacksmith shop, or be conscripted, he voluntarily joined the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army, as quartermaster sergeant.

Encouraged by progressive ideas, courageous mentors, and early personal successes, both Tauhia and Krippner were convinced they could change the status quo as it affected their own lives and chart the course of their lives, accordingly. Both encountered obstacles with skill, perseverance, resourcefulness and resilience, not letting go of personal (and collective) visions. After Tauhia found out that former enemies – Ngāti Pāoa and Pomare II of Ngāti Manu – and also his relatives of Ngāti Whātua had sold Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo’s land at Mahurangi to the British Crown in 1841, he and his hapū fought with non-violent measures to contest the so-called Mahurangi Purchase. In this lifelong battle, which Tauhia understood as seeking utu for his tribe’s defeat at the Battle Te Ika-a-Ranganui, Tauhia chose the British Queen and the Gospel as his allies. He was christened and took on the name Te Hemara Tauhia. He believed in and constantly referred to the agreements reached between representatives of the British Queen and Māori rangatira in Te Tiriti o Waitangi/The Treaty of Waitangi. Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo’s and Tauhia’s perseverance was partly successful: the Waiwerawera/Puhoi Reserve of 6,635 acres was officially recognised by the Crown as land owned and occupied by Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo in 1853. Their ownership claims over the islands Te Tiritiri Matangi and Hauturu (Little Barrier), however, were annulled by the Native Land Court in 1867, and again in 1894, three years after Tauhia’s death. Thus, the largest part of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo’s ancestral lands along the east coast was alienated as a result of the Mahurangi Purchase of 1841, not because of sales completed by Te Hemara Tauhia or other members of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo.

Krippner served as quartermaster sergeant for six years, 1842-1848, stationed in the fortress of the German Confederation at Mainz near Frankfurt. After the Revolution of 1848, serfdom was abolished in the Austrian Empire. Krippner thus received full citizenship, and was promoted to second lieutenant. As commander
of his regiment’s sergeant school in Frankfurt, Krippner gained access to Frankfurt’s bourgeois society, where he met lifelong friends and his future wife, Emily Longdill from London. In 1851 Krippner was entrusted with the accounting and financial management of the Supreme Command of the German Federal Army at Frankfurt, and he became an adjutant attached to the commanding officer of the German Federal Army, Major General von Schmerling. Throughout his military career, Krippner acquired ‘no special military skills’ and he ‘never served in the face of the enemy’. Nevertheless, he was promoted to lieutenant, probably for innovations in accounting, and he was awarded the Prussian Order of the Red Eagle Fourth Class.

From his position in the Supreme Command of the German Federal Army in Frankfurt, Krippner gained first-hand knowledge of growing Prussian-Austrian tensions. Concerns for the future of his family, both in Frankfurt and in Bohemia, prompted him to search for a better life away from European wars and the negative effects of industrialisation in the Plzeň region. During the Austro-Sardinian War in 1859, which threatened to develop into a war between the German Confederation and France, Krippner was promoted to captain. Two months after his promotion, Krippner arrived in London as ‘a man of private means.’ His family and six other persons from Krippner’s home village migrated to New Zealand, two days before the ratification of the peace agreement between Austria, Sardinia and France. The investigation of the circumstances surrounding Krippner’s departure from his post in Frankfurt reveals that his journey to London, and from there to New Zealand, would not have been possible without financial and logistical help from German emigration agents and advocates, British shipping companies, the Auckland Provincial Government, and supporters of plans for Austrian colonial expansion.

Whether knowingly or not, Krippner and the first group of Bohemian immigrants were part of an advertising campaign which sought to promote New Zealand as a dream destination for potential emigrants and capital investors from Europe and the German Confederation. Looking for clues about the origin of Krippner’s ideas and financial means for migrating to New Zealand exposes the contributions to
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the New Zealand advertising scheme of the former Frankfurt merchant, Johann Franz Haast – later known as Sir Julius von Haast, explorer, geologist and founder of the Canterbury Museum – and of the German geologist, Dr Ferdinand von Hochstetter. The link between the two German scientists and the promotion of New Zealand as an emigration destination, in turn, points to the political goals of the Novara expedition of 1857-1859, which was masked as a peaceful, scientific circumnavigation of the world by an Austrian frigate. Austria's unsuccessful attempts at overseas colonisation, and the role of the Novara expedition as discussed by David G L Weiss, Gerd Schilddorfer and Herman Mückler, requires further investigation in connection with the process of New Zealand's colonisation. An irony of history is that the two Waikato rangatira who travelled as crew on board the Novara to Europe, and who were presented by the scholarly expedition leader, Dr Scherzer, to the Austrian Emperor and the people of Vienna, brought back to Aotearoa a printing press that subsequently was used to print the Kīngitanga newspaper Te Hokioi.

Placing Te Hemara Tauhia’s and Martin Krippner’s life narratives side-by-side makes the simultaneity of events in New Zealand and Europe more tangible and further undermines claims of the innate superiority of Western European civilization. For example, on 25 July 1859 Dr Hochstetter addressed Paora Tuhaere and other Māori assembled at Auckland with the words:

You have embraced Christianity – hold fast; seek after those things of the Pakeha which will improve your condition, that ye may live happily, and enjoy the blessings of civilization in this beautiful and pleasant island.

