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MAORI AND PAKEHA AT TE AROHA: THE CONTEXT: 2: MAORI IN HAURAKI IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Abstract: After the arrival of Europeans, the Maori population of Hauraki suffered a rapid decline. Some rangatira opposed Pakeha ways, whereas others adopted these for their personal benefit. Keeping ‘the peace of Hauraki’ required government agents to intervene in various disputes between hapu (Ngati Hako in particular causing concern in the 1870s and early 1880s). Although rangatira had links to both Queen Victoria and King Tawhiao, the government was relieved that most remained ‘loyal’ to the new order, and only an intransigent minority opposed the spread of ‘civilisation’ through its roads, telegraph, and the snagging of the Waihou River. A liking for Pakeha goods encouraged collaboration, with Maori joining the cash economy through their involvement in road making, gum digging, and European agriculture to raise money for, in part, traditional gatherings that for a while were more lavish than earlier possible.

Maori of all ranks were quick to stand up for their rights by using the court system, reminding Pakeha of the Treaty of Waitangi, and, in some cases, violence. Tensions were eased by Maori socializing with Pakeha in sport, horse racing, and even the Volunteers, but drinking together in hotels could result in fights, and the lure of alcohol had to be countered by temperance movements. A few Maori children attended school, with Pakeha, and for a time the government provided a (free) doctor and vaccinated them against smallpox (though some preferred traditional ‘cures’ for other ailments). For most, living conditions remained poor. Criminal behaviour was of a minor nature. Christianity had to compete with old beliefs (notably in maketu), newer ones such as ‘Hauhauism’, and by the later years of the century the popularity of the Mormons.

Examples are included of intermarriage, ‘half-castes’, and Pakeha Maori, all being notable features of the time. In a variety of ways, Maori society was sufficiently resilient to adapt and thereby to survive the impact of Pakeha settlement, which produced massive changes and dominated the region well before the end of the century.

HOW MANY MAORI?
One historian has estimated that, during the first 50 years of Pakeha settlement, the number of Hauraki Maori halved.\footnote{W.H. Oliver, ‘The Social and Economic Situation of Hauraki Maori after Colonisation’, in Hauraki Maori Trust Board, \textit{The Hauraki Treaty Claim} (Paeroa, 1997), vol. 10, p. 58.} The census taken in March 1874 gave a total of 1,420 Ngati Maru, mostly living in Hauraki.\footnote{Results of a Census of the Colony of New Zealand Taken for the Night of the 1st of March, 1874 (Wellington, 1875), p. 276.} That taken in March 1878 of Ngati Maru living in Hauraki produced a total of 1,598. As with the other censuses, this included children, plus 40 half-castes living with the tribe.\footnote{Results of a Census of the Colony of New Zealand Taken for the Night of the 3rd of March, 1878 (Wellington, 1880), p. 354.} Three years later, the number living at Thames was 1,227 (some lived in Auckland and at Taupo, on the other side of the firth).\footnote{Results of a Census for the Colony of New Zealand, Taken for the Night of the 3rd of April, 1881 (Wellington, 1882), p. 310.} When the next census was taken, in 1886, the \textit{Thames Advertiser} feared it would reveal that Ngati Maru and neighbouring tribes had ‘diminished in numbers to an alarming degree’. It blamed depopulation on the ‘adoption of European vices’, which had caused the birth rate to fall ‘almost to nothing. The decay of a noble race is obviously a mere matter of time’.\footnote{Thames Advertiser, 13 February 1886, p. 3.} Later that year, the newspaper repeated that Maori seemed ‘to be fast disappearing. Yesterday, a fine little girl, a daughter of Hemi Watene,\footnote{See \textit{Thames Advertiser}, 8 July 1875, p. 3, 20 October 1876, p. 3, 11 June 1878, p. 3; \textit{Thames Star}, 30 April 1887, p. 2; not an investor in Te Aroha mining.} aged nine years, and last week one two years old died at Kupata, near Kirikiri. The race may, indeed, be compared to a candle being burned at both ends’, with the old people dying and ‘the frequent deaths of children, of which we hear so often’.\footnote{Thames Advertiser, 16 September 1886, p. 2.} The following month, Henry Dunbar Johnson,\footnote{See paper on Lavinia and Henry Dunbar Johnson.} an Ohinemuri correspondent for this paper, reported that, ‘as far as this district is concerned, the native race is dying out fast. When I first came here, eleven years ago, both banks of the Ohinemuri River, from the junction’ with the Waihou ‘to Mackaytown were fully lined with whares, swarming with natives, and now there’s scarcely a stick left’.\footnote{Ohinemuri Correspondent, \textit{Thames Advertiser}, 28 October 1886, p. 2.}
The 1886 census recorded 1,580 Ngati Maru. Members of all tribes living in Thames County totalled 1,222, in Ohinemuri County 484, and in Piako County 518. The 1891 census recorded 1,349 Ngati Maru, and the number of all Maori living in the three counties was 844 for Thames, 512 for Ohinemuri, and 846 for Piako. Five years later, there were 1,202 Ngati Maru, and 1,010 Maori lived in Thames, 483 in Ohinemuri, and 291 in Piako. In 1901, there were 692 Ngati Maru, and the number of Maori in Thames was 774, Ohinemuri 630, and Piako 409. These figures indicated both a notable decline by the twentieth century and considerable mobility. The Thames Advertiser explained an increase in the number of Maori living within the Auckland provincial district in 1878 to migration from places where they were not ‘treated with such respect or consideration’. The validity of the claim that Maori were treated in this way will be one of the main themes considered in this chapter. As in the chapter on Pakeha attitudes to Maori, all named individuals, both Maori and Pakeha, were shareholders in claims in the Te Aroha Mining District unless otherwise noted.