A month earlier, on 24 June 1859, over 250,000 Austrian, French and Italian soldiers – most of them Christians – fought each other in the Battle of Solferino during the Austro-Sardinian war. As a result of that battle, the Red Cross was founded, and Krippner deserted his post in the Austrian Imperial-Royal Army to migrate to New Zealand seeking a better life for his family and fellow Bohemians. A closer look at the Battle of Solferino and its aftermath also provides
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comparative insights into cross-cultural burial beliefs and practices. Ten years after that battle, the remains of about 6,000 fallen soldiers were exhumed and their bones and skulls displayed in two ossuary chapels where they can be viewed and mourned to this day. This ancient Christian tradition is very similar to the Māori ritual of hahunga (ceremony for uplifting bones), which Christian missionaries in New Zealand frowned upon and regarded as a heathen ritual.⁸

Both Krippner and Tauhia believed in the promises made by British Crown representatives, Christian missionaries, and immigration agents. That these various promises mostly turned out to be lies is not the fault of Krippner and Tauhia. After the official recognition of the Waiwerawera/Puhoi Reserve, Tauhia, together with other members of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo, signed deeds of sale for blocks of land surrounding the reserve. The British Crown already claimed ownership of the land that formed part of the Mahurangi Purchase of 1841. However, by signing the deeds of sale, Tauhia and his hapū agreed to extinguish the Native Title. They accepted compensation payments and expected that the presence of Pākehā who would settle on their land would advance the infrastructure and economic development of the region. Ironically, when the Bohemian settlers arrived and during their first years at Puhoi River, support worked the other way: it was up to Tauhia and his hapū to save their new Pākehā neighbours from starvation. The building of a road connecting Puhoi with Auckland was then delayed for two decades, and the Puhoi Highway District Board collected taxes to pay for its construction. Promised schools and hospitals for Māori living in the Waiwerawera/Puhoi region were never set up.

Krippner and the other Bohemian immigrants were attracted to New Zealand by the prospects of free land grants and by the immigration agents’ praises of New Zealand as ‘paradise on earth’. But when the Bohemians arrived in New Zealand, they found the Crown and settlers at war with Taranaki and Waikato Māori, while the free land grants turned out to be isolated hilly terrain covered in dense rain forest. With insufficient funds to invest in the development of farms or to support themselves until their farms could return income, the Puhoi Bohemian settlers depended on the help of local Māori. Krippner and nine other Bohemian men then
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joined the Waikato Militia, where they earned a regular income and were promised land in the Waikato, which, so they hoped, would be more fertile and easier to cultivate than the land they had been allocated at the Puhoi River.

By accepting the free land grants and joining the Waikato Militia, the Bohemian immigrants became unwitting agents of the colonisation process in New Zealand, as did Tauhia and his people by signing the deeds of sale and accepting compensation payments. Krippner and the Bohemian immigrants did not ask where the ‘free’ land came from and whether any special services to the colony were expected of them in return. Tauhia and other rangatira of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo concluded ‘local treaties’, as the historian Vincent O’Malley describes these types of deeds of sale, with representatives of the British Crown. This was even though the Crown had shown no intention of respecting a sovereign partnership between Māori and Pākehā, and indeed, appeared to nullify any such commitment, notably by passing the New Zealand Constitution Act of 1852 and by declaring war in the Taranaki region in 1860. Despite these setbacks, both Tauhia and Krippner were convinced that the current situation in New Zealand was safer and more prosperous than the times and places they had left behind.

The vulnerable situation of Tauhia and his hapū, and of Krippner and the Bohemian immigrants, was exploited by the colonial government for its land-grabbing agenda. My investigation of Krippner’s alleged ‘mercenary’ motives for encouraging his Bohemian compatriots to follow him to New Zealand reveals the colonial government’s plan to recruit 1000 German military settlers, who were to be placed in the bush along the frontier between British settlers and so-called ‘hostile’ Māori. This plan of bonded immigration, developed further in 1862 under the vice-regal leadership of Governor Sir George Grey, failed because the Hamburg shipping company J. C. Godeffroy and Son considered the proposed scheme as ‘selling emigrants or sending them into slavery’, and after initial interest, subsequently refused to cooperate.⁹ Martin Krippner’s family and the first two groups of Bohemian immigrants arrived in New Zealand as part of the Auckland Provincial Government’s plan of introducing German settlers under the

---

⁹ ‘Further Papers Relative to the Introduction of German Immigrants into New Zealand’, p. 17.
free land grant scheme as legislated for by the Auckland Waste Lands Act of 1858.

The choice of Puhoi as the location for the Bohemian settlement was probably based on a strategic decision by the Auckland Provincial Government to settle the Bohemian immigrants as a buffer between northern Māori and Auckland. It is also possible that the private economic interests of the Auckland Superintendent, Robert Graham, who had purchased the nearby Waiwera Hot Springs, also influenced the decision. To what extent Krippner was involved in the selection of such an isolated and densely forested terrain remains unclear. Perhaps he had envisaged a profitable market and rising land values in the neighbourhood of a flourishing spa town at Waiwera Hot Springs, similar to the spa towns in North Bohemia.

Evidence shows that Krippner never received any payment or other form of recognition for introducing the first Bohemian settlers to New Zealand. The accusations of mercenary motives inspiring Krippner to encourage his fellow Bohemians to come to New Zealand are thus proven incorrect. On the contrary, it was the Puhoi Bohemian community who asked Krippner to apply for the position as New Zealand’s German immigration agent so that he could help more Bohemians to migrate to New Zealand. Krippner’s application was not successful, and that special request by the Bohemian community has been ignored in historical accounts of Puhoi.

At the Kohimarama Conference in 1860, Governor Browne openly threatened to extinguish Māori ‘as a race’ should they resist British sovereignty in New Zealand. In response, Tauhia and all rangatira present at the conference confirmed their allegiance to the Crown. Tauhia was appointed a Native Assessor, and so assumed a role as an intermediary seeking to resolve conflicts both among Māori and between Māori and the Crown. In 1863 Krippner was commissioned captain in the Waikato Militia, although he and his Third Company of the Third Waikato Regiment kept away from armed combat during the Waikato War. Instead, Krippner and his company guarded Māori prisoners of war held on board the hulk Marion anchored in the Waitematā Harbour. Records show that Krippner fostered an environment on board the ship in which the Māori prisoners were treated with respect and human decency, an attitude for which he was ridiculed by the press and an Auckland satirist. Tauhia, meanwhile, helped the prisoners escape after
they were transferred to Kawau Island, and he subsequently acted as an intermediary between the fugitives and the New Zealand government. However, Tauhia’s and Krippner’s efforts to keep violent conflicts away from their people were soon forgotten because of Krippner’s allegedly dubious financial affairs and Tauhia’s sales of hapū land. While the detailed reconstruction of the events relating to the Māori prisoners of war, who were guarded on board the hulk Marion by Captain Martin Krippner and later assisted in their escape from Kawau Island by Te Hemara Tauhia, fills a gap in the images created of Tauhia and Krippner, it also points to aspects that hitherto have been neglected in historical accounts of the war in the Waikato.¹⁰

During his service in the Waikato Militia, Krippner accrued debts, especially after he was struck off pay, like all Waikato Militiamen, up to a year earlier than stipulated in their contracts with the New Zealand government. Krippner owed money to the government, but also to one of the German militiamen in his company. As a result, Krippner sold his entitlement to a land grant of 300 acres at Ohaupo in the Waikato to an affluent settler from Auckland, who offered to pay his debts. Investigating the circumstances of Krippner’s forced sale of his Ohaupo land serves as a case study illustrating the situation many Waikato militiamen and their families found themselves in after they were of no more use to the government’s and private speculators’ land grabbing agenda. The news of Krippner’s debts damaged his credibility and probably provoked allegations of embezzlement of other Bohemian settlers’ money. However, there is no evidence to support such allegations.

At the Native Land Court hearing in January 1866, the Waiwerawera/Puhoi Reserve was subdivided, and the resulting twelve blocks of land were allocated to individuals or small groups belonging to Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo, Ngāti Manu and Waikato. During the 1870s, Te Hemara Tauhia, his brother, and the Pomare brothers mortgaged and sold sections of the former reserve; whether they consulted the whole group and shared the proceeds from the sales is not known. However, because of official government papers recording Native Land Court

---

Judge Rogan’s remarks about Te Hemara Tauhia living in a neat European style house by 1867, and Wiremu Pomare’s critique of Tauhia for selling parts of the blocks without distributing the money among members of the hapū, official written documents have served henceforth as evidence for portraying Tauhia as a selfish rangatira. The fact that Te Hemara Tauhia, together with his friend and relative Paora Tuhaere, supported the Kotahitanga movement and was involved in the reconciliation process between the government and the Kīngitanga, was pushed aside or forgotten by descendants of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo and Ngāti Whātua. Perhaps the process of forgetting was accelerated because Tauhia had no surviving children. Further, no portrait of Te Hemara Tauhia was ever photographed or painted – unlike Paora Tuhaere, whose portrait, painted by the Bohemian-Czech artist Gottfried Lindauer (1839-1926), was exhibited just last year in Plzeň and Berlin.¹¹

Te Hemara Tauhia led his hapū in re-establishing themselves on former ancestral lands at the Puhoi River, and he continually argued with Crown officials and in the Native Land Court for the recognition of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo as owners of land sold to the Crown by other hapū. He promoted economic enterprises by setting up hapū-owned and operated coastal shipping and logging businesses. He helped the newly arrived Bohemian settlers and escaped Waikato prisoners of war in times of crisis. He fought for the recognition of a Māori Parliament operating alongside the Pākehā Parliament, and he was committed to a vision of Aotearoa New Zealand as a country where Māori and Pākehā would respect each other and live together in peace. All those actions bear witness to Te Hemara Tauhia’s qualities as a rangatira, leadership qualities that anthropologist Paul Tapsell describes as being ‘capable of weaving (ranga) together those with whom he or she travels (tira)’ and a capacity to ensure the well-being (manaakitanga) of his or her people.¹²

¹¹ Gottfried Lindauer, Paora Tuhaere, 1895, oil on canvas, Auckland Art Gallery Toi o Tāmaki; this painting was part of the exhibition Māori Portraits by Lindauer travelling to Berlin and Plzeň in 2015, see Auckland Art Gallery Toi o Tāmaki, Historic Māori Portraits Travel to the Czech Republic, <http://www.aucklandartgallery.com/page/historic-maori-portraits-travel-to-the-czech-republic> [accessed 20 October 2016].