THE VIEWS OF AN ‘OLD SCHOOL’ RANGATIRA

George Thomas Wilkinson, Native Agent for Hauraki and then Waikato and the King Country, through his close personal contacts with Maori sympathized with their position in a settler society, which he usually considered to be superior to late nineteenth century Maori society. In his annual report for 1884 he recorded the death of Te Hira Te Tuiri, who ‘on

---

10 Results of a Census for the Colony of New Zealand Taken for the Night of the 28th of March, 1886 (Wellington, 1887), pp. 360, 364.
11 Results of a Census for the Colony of New Zealand Taken for the Night of the 5th of April, 1891 (Wellington, 1892), pp. xlvi, li.
12 Results of a Census for the Colony of New Zealand Taken for the Night of the 12th of April, 1896 (Wellington, 1896), pp. 133-134.
13 Results of a Census for the Colony of New Zealand Taken for the Night of the 31st of March, 1901 (Wellington, 1902), pp. xli, xlvii-xlviii.
14 Editorial, Thames Advertiser, 16 November 1878, p. 2.
15 See paper on Merea Wikiriwhi and George Thomas Wilkinson.
16 See New Zealand Herald, 13 November 1883, p. 5; Bay of Plenty Times, 17 November 1883, p. 2.
account of his great rank and position’ had been able to keep Ohinemuri closed to mining from 1868 to 1875:

He was a most consistent chief of the old school, and considered more the benefit of the Maoris as a race than that of individuals, and his impression always was that the two races were so differently constituted, and their manners and customs were of such a different nature, that what was beneficial to one was detrimental to the other; hence his idea of the necessity of keeping them as far apart as possible. And he was not alone in that idea; the majority of old Natives who have had experience in the matter, and are entitled to speak (and not a few Europeans also), are of the same way of thinking. When Te Hira found that he was not able any longer to resist the wishes of his people, he reluctantly gave in; but, in order that he might not take any further part in what he considered would end disastrously to his people, he left Ohinemuri.17

Probably only a minority of Maori were reluctant to change, and force of circumstances meant this minority had to adopt new ways and abandon old ones.

“THE FEELING OF THE NATIVES TOWARDS THE GOVERNMENT”18

When annual reports from ‘Native Officers’ were first published in 1872, this was the first point that the Native Office required Edward Walter Puckey, the first native agent at Thames, to report on.19 This ‘feeling’ had always been of great concern, as illustrated by a visit by George Clarke, Protector of Aborigines, to ‘the Thames’ and Waikato in December 1840. His came to visit ‘the chiefs of that district, and as far as possible to counteract the ill feelings of the natives towards the Government, arising from their natural jealousy, and strengthened and encouraged by designing men’;20 clearly the latter were Pakeha. At the site of the future Thames goldfield,

17 G.T. Wilkinson to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 14 May 1884, AJHR, 1884, G-1, p. 13.
18 E.W. Puckey to Native Minister, 9 July 1872, AJHR, 1872, F-3, p. 6.
19 E.W. Puckey to Native Minister, 9 July 1872, AJHR, 1872, F-3, p. 6.
20 George Clarke, ‘Report of his Visit to the Thames and Waikato’, n.d. [early 1841], appended to Sir George Gipps to Lord John Russell, 7 March 1841, British
I visited the chiefs at Kawaranga [Kauaeranga], to correct the information generally in circulation amongst them, that the plans of Government are inimical to the welfare of the natives, and will ultimately prove the means of their destruction. This principle seems deeply rooted and widely disseminated around.\textsuperscript{21}

Clarke gave several examples of leading rangatira who feared government policy meant the loss of their land, rightly, for Clarke was assessing its suitability for purchasing for farming.\textsuperscript{22} He concluded by giving a very positive assessment of Maori adjusting to new ways, but repeated that peace and harmony depended on government policy:

The rapid advancement the natives are making in civilization, will appear not only from the extent of their cultivations, but from the fact, that there is scarce a village through which we passed that has not its village school and chapel; and in every place the sanctity of the Sabbath [was] strictly observed. There is a thirst for reading, and continued applications for books. In the Thames and Waikato there are several thousand natives who can and are being taught to read and write. Great crimes are rarely heard of, but from among those who tenaciously adhere to their native and heathen prejudices. Wars have generally ceased, and cannibalism is spoken of with abhorrence. The very intelligent remarks that are continuously made, show them to be a people far removed from that barbarism which interested and designing men have represented them to be in, and in which it might be convenient to place them. Their sober, orderly, respectful, and faithful habits too plainly show that there is more excellence in them than there is to be found in the bulk of our own countrymen.