Nevertheless, Tauhia’s power to protect his and his hapū’s mana over ancestral land was limited. While he and his hapū succeeded in asserting their mana over the so-called Waiwerawera/ Puhoi Reserve in the 1850s, most of the land constituting that area was alienated after the subdivision of the reserve by the Native Land Court in 1866. Tauhia and other members of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo then took out mortgages, and after failure to repay these loans were forced to sell more of their hapū land. In that respect, Tauhia and other rangatira failed in their roles as kaitiaki, which Tapsell defined as ‘ensuring the kin group perpetuates through the generations with customary authority (mana) over estates (whenua), people (kāinga) and ancestral treasures (taonga) intact if not enhanced.’

There is no evidence supporting the accusation that Te Hemara Tauhia led a ‘high life’ at the cost of his people. Tauhia used parts of the loans to pay for his whāngai son’s schooling and medical treatment; however, he and his hapū also took out loans to pay for court fees and fines imposed on other members of Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo.

Meticulous research and analysis of previously ignored primary sources reveal Te Hemara Tauhia’s and Martin Krippner’s complex and multifaceted lives, thereby contradicting the images currently upheld by descendants of Tauhia’s and Krippner’s relatives and communities. Both men’s life narratives touch upon themes ignored or mentioned only briefly in previous histories relating to nineteenth-century Aotearoa New Zealand and the Austrian Empire. In particular, they draw attention to the New Zealand Government’s scheme to introduce German military settlers; the hidden political agenda of the Austrian Novara expedition and the role of German scientists in propagating the idea of New Zealand as an ideal emigration destination; the affairs surrounding the Waikato prisoners of war held aboard the hulk Marion and their subsequent escape from Kawau Island; also coming into view are Ngāti Whātua’s trading and political relationships with Rarotonga during the 1860s and the inconsistent procedures and judgements and the methods of intimidating claimants during the Hauturu Native Land Court hearings. All these topics deserve to be further investigated and discussed in their own right.
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This cross-cultural dual biography gives voice to the two obscure men, Te Hemara Tauhia and Martin Krippner, and provides new insights into aspects of nineteenth-century Aotearoa New Zealand and the Austrian Empire, from both a Māori and a European-settler perspective. An even more complete picture of these geographical regions during that historical period may be obtained by investigating in detail, for example, how Tauhia’s sister, Makareta Kotare, his wife, Miriama Houkura, or his mother, Mereana Te Anini, and Krippner’s wife, Emily née Longdill, and his mother, Anna née Pallier, experienced war and its aftermath, migration, cross-cultural encounters, and how they dealt with infant deaths or childlessness. The search for any surviving primary sources telling about the lives of these nineteenth-century women would constitute a challenge; however, if their potential biographer is equipped with sociological and historical imagination ‘held tightly in check by the voices of the past’, such a cross-cultural group biography would add considerably to what this thesis seeks to achieve: telling localized de-centred histories within a global context.14

The third major aim of this thesis has been to contribute with its findings to a dialogue between Māori and Pākehā, in order to better understand our separate and entwined histories and the similarities and differences of each other’s culture. Such a dialogue took place during Puhoi’s 150th anniversary celebrations. The process of this research, which incorporated conversational interviews with descendants of relatives and contemporaries of Te Hemara Tauhia and Martin Krippner, and the presentation of research findings at a seminar and at international conferences, provided further impetus and opportunity to deepen such a discourse.

While previous biographical accounts accused Tauhia and Krippner of being selfish leaders rendered incapable by their personal flaws of creating ‘sustainable incomes’, this cross-cultural dual biography identifies that, to the contrary, it was the social, economic and political structures of colonisation and capitalism that provided the circumstances leading to Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo’s loss of ancestral lands and to the Bohemian settlers’ struggle in the midst of dense rain forest and subsequent enticement into the Waikato War. Tauhia’s and Te Kawerau/Ngāti Rongo’s generosity saved the Bohemian settlers from starvation;

14 Zemon Davis, The Return of Martin Guerre, p. 5.
Krippner’s and Tauhia’s diplomatic skills prevented violent conflicts that could have been triggered by the affairs surrounding the Waikato prisoners of war. Both men had great facility and potential as cultural envoys for a peaceful and prosperous coexistence that might have been. It is important to hold persons in leadership positions accountable for their actions; however, Father Silk and Paul Goldsmith, the authors of accounts portraying Te Hemara Tauhia and Martin Krippner as greedy, selfish leaders, may have used the two historical figures for hidden ideological agendas, and perhaps, they saw Tauhia and Krippner as scapegoats for moral dilemmas, both within the European and Māori community of the Puhoi region and beyond.

This thesis shows that when Māori and Pākehā show solidarity and join forces, they can resist political and economic exploitation which to this day threatens the peaceful coexistence of Māori, Pākehā and other ethnic groups in Aotearoa New Zealand.15 Discussing the lives and visions of Te Hemara Tauhia and Martin Krippner in the form of an exhibition at the Puhoi Bohemian Museum, or as a documentary or feature film, would reach a wider New Zealand and perhaps even global audience. Tauhia’s and Krippner’s names could be cleared of a century-and-a-half of false accusations, and their contributions to the Puhoi community and beyond might be honoured posthumously.