After repeating that Maori were ‘capable of high moral and intellectual attainments’ he repeated that their ‘apprehensions’ about the future were ‘too apparent from every communication and converse held with them’. Indeed, ‘one rash, injudicious step, and the whole country is involved in trouble and ruin’.\textsuperscript{23}


\textsuperscript{21} Clarke, p. 443.

\textsuperscript{22} Clarke, pp. 441, 443-445, 448.

\textsuperscript{23} Clarke, p. 448.
Several ‘rash’ and ‘injudicious’ steps did ensue, leading to warfare in several parts of the North Island. Hauraki Maori feared war spreading into their district, and in the first half of 1867 James Mackay, Civil Commissioner for Hauraki, helped to prevent this by getting hapu to agree to keep the peace – and thereby, he and they understood, avoiding having their land confiscated.²⁴ In 1872, Puckey reported that the attitude of Hauraki Maori to the government was steadily improving; the firm and conciliating policy which has been carried out through the whole Colony has born good fruit....

Those who three years ago were rabid Hauhaus, jealous of the name of Queen or Government, appear now to be only waiting a fit and proper opportunity of gracefully relinquishing their adherence to the King party.²⁵

In the subsequent year, because the ‘distrust as to the intentions of the Government’ was ‘passing away in this district’, Maori were spending less time at ‘useless political meetings’.²⁶ His 1874 report described the feeling as ‘highly satisfactory’, for even the few Hauhau and ‘avowedly King Natives’ were ‘in the main quietly and peaceably disposed’. The visit by the new Governor and the meeting he attended at Taipari’s house had ‘left a most favourable impression amongst the Natives generally’.²⁷ The following year Puckey stated that ‘but few’ did not ‘owe allegiance to the Queen and her laws, and who would not yield ready obedience to a summons from the Resident Magistrate’s Court’.²⁸

In 1878, Puckey reported that the formation of Sir George Grey’s government, in which Hoani Nahe,²⁹ a rangatira of Ngati Maru, was a

²⁶ E.W. Puckey to Native Minister, 30 April 1873, *AJHR*, 1873, G-1, p. 3.
²⁷ E.W. Puckey to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 29 May 1874, *AJHR*, 1874, G-2, p. 4.
²⁸ E.W. Puckey to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 16 June 1876, *AJHR*, 1876, G-1, p. 21.
²⁹ See *Cyclopedia of New Zealand*, vol. 1 (Wellington, 1897), p. 79; *Thames Advertiser*, 11 February 1891, p.2; *New Zealand Herald*, 21 May 1894, p. 5; he did not invest in Te Aroha mining.
minister, had afforded 'much gratification', for Maori expected 'much good to follow'. While Te Kooti and his wife had been proselytizing for their faith, Puckey did not attach any ‘political significance’ to their efforts, as the Hauraki tribes were ‘unmistakably loyal’. Nevertheless, Hauhauism was gaining new converts.30 There was no change in the following year. ‘All sections of the Hauraki people’ excepting those living at Te Komata, Mataora (on the coast), and Piako were, ‘as they have been for years past, quite amenable to British law’. Although the ‘Hauhau section’ included ‘men of considerable influence and singular force of character’, they were ‘but a small minority’, and he anticipated that in ‘a few years’ they would ‘become weary of their self-imposed, though partial, isolation’.31 In 1880, he judged that most Maori were ‘very favourably disposed towards’ Sir John Hall’s new government. After listing the Hauraki rangatira ‘of the highest rank and prestige’ who had died since 1869 and who ‘had great influence for good, and inculcated friendliness to the pakeha during the younger days of the colony’, he regretted that their successors either did not ‘have the same influence for good’ or did ‘not appear to exercise it’.32

Wilkinson, in his 1882 report, stated that despite their low levels of drunkenness and crime, Hauraki Maori were

by no means the unoffending or easy-to-deal-with sort of people that a stranger would be led to suppose. The number of tribes in the district, their different politics, their numerous religious faiths, and last, but not least, their petty jealousies, make them by no means an easy people to manage; so that, taking the district as a whole, it is, if I may use the simile, like a ship which, although not having one large leak that endangers her safety, still has such a number of small ones occasionally bursting out that continued attention is required to keep them stopped.