†††

15 For example, colonisation, economic and environmental exploitation are current in the form of the trade agreement TTPA or plans for deep-sea oil drilling off the coasts of New Zealand.
Appendix I: The Story of Captain Krippner and Otto von Bismarck

In 1878, a story of Captain Krippner sharing wine and cigars with Otto von Bismarck (1815 - 1898) appeared in the *Auckland Star* and in several other New Zealand daily newspapers.\(^1\) Regardless whether this anecdote is based on truth or fiction, it can be understood as a valuable example of Krippner’s love for storytelling which a New Zealand journalist turned into an entertaining article for the press. At the time of publication of this article, Bismarck had been raised to the rank of Prince and acted as Chancellor of the German Empire.

*Captain Krippner [sic], of Puhoi, Auckland, tells a good story about this distinguished Prussian. Whilst the captain was serving as an aide-de-camp in the Austrian staff many years ago, before the days of Sadowa, there was a field near Vienna, and the staff set out for the parade ground. One of the Austrian Princes leaped on the back of his splendid charger and dashed away at a gallop, leaving his staff far behind. Captain Krippner followed, and came up with a man in the uniform of a militia lieutenant, with a bullet-head, deep-set eyes, and a fierce moustache. The captain, then a first-class lieutenant, saluted the stranger, and offered him a cigar, which was courteously accepted. "You smoke a good cigar," remarked the lieutenant of militia, "now try one of mine." "Ah, brother," rejoined Lieutenant Krippner, "you say my cigar is a good one, but yours is much better." "Oh, I have thousands of them at my house," replied the militia man. The aide-de-camp was thunderstruck. How could a poor devil of a militia lieutenant afford to keep thousands of such splendid cigars as that?*

They rode on chatting pleasantly, but Lieutenant Kripner soon observed many other singular traits about the militiaman. He had a way of eliciting other people’s thoughts without disclosing his own, and he seemed to have almost everything at his fingers’ ends. When they reached the camp, Lieutenant Kripner was astonished at hearing a brother officer address the plain-looking lieutenant of militia as “Your Excellency.” He sought information: “Don’t you know who that is?” said the other, “why, he’s Von Bismarck, the new Ambassador from Berlin, and ‘der teufel’² for everything!” “Potztausend!”³ – claimed Lieutenant Kripner, “and I took him for a plain second class militia lieutenant.” He went and apologised to Bismarck, who, however, replied, “Do not apologise, my dear lieutenant; I always desire to be treated as a comrade. Come to my quarters after this affair is over, and we will crack a bottle over it.” Lieutenant Kripner went, and was astonished no less at the magnificence of the Ambassador’s salons than at the extraordinary flavour of his wines. They drank several bottles of Cliquot, and tasted other sorts; smoked cigars, chatted over the classics, art, war, politics, and scandal, and Lieutenant Kripner departed with one all-absorbing idea, viz, that if the new Ambassador were as good a diplomatist as he was a drinker, he was in a fair way of earning distinction.

² der Teufel – the devil
³ Potztausend! – Upon my soul!
Appendix II: Ethical Statement and Information Sheets for Interview Participants in English, Māori and German

Ethical Statement

During all stages of the research I adhere to the ethical standards set down by the University of Waikato and New Zealand Law. This study also complies with the Principles of Professional Responsibility and Ethical Conduct of the Association of Social Anthropologists of Aotearoa/New Zealand (ASAA/NZ), published on the association’s website http://www.asaanz.org/code-of-ethics/, and with the code of ethics of the National Oral History Association of New Zealand, published on-line http://www.oralhistory.org.nz/index.php/ethics-and-practice/. Oral participants in my research were provided in advance with an information sheet describing the project’s objectives and methodologies. Copies of the Information Sheet and the Consent Form are attached.

As a professional NAATI (National Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters) accredited translator, interpreter, and a member of the New Zealand Society of Translators and Interpreters (NZSTI), I also adhere to the professional code of ethics as published on the AUSIT website www.ausit.org and on the NZSTI website www.nzsti.org.
Information Sheet

Neighbours at Puhoi River: A Cross-Cultural Dual Biography of

Te Hemara Tauhia and Martin Krippner

Researcher: Anne Eddy

As a PhD student at the University of Waikato, I am conducting research to re-construct the biographies of the Rangatira, Te Hemara Tauhia (1815 – 1891), and Captain Martin Krippner (1817 – 1894). By placing both men’s life stories side-by-side, I attempt to take a fresh look at historical phenomena in nineteenth century New Zealand as well as in the Austrian Empire. It is not the intention of this study to judge or justify either man’s actions. Rather, my project asks: what factors led to their decisions and what choices did they – and their people – have at that particular time?

Interviews

In addition to archival research, I wish to talk to descendents of relatives and contemporaries of Te Hemara Tauhia and Martin Krippner in order to find out what is remembered today about these two fascinating and controversial historical figures. The interviews will take the form of informal conversations, where we share information about the history of the Puhoi and Ohaupo regions in general, and about the lives of Te Hemara Tauhia and Martin Krippner in particular. The interviews will take place on locations most suitable for participants. With the participants’ consent, I will audio-record the interviews.

What are your rights as participants?