Despite this, in the past two years every difficulty had been ‘got over by prompt attention’. He claimed that the ‘considerable number of Hauraki natives’ who had attended a King meeting did so ‘more out of curiosity and amusement than anything else’, with the exception of Ngati Hako and some

30 E.W. Puckey to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 3 June 1878, AJHR, 1878, G-1A, p. 1.
31 E.W. Puckey to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 26 June 1879, AJHR, 1879, G-1, p. 14.
32 E.W. Puckey to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 29 May 1880, AJHR, 1880, G-4, p. 5.
Ngati Paoa and Ngati Tamatera. This meeting was to Wilkinson ‘a curious instance of the force of example’:

As is usual at those meetings, everything that was said and done, both by visitors as well as Tawhiao’s own people, was to his acknowledgment and glorification as Maori King, and some of the tribes handed over their lands into his keeping, which meant that roads, railways, and surveys, also sales and leases, were not to be allowed in connection with them. This action rather put the Hauraki delegates into the proverbial “corner,” as nearly all their lands are already sold. However, not to be outdone in generosity, they, or some of them, handed over Te Aroha, Moehau, and Waikawau Blocks, within the Hauraki District, to Tawhiao, and thereby relieved their consciences of the fear of being behind-hand with their brother visitors in generosity and admiration for their so-called King. When I state that these three blocks had already been sold and conveyed to the Crown, the grimness of the joke will, I think, be apparent; and it is to be hoped, for the sake of the givers, that Tawhiao was ignorant at the time as to who was the real owner of these lands.³³

In June 1883 he reported that Maori had conducted themselves in ‘a peaceable and matter-of-fact way’.³⁴

King Tawhiao constantly sought support in Hauraki, but mostly received no more than lip service. And when he held a meeting with leading rangatira in Auckland in 1884, the first toast was to ‘the health of the Queen and King’, to which he made no objection;³⁵ by then rangatira sympathetic to his concerns about Pakeha encroachment were realistic about their situation. When he visited Thames in January 1886, the Thames Advertiser commented that the ‘Kingite element’ was ‘a decided minority amongst the Hauraki tribes’.³⁶ Yet at Thames and Ohinemuri most Maori were willing to sign his petition to the Queen and to acknowledge his mana.³⁷ In 1892, the Ohinemuri Gazette regretted that Maori in that district were ‘taking up the “King” movement strongly’, for

³³ G.T. Wilkinson to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 17 May 1882, AJHR, 1882, G-1, p. 3.
³⁴ G.T. Wilkinson to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 11 June 1883, AJHR, 1883, G-1, p. 6.
³⁵ Thames Advertiser, 14 February 1884, p. 3.
³⁷ Thames Advertiser, 13 February 1886, p. 2.
that would mean that the next hearing of the land court would 'be a failure'.

Tawhiao's son was welcomed in Ohinemuri in 1895 with Pakeha-influenced festivities, as the Te Aroha newspaper noted:

The Paeroa natives are still holding a festival in honour of King Mahuta's visit, and special dancing in front of His Majesty is indulged in. The whole affair is out of the common, one of the special features being the dancing of a number of Maori maidens, dressed in white, to a violin and accordion accompaniment, also the dancing performance of about twelve young native men, representing minstrels.

ATTITUDE TO PAKEHA

Kerry Howe argued, in 1973, that 'for too long' Maori had 'been considered the passive agents in the face of Western impact', for they played a 'positive role' in 'the contact situation'. Certainly in Hauraki, Maori were anything but passive and responded in a variety of ways to Pakeha settlers, who could never be sure that their response might not be forceful.

According to Puckey, in 1872 Maori were 'just so far advanced in civilization as to make them aware' of 'certain advantages' of 'becoming members of a community with their pakeha neighbours, yet at the same time they are unwilling to give up their natural rights, and share with their pakeha friends the privileges of society'. Three years later, 'all the professedly Hauhau' had 'entirely broken through that rigid exclusiveness which so long kept them aloof from free intercourse with their Pakeha neighbours'. In 1877, he judged that as the 'old chiefs' were 'passing away into another state of being', their successors either viewed or were 'likely to view the rapid progress of the European race with less jealous eyes'.

---

38 Ohinemuri Gazette, 22 February 1892, p. 4.
39 Te Aroha News, 29 June 1895, p. 2.
41 E.W. Puckey to Native Minister, 9 July 1872, AJHR, 1872, F-3, p. 6.
42 E.W. Puckey to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 28 May 1875, AJHR, 1875, G-1B, p. 1.
43 E.W. Puckey to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 8 June 1877, AJHR, 1877, G-1, p. 4.
In 1881, in referring to the ‘considerable number’ of Maori and Pakeha who were gum digging, Wilkinson was ‘glad to be able to say that, notwithstanding their continually being thrown into each other’s presence, in the wilds of the forest, no act of violence or aggression has yet occurred to cause either Pakeha or Maori to view one another with distrust or suspicion’. The ‘disposition towards Europeans’ of ‘the loyal Ngatimaru and Ngatipaoa’ was ‘all that could be desired’, as was that of Ngati Whanaunga at Coromandel, and ‘a portion’ of the Ngati Tamatera of Ohinemuri and Cabbage Bay.