If you agree to participate in my research, you have the right to:

- Remain anonymous so that any information you share is not linked to your name;
- Refuse to answer any particular question(s);
- Decline to be audio recorded and request that the recorder be turned off at any time;
- Request a copy of the transcript of the interview;
- Request that any material be erased or added;
- Ask any questions about the research at any time during your participation;
- Request to receive a copy of my findings of the research.
Storage and access to recorded materials

Should you agree to record the interviews, I will store all digital audio-recordings and transcripts both on my private computer and on the computer provided by the University of Waikato. Both computers are secured with regularly changing passwords and will be accessible only by me. The period for storing non-identifying data is five years. After that period, all audio-recordings and transcripts will be deleted or, with your expressed permission, stored indefinitely by the University of Waikato or in public archives, such as the Puhoi Bohemian Museum & Archive of the Puhoi Historical Society. You can decide in which archive the records will be stored. If you wish to remain anonymous, I will ensure that any information you provide cannot be linked to your name.

The Results

The results of this research will be used for my doctoral thesis. The completed thesis will be printed in the form of hard bound copies, and one digital copy will be accessible online. The findings may also be used in presentations and journal articles, and perhaps in other publications such as a book. One hard bound copy of the thesis and any derivative publication will be added to the collection at the Puhoi Bohemian Museum & Archive of the Puhoi Historical Society.

The Researcher

Born in Saxony, former East-Germany, I obtained the degree of Diplom-Sociologist at the Free University of Berlin in 1997. After moving to New Zealand in 1998, I worked as a German-English translator and interpreter. In 2010 I have completed a Bachelor of Arts in Te Reo Māori at the University of Waikato, including studies in Tikanga Māori, New Zealand history and cultural anthropology. In 2013 I have been granted a doctoral scholarship from the University of Waikato to carry out research regarding the lives of Te Hemara Tauhia and Martin Krippner in order to write a cross-cultural biography.

Anne Eddy, 4 Howell Avenue, Hamilton 3216, Telephone: +64 (0)7 856 5258  Mobile: +64 (0)21 045 8980, Email: anneeddy.translator@gmail.com

This research project has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. Any questions about the ethical conduct of this research may be sent to the Secretary of the Committee, email fass-ethics@waikato.ac.nz, postal address, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Te Kura Kete Aronui, University of Waikato, Te Whare Wananga o Waikato, Private Bag 3105, Hamilton 3240.
He Mōhiohio E Pā Ana Ki Te Rangahau Nei
Ko Te Hemara Tauhia rāua ko Martin Krippner:
He Kūrero Haurongo Taurua e Whakawhitī Tikanga-ā-Iwi ana

He ākonga tohu kairanga ahau ki Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato, ā, ka pīrangihau ahau ki te rangahau i ngā haurongo o te rangatira Te Hemara Tauhia (1815 – 1891) rāua ko te kāpene Martin Krippner (1817 – 1894) hei whakamārama i ētahi o ngā āhuratanga o te hītori o Aotearoa, o Ateria hoki. Kāore te rangahau i te whakatika, i te whakahē rānei i ngā mahi tautohenga o Te Hemara Tauhia rāua ko Martin Krippner. Otirā, ka pātai ahau: he aha ngā take o rāua mahi nei, ā, ko eheangā momo ara e wātea ana ki ngā tāngata whenua, ki ngā Pākeha hoki e noho ana i Aotearoa i roto i te rautau tekau mā iwa.

Ko ngā Uuiunga

I tua atu i te mahi rangahau i roto i te whare pukapuka me te rua mahara, ka pīrangihau ahau ki te kōrero ki ngā uri o Te Hemara Tauhia rāua ko Martin Krippner, ki ngā uri o ngā tāngata e noho ana i tā rāua taha hoki. Ko te pātai he aha ngā maumaharatanga e pā ana ki ēnei tāngata, e pā ana ki ā rāua mahi tautohenga hoki. Ko te āhuratanga o ngā ūuiuinga he ārīte ki ngā kōreroreo o ia rā, arā, ka whakawhitihina whakaaro tātou e pā ana ki ngā tāngata e rua me te hītori o te rohe o Puhoi, o Kaipara, o Ohaupo (Waikato) rānei. Kei a koe te whakataunga kei hea te ūuiuinga. Mēnā ka whakaae koe, ka mauhanga au i te kōrero nei ki te mihini hopu reo.

Ko tō Mana e pā ana ki te Rangahau

Mēnā ka whakaae koe ki te whai wāhi ki te ūuiuinga, kei a koe te mana:

- ki te whakatau he ingoakore te ūuiuinga nei, arā, kāore he hononga o tō ingia ki te ūuiuinga;
- ki te whakakore whakautu ki ētahi o ngā pātai nei;
- ki te whakakore te mauhanga i te kōrero nei ki te mihini hopu reo, ā, ka taea e koe te whakamutunga i te ūuiuinga i ngā wā katoa;
- ki te hiahia i tētahi puka o te ūuiuinga;
- ki te ūkui i tētahi kōrero, ki te āpiti rānei;
- ki te pātai i ngā pātai e pā ana ki te rangahau i ngā wā katoa;
- ki te hiahia i tētahi puka o ngā hua o te rangahau nei.
Ko te Rokiroki rāua ko the Mana ki te Pānui i ngā Uuiuinga

Mēnā ka whakaae koe ki te mauhanga i te uuiuinga nei ki te mihini hopu reo, ka rokiroki au i ngā mauhanga o ngā uuiuinga i roto i tāku rorohiko kei tōku whare, kei tōku tari i te Whare Wānanga o Waikato hoki. Nō tētahi kupu muna e mōhiotia me panonitia ana e ahau anake, ko au anake ka taea te whakamahi i ngā rorohika e rua. Ko te wā rokiroki mō ngā kōrero muna ingoakore he rima tau. I muri i tēnā, ka ūkuina i ngā mauhanga katoa. Mēnā i whakaae koe ki te rokiroki i te mauhanga o te uuiuinga mō te wā heke mai nei, e rokirokitia ana te uuiuinga kei roto i Te Whāre Wānanga o Waikato, kei roto i Te Whare Tāonga o Puhoi, kei roto i tētahi atu whare pukapuka o Aotearoa rānei. Kei a koe te whakataunga kei hea e rokirokitia te uuiuinga. Mēnā ka hiahia koe he ingoakore te uuiuinga nei, ka ūkuina ngā hononga katoa o tō ingia ki te uuiuinga.