ENCOURAGING HARMONY

Bill Oliver has argued that Maori ‘leaders who co-operated with the government had a stark choice – either to resist constant and heavy pressure or to join the willing side in the hope of securing at least some advantages’. Alan Ward has a more positive view of how rangatira responded to the new opportunities.

Persons of mana were impelled to demonstrate it, by boldness and by constant concern for their names and stations. This made chiefs, especially young and aspiring chiefs, enterprising travellers, entrepreneurs, adaptors and innovators when European material wealth and ideas came on the scene.

Rangatira benefiting from goldfields revenue drew political conclusions, as illustrated by the speech made by Taipari’s father, Hoterene, at the Christmas dinner provided for his iwi in 1868, summarized by the Anglican vicar:

The substance of his speech was that New Zealand formed one country - the inhabitants living therein ought to be one united people. Formerly the Maories had divided this country into a great number of separate states each at war with one another -

44 G.T. Wilkinson to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 28 May 1881, AJHR, 1881, G-8, p. 7.
45 G.T. Wilkinson to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 28 May 1881, AJHR, 1881, G-8, p. 8.
46 Oliver, p. 11.
like a house under one roof being divided into separate and 
hostile rooms, causing disquiet, confusion, murder, &c. Now he 
hoped the time was coming when there would be Peace on earth 
and Goodwill towards all men: when they would forget they 
belonged to this hapu or that hapu, but remembering they were 
all New Zealanders, love one another as Brethren and live 
together in harmony.48

He had been the only leading member of Ngati Maru not to leave 
Thames to oppose the Crown in the Waikato War, and had urged his iwi not 
to respond to the erection of redoubts in the Firth of Thames.49 At a 
celebration at Mackay’s house in Thames in 1869, Hoterene, in ‘responding 
to the toast to his health, said that since the Europeans had come to 
Shortland perfect good feeling had existed between both races, and this, he 
hoped, would be continued’.50 In 1873, when his wife Wikitoria was arrested 
and forfeited bail for being ‘drunk and incapable’, he ‘was exceedingly 
wroth, and declared that the action was the height of ingratitude after all 
he had done for Europeans and the progress of the Anglo-Saxon race’.51

The government’s favourite ‘friendly’ rangatira at Thames, Wirope 
Hoterene Taipari, made sure he benefited from Pakeha settlement.52 In 
addressing a Presbyterian soiree in 1868, he stressed that ‘God is the 
Creator of us all…. For that reason I give you land to build churches on. It 
is my desire that we should all live in peace…. I am glad to see Maoris and 
white men working in claims together. We are of one origin: though the 
skins may be different in colour, the blood is the same’.53 In 1870, at a 
korero for the first Governor to visit Thames, he was described as a ‘truly 
loyal chief’,54 and made an appropriate speech:

48 Thames Journals of Vicesimus Lush, p. 46.
49 Monin, This is My Place, pp. 196, 199; for an 1861 assessment that part of his tribe was 
‘disaffected’, see James Preece to Native Secretary, 19 August 1861, ‘Reports on the State 
of the Natives in Various Districts, at the time of the arrival of Sir George Grey’, AJHR, 
1862, E-7, p. 13.
50 Auckland Weekly News, 29 March 1869, p. 3.
51 Thames Advertiser, 17 May 1873, p. 2, Police Court, p. 3.
52 See paper on Maori and goldfields revenue.
54 Auckland Weekly News, 15 January 1870, p. 3.
It is a great thing to see people face to face. Come and see your two races, the European and the Maori ... under the protecting shade of the Queen. You taught us to cease from cannibal tricks, and to live in peace. The missionaries came, and we were taught in schools, and we have done as we were taught. You now see your two races as one. You take charge of Hauraki, and keep it in peace.\[55\]

In the following year, when Donald McLean visited Thames, Taipari greeted him as ‘their parent, friend, and protector’.\[56\] Two years later, after Timothy Sullivan, a surveyor, was murdered near Cambridge, at a meeting held by 150 Maori in Thames Hotere was the first to speak:

He condemned the work of Waikato in murdering Europeans, and disturbing the peace of the district. He asked the people residing within the boundaries of Hauraki not to assist the Waikatos in any way. They should send notices from that meeting throughout Hauraki, to Piako and Ohinemuri, asking the tribes not to help the Waikatos, but to keep quiet. He said that this work of the Waikatos was not understood by the people of this district, and was unexpected. They should give a warning all over the district not to interfere, as that would bring trouble amongst themselves.