Te Hua o te Rangahau

Ka whakamahia ngā hua o te rangahau nei hei tāku tuhinga whakapae. Ka whakakawenatatia te tuhinga whakapae, ā, ka pānuitia i runga i te ipurangi. Ka whakamahia pea hoki ngā hua o te rangahau i roto i ētahi whakaatu-ā-waha, i ngā pukapuka putaputa, i ngā pukapuka hoki. Ka āpititia kotahi puka o te tuhinga whakapae me o ētahi o ngā pukapuka ki roto i te Whare Taonga o Puhoi.

Ko te Kairangahau

I whānau mai ai u Saxony, tētahi rohe o Tiamani-ki-te-Rāwhiti. I te tau 1997, i whiwhi mai ai u i te tohu paerua i te akoranga Mātauranga Hapori i te Freie Universität Berlin, arā, te whare wānanga o Perini. I muri i tāku hekenga ki Aotearoa in te tau 1998, ka mahi ahau hei kaiwhakawhiti-reo-ā-tuhi, -ā-waha hoki. I te tau 2010, i whiwhi mai ai u i te tohu paetahi i Te Reo Māori i te Whare Wānanga o Waikato. I ako au hoki i ngā ahuatanga o te tikanga Māori, te hītori o Aotearoa me te mātauranga tikanga tangata. I te tau 2013, i whiwhi mai ai u i tētahi karahipi o te Whare Wānanga o Waikato kia rangahau i ngā kōrero haurongo o Te Hemara Tauhia rāua ko Martin Krippner.

E whakaaetia tēnei rangahau e te Human Research Ethics Committee o Te Kura Kete Aronui. Mēnā he pātai e pā ana ki te ara tika o te rangahau nei, tuhia atu koa i ngā pātai ki te Secretary of the Committee, wāhi īmera fass-ethics@waikato.ac.nz, wāhi noho, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Te Kura Kete Aronui, University of Waikato, Te Whare Wananga o Waikato, Private Bag 3105, Kirikiriroa 3240.
Informationsblatt

Te Hemara Tauhia und Martin Krippner: Eine kulturübergreifende Doppelbiographie

Forscherin: Anne Eddy


Interviews

Was sind Ihre Rechte als Interviewteilnehmer/in?

Sollten Sie der Teilnahme an diesem Interview zustimmen, haben Sie das Recht:
- anonym zu bleiben, so dass keine der von Ihnen mitgeteilten Informationen mit Ihrem Namen in Verbindung gebracht werden können;
- die Beantwortung einer Frage abzulehnen;
- die digitale Aufzeichnung des Interviews abzulehnen, oder jederzeit das Ausschalten des Rekorder zu verlangen;
- eine Kopie des Transkripts zu erhalten und die Löschung oder das Hinzufügen von Informationen zu verlangen;
- während des Interviews weitere Fragen zu stellen;
- eine Kopie der Forschungsergebnisse zu erhalten.
Speicherung und Zugriff auf aufgenommenes Material

Forschungsergebnisse

Über die Forscherin

Dieses Forschungsprojekt wurde von der Ethikkommission des Fachbereiches Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften (Human Research Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences) befürwortet. Sämtliche Fragen bezüglich des ethischen Verhaltens in diesem Forschungsprojekt richten Sie bitte an die Sekretärin der Kommission, E-Mail fass-ethics@waikato.ac.nz, Postadresse: Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Te Kura Kete Aronui, University of Waikato, Te Whare Wananga o Waikato, Private Bag 3105, Hamilton 3240.
Appendix III: Participant Consent Form

English

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

[A completed copy of this form should be retained by both the researcher and the participant]

Description of Project: This research seeks to re-conduct the biographies of two fascinating and controversial historical figures, the Ranger, Te Rerema Tawhia (1815 – 1891), and Captain Martin Kriperer (1817 – 1894). Placing both men's biographies side-by-side enables a fresh look at historical phenomena in nineteenth century New Zealand as well as in the Austrian Empire. It is not the intention of this study to judge or to justify either man's actions. Rather, the project asks what factors led to their decisions and what choices did they – and their people – had at that particular time.

Name of person interviewed: ______________________________________

Contact details: ________________________________________________

Please complete the following checklist. Tick [✓] the appropriate box for each point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have received a copy of the Information Sheet describing the research project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to participate in this interview.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that I can decline to answer any particular question.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that I can ask any further questions about the research that occur to me during my participation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that I can stop the interview at any time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consent to this interview being recorded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that I can ask to have the recorder turned off at any time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish to remain anonymous.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recorded interview can be stored indefinitely (*Please cross out what is not applicable.)