Other speakers echoed his views.\[57\] ‘Leading Europeans’ were invited to a subsequent meeting, which again urged Hauraki Maori, in the words of one rangatira, ‘to stay quietly in their own district, and take no part, directly or indirectly, in the quarrel’. The murder was condemned, and land should be taken for utu.\[58\] The following month, Taipari stated that there was only one law in New Zealand for both Pakeha and Maori.\[59\] He gave a very practical reasons for following the government’s wishes that they ‘remain quiet. If they were drawn into war the mat would be taken from under their feet, meaning that a confiscation of land would follow’.\[60\] This was repeating a warning he had made when welcoming Donald McLean to Thames two years previously, when he said that the government ‘never

56 Auckland Weekly News, 1 April 1871, p. 15.
57 ‘The Murder at Waikato: Meeting of the Thames Natives’, Thames Advertiser, 1 May 1873, p. 3.
58 Thames Correspondent, Auckland Weekly News, 17 May 1873, p. 11.
59 Thames Advertiser, 7 June 1873, p. 3.
60 Auckland Weekly News, 7 June 1873, p. 10.
confiscates land without a cause, and it is for us to look what Government did to the Waikatos. Let us think of this, and let us reflect and look towards Tauranga and Opotiki, where land had been confiscated. When John Ballance visited Thames in 1885 in his role as Native Minister, Taipari told him that ‘the Maoris and Europeans had but one policy and system of management, the only difference between them being those of colour and language’.

When conflict over the erection of a railway bridge over the Waitoa River led to an 1885 attempt to destroy it by Maori living near Morrinsville, the conflict was settled out of court by them paying £50 and ceasing their obstruction. At a dinner held in a Hamilton hotel to celebrate the reconciliation, the first Maori to speak quoted the words of the chief William Thompson [Wiremu Tamihana] about the good feeling that should exist between both races, and said that it was on account of these words that they were enabled to meet together that day and settle their differences amicably, and without recourse to law. He hoped the Europeans and Maoris of Waikato would long live to settle their differences in this way.

The second to speak was Tuwhenua Tiwha:

He thought the Maoris should be the same as the Europeans, and that there should be no difference whatever between the two races; that the justice which was meted out to the Europeans should be meted out to the Maoris, and vice versa. He knew the Maoris had strong feelings towards the Pakehas, and the Pakehas towards the Maoris, but the Lord gave them those feelings. Had the [railway] company even signified its willingness to pay the compensation when they spoke to them, there would have been no trouble.

Hare Penetito, one of those most actively opposed to this Pakeha infringement of Maori rights, agreed that ‘if they had understood each other

---

61 Auckland Weekly News, 1 April 1871, p. 15.
62 Thames Advertiser, 12 February 1885, p. 3.
63 See Evelyn Stokes, Wiremu Tamihana: Rangatira (Wellington, 2002).
as well at first as they did then, the trouble would not have happened. Let them all live peaceably together’. The last Maori to speak, Charlotte Tamihana, contradictorily wanted God to ‘maintain the Queen’s laws, and may they all live under the influence of good King Tawhiao’.66

Rangatira who were well disposed to Pakeha were sometimes included as members of committees established for important public purposes. For instance, some were appointed to the committee that was to choose a memorial to magistrate Harry Kenrick.67 Before his funeral, it was announced that Kenrick’s ‘last wish was that the Miners and Maoris should have an opportunity of attending’. Taipari was a pallbearer, and Kenrick’s family led the funeral procession, followed by 40 miners, 30 Maori, and then the general public.68 That Kenrick had been admired by Maori had been illustrated in the previous year, when in response to a report that he was to be moved to another district Maori had met to oppose this.69

**REWARDS FOR ASSISTING THE GOVERNMENT**

Rangatira who supported Pakeha settlement were given financial recognition by the government. For instance, Wilkinson considered it was mainly through the assistance of Rapata Te Arakai, also known as Rapata (or Ropata)Te Pokiha,70 principal rangatira of Te Uriwha hapu of Ngati Tamatera, that Ohinemuri was opened to mining; Rapata received a government pension of £20 per annum.71 A grateful government gave money to other rangatira who assisted to open Ohinemuri for mining.72 Land, not money, was given for settling a long-running dispute over land at Hikutaia, the government meeting the cost of survey and other expenses.73

---

65 See Maori Land Court, Waikato Minute Book no. 13, p. 170; Hauraki Minute Book no. 58, p. 84; *Waikato Times*, 8 August 1885, p. 2.
66 *Waikato Times*, 11 August 1885, p. 3.
67 *Thames Advertiser*, 23 August 1886, p. 2.
68 *Thames Advertiser*, 3 August 1886, p. 3, 4 August 1886, p. 3.
69 *Thames Advertiser*, 17 September 1885, p. 2.
70 See paper on Maori land in Hauraki.
71 G.T. Wilkinson to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 25 May 1886, *AJHR*, 1886, G-1, p. 10.
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Under his original name of Hanauru Taipari, Wirope Hoterene Taipari (renamed after a leading Pakeha official, Willoughby Shortland)\(^\text{74}\) was appointed an assessor in the Hauraki district in April 1864, on a salary of £40, raised to £60 in 1872.\(^\text{75}\) This gave him the right to sit with the magistrate in cases involving Maori.\(^\text{76}\) In 1865 he was appointed an assessor in the land court.\(^\text{77}\) After Edward Wood, a merchant,\(^\text{78}\) illegally imported spirits into the Native District of Hauraki in 1866, Taipari seized them along with the ship on which they were sold. Two months previously, he had fined Wood £11 ‘for a similar offence’, and the Coromandel magistrate considered that ‘too much praise cannot be bestowed’ on him ‘for the intelligence as well as zeal and promptitude with which he has acted not only in this but in several instances’, and suggested that a magistrate be stationed at Kauaeranga, the future Thames, ‘to co-operate with Taipari’.\(^\text{79}\) (In contrast, a reporter believed the unjust charges were not proved and illustrated that ‘any one of us Pakehas is at the mercy of any native who may chose to wear that a bottle of grog has been sold to him’.)\(^\text{80}\) His appointment as Native Commissioner in 1872 gave him a salary of £300; although a newspaper wondered what services he would provide, it also noted that he had gone to Coromandel to end conflict amongst Maori there.\(^\text{81}\) In return for his stipend, Taipari was expected ‘to assist the Government to maintain good government and good manners’ amongst Maori,\(^\text{82}\) a role he continued for the rest of his life.\(^\text{83}\) For instance, in 1870

---

\(^{74}\) See *A Dictionary of New Zealand Biography*, ed. G.H. Scholefield (Wellington, 1940), vol. 2, pp. 299-300.
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\(^{78}\) See *New Zealand Herald*, 8 February 1870, p. 4; *Auckland Weekly News*, 28 March 1868, p. 19, 14 September 1905, p. 22.

\(^{79}\) H.C. Lawlor to Frederick Whitaker, 30 November 1866, Coromandel Warden’s and Resident Magistrate’s Letterbook 1862-1867, 195/66; see also H.C. Lawlor to Native Minister, 31 December 1866, 220/66, BACL 14446/1a, ANZ-A.
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he accompanied officials to convince hapu to let telegraph wires cross their land, and later assisted efforts to convince Tukukino to let the telegraph, road, and railway cross his land at Komata. He also interceded with the authorities on behalf of rangatirira in trouble with the law. For accompanying government ministers to resolve difficulties, he insisted on being paid for his travel and other expenses; indeed he attempted to milk the government of more expenses than were justifiable. In 1876 some Maori and land court judges considered he was 'abusing his position as a Govt officer' to obtain more land than he was entitled to.

In 1881, Taipari was appointed an assessor for the Te Aroha district under the Outlying Districts Sale of Spirits Act. Later his peers elected him an assessor dealing with licensed premises under the Licensing Act Amendment Act of 1882. As assessor for the Kirikiri Native Licensing District, he insisted that Hori Matene have the sole publican’s license for that settlement, meaning that the other two licenses could not be renewed; the Hastings Licensing Committee could not over-rule him.

As a result of his ‘friendly’ disposition towards the government and his official posts, Taipari received a steady if variable income. At a time of
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retrenchment in 1880, his salary as assessor was reduced from £250 to £100, a decision he wanted reversed. His ‘pension’, as it was termed, was £8 6s 8d every month from the mid-1880s, with additional payments when acting as an assessor and attending court sittings. At the time of his death, he was still receiving a pension of £100 a year. Combined with his rents from land and miners’ rights, Taipari became extremely wealthy, possibly the main reason for his supporting Pakeha settlement. He was ‘taunted’ by rangatira less enthusiastic about the imposition of Pakeha rule for his ‘dependant position’ and being ‘influenced by Government pay’. Critical of his daughter as ‘a woman who sells land’, as she did when she became bankrupt, because of his income he had no need to sell any. He did co-operate with the wishes of the government by selling his hapu’s section of the Thames foreshore in 1869, when all the other chiefs refused (they sold their interests four years later). His estate was worth over £10,000.

For obvious reasons, the government flattered rangatira such as Taipari, and encouraged them to remain loyal to Pakeha authority. For example, Taipari, one of his wives, his parents, and Rapata Te Pokiha attended the Governor’s Ball in Auckland in 1869. When Governor Bowen visited Thames the following year, Taipari and three other rangatira were given the ‘right of private entry’ to see him, and Taipari’s wife and daughter attended Lady Bowen’s reception.

NGATI HAKO AGAINST BOTH PAKEHA AND MAORI
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In 1873, a surveyor named Simpson, instructed to make ‘a flying survey’ for a railway line between Waikato and Thames, succeeded despite ‘great opposition’. In an example of this, he told the press that he had ignored orders from Maori at Ohinemuri (probably Ngati Hako) not to go further up-river.

So when the boat was about eight or nine miles above Ohinemuri, the pursuers appeared on the bank, “bloody with spurring, fiery red with haste,” and called on those in the boat to pull to the land. This order, however, was set at nought by the simple plan of keeping in the middle of the river, and continuing to pull briskly onwards. What measures the pursuers might have resorted to we do not know, but perhaps they were somewhat restrained at seeing a double-barrelled gun on board the boat.