* by the University of Waikato
* by the Kinoi Bherman Museum & Archive of the Kinoi Historical Society
* or in any other public archive in Australia

I understand that I retain ownership of my interview.

I agree that the information/images/manuscripts I provide can be used for the purposes of the research as outlined in the Information Sheet. (*Please cross out what is not applicable.)

I wish to receive a copy of the findings.

Participant: ___________________________ Researcher: Anne Edly
Signature: ___________________________ Signature: ___________________________
Date: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
Māori

HE WHAKAAE A TE KAIURU

[Me takī te kaiangahau ōia koe te kaiuru i tētahi tūru o tāne puka]

Ko te kaupapa o te rangahau nei: Ka pīrangi ahu kū te rangahau i ngā heuranga o te rangatira Te Heman Tauhia (1815 – 1891), ūia ko te kāpene Martin Krippner (1817 – 1844) nei whakamārama i tētahi o ngā whakaranga o te Hitoro o Aoteaora, o Akari hoki. Kāore te rangahau i te whakahatia, i te whakaakitía, i te whakahū tūria i ngā mahi o Te Heman Tauhia. Ūia ko kātunui Krippner, ātea, ka pāhai ahu kū aha ngā takake o rauamahia nei, tī ko te tua ngā momo ara e wātea ana ki ngā tīngata whenua, ki ngā Pāteha hoki o noho ana i Aoteaora i runga te turutu tēmatu mai rūnui.

Ko te ingoa o te kaiuru: ____________________________

Ko te wāhi noho me te nama waia: ____________________________

Tohusa [“”] te katoa o raro nei e hāngai ana ki a koe

I whakahiutia te kupu Whakamārama o te kaupapa o te rangahau nei:

Ka whakata ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?

Kī te mōhio ahu kū te uru mai kī te ulunga?
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Glossary of Māori, German and Czech Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Māori</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>atua</td>
<td>god</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aukati</td>
<td>border, boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hahunga</td>
<td>ceremony for uplifting bones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haka</td>
<td>posture dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hākari</td>
<td>feast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hapū</td>
<td>tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He Whakaputanga</td>
<td>The Declaration of Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hoe</td>
<td>paddle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hui</td>
<td>meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iwi</td>
<td>confederation of tribes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaiako</td>
<td>teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāinga</td>
<td>settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaitiaki</td>
<td>protector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaiwhakawā</td>
<td>native assessor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karakia</td>
<td>ritualistic chant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaumatua, kaumātua</td>
<td>elder, elders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāwanatanga</td>
<td>governorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kīngitanga</td>
<td>Māori King movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kōiwi</td>
<td>bones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>korowai</td>
<td>Māori cloak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kotare</td>
<td>name of Kingfisher bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mana</td>
<td>power, authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>māra</td>
<td>cultivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matua kēkē</td>
<td>uncle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mokopuna</td>
<td>grandchild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngeri</td>
<td>action song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nikau</td>
<td>palm tree in NZ forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nikau whare</td>
<td>palm hut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ōhaki</td>
<td>dying speech, will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pā</td>
<td>fortress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patere</td>
<td>abusive song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pōwhiri</td>
<td>ceremonial welcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puhi</td>
<td>a virgin maiden of rangatira descent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
pukapuka ōhaki
written form of ōhaki
pūtake
reason, cause
rangatira
leader
rata
here: doctor
rūnanga
committee
taiha
fighting staff
tangata tauhou
strangers
tangata whenua
local people, indigenous people
tangi
funeral
tapu
sacred, prohibited, restricted
taua
war expedition
taurekareka
slave
Te Tiriti o Waitangi
The Treaty of Waitangi
teina, pl. tēina
younger sibling or cousin of same gender
tohu tapu
distinctive mark
tohunga
here: healer
tuakana, pl. tuākana
older sibling or cousin of same gender
tupuna, pl. tūpuna
ancestor
tūtūā
commoner
umu
earth oven
urupā
cemetery
utu
revenge, cost
wāhi tapu
sacred place
waiata aroha
love song
waipirau
alcohol
wairua
spirit
waka
canoe
whakapapa
genecology
whānau
family
whāngai
adoptive children
whare parameta
parliament building
whare rūnanga
meeting house
wharenui
meeting house
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bier- and Branntweinzwang</td>
<td>Compulsory Purchase of Beer and Brandy Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundesheer</td>
<td>German Federal Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundestag</td>
<td>Federal Diet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduite-Liste</td>
<td>officer evaluation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutscher Bund</td>
<td>German Confederation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourier</td>
<td>quartermaster sergeant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frondienst</td>
<td>unpaid labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
<td>grammar school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Häusler</td>
<td>cottagers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaufschilling</td>
<td>purchase price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Königlich Preußischer Roter</td>
<td>Prussian Order of the Red Eagle Fourth Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adler Orden 4. Klasse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leibeigenschafts-Aufhebungspatent</td>
<td>Abolition of Serfdom Decree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oberleutnant</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophische Lehranstalt</td>
<td>philosophical institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religionsfond</td>
<td>Religious Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trivialschule</td>
<td>elementary national school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unterleutnant 2. Klasse</td>
<td>second lieutenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unterleutnant 1. Klasse</td>
<td>second lieutenant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Czech</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>karabáčnik</td>
<td>farm manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>robota</td>
<td>unpaid labour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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