After having ‘roared themselves at the boat, the Maoris returned again and the party was left to pursue their course unmolested’. At a subsequent meeting, Maori agreed to catch up with the boat, seize any property, and divide it ‘amongst those whose commands they had disregarded’. The man who was allotted the gun caught up with the boat near Te Aroha, ‘where, accompanied by several Maoris belonging to that part of the country’, he demanded it. It belonged to John Duncan, the interpreter.104

The native claimed and took hold of the gun, and further said that Mr Puckey had authorized him to take it. Mr Duncan said he was willing to give the native the gun, but first he would give him the content of both barrels. The native declined to receive the gun on this condition, and as it appeared that Mr Duncan would not let him have it on no other terms, he did not attempt to use force. He had the insolence, however, to demand to be conveyed down to Ohinemuri, but Mr Duncan declined his company.105

At the end of May 1880, when Puckey wrote his last report (he was replaced by Wilkinson), he regretted that ‘no favourable opportunity has yet occurred to arrest the perpetrators’ of what he described as ‘the Pukehange outrage’, meaning the shooting of ‘Daldy’ McWilliams.106 ‘The excitement consequent upon the act of shooting at a white man – the first, I believe, which has ever occurred at the Thames – has died out; but the members of

104 See Thames Advertiser, 20 April 1874, p. 3, 21 April 1874, p. 3.
105 Thames Advertiser, 2 April 1873, p. 3.
106 See paper on this incident.
the Ngatihako hapu more immediately connected with Epiha and Pakara’, reputedly responsible for the shooting, were keeping ‘very much to themselves. For fear of wider conflict, Taipari had told a meeting of Ohinemuri Maori ‘that he intended to occupy a position at Kerepehi on the Piako River, for the purpose of preventing outsiders from joining the Ngatihakos’, and went up that river cautioning Maori ‘against aiding and abetting the Ngatihako on penalty of having their land confiscated’. To explain Ngati Hako’s behaviour, Wilkinson gave a detailed explanation of their relations with other hapu and with Pakeha:

These people, in olden times, were the owners of nearly all the land in the Ohinemuri District; but, unfortunately, their rank and possessions did not give them immunity from the attacks of their enemies, and they have, therefore, through successive defeats (long before the advent of Europeans), had to succumb to the stronger arms and overwhelming numbers of their adversaries. But although defeated, they were not entirely dispossessed of their territory; and this fact, coupled with their having intermarried with their conquerors, causes them at the present time to take up a social position that they are not entitled to assume, and which is continually being resented by the Ngatitamatera Tribe, who are the present owners of the land originally owned by Ngatihako. Their claims to land are, with few exceptions, successfully opposed in Native Land Courts by Ngatitamatera, and this has caused them to assume a morose and apparently unfriendly attitude to everybody, and especially to the Pakeha. I do not mean that it is to be inferred that these people are in the habit of molesting Europeans on any pretence whatever; but their having to take up a subservient position amongst other tribes in this district – they who were formerly lords and masters of the whole country – is particularly galling to them, and has caused them to eschew not only the Pakeha, but also those Natives who, through having plenty of land to dispose of, are on good terms with their European neighbours; and, as might be expected of a dissatisfied people, they have fully adopted all the laws and doctrines (religious or otherwise) of king Tawhiao, especially as regards opposition to roads, telegraphs, surveys, and leasing or selling of land, and even to the removing of the snags in the Waihou River, near their settlement, which are at present an obstacle to navigation. They seem to have chosen for themselves a policy of sullen opposition to anything
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107 E.W. Puckey to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 29 May 1880, AJHR, 1880, G-4, p. 4.
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that would further the advancement of the district from a European point of view, and are ready at any time to resent, by force, if necessary, any encroachment (whether by Natives or Europeans) upon their self-adopted laws and regulations.

The shooting of McWilliams was an instance of this, on the pretext ‘that false boundaries had been given by the Natives who sold the Pukenange Block to the Government, and, therefore, a portion of their land adjoining was being wrongly included in the survey’. This dispute ‘could easily have been settled’ when the case was considered by the land court. They had since ‘ordered off with threats’ Pakeha sent to remove snags. ‘Notwithstanding these bad traits in their character’, when ‘left entirely alone’ they were ‘an unoffending people, and, on account of the rigidity with which they carry out their kingite and semi-religious principles’, seldom offended against Pakeha laws. After Himiona Haira was murdered at Te Aroha,109 their principal rangatira ‘behaved remarkably well all through the trying time, and were the first to accede to my request to leave the matter for the law to decide’. Their influence restrained ‘some of the more turbulent spirits’ from taking revenge on Pakeha they suspected of being guilty. ‘Action of this sort’, which showed that they had ‘no wish to pick a quarrel with us’, was ‘deserving of praise, and should go a great way towards softening any hard feelings that we may have harboured against them on account of their persistent opposition to our progressive and go-a-head policy’ concerning their land.110 The Thames Advertiser considered that these remarks, like the remainder of Wilkinson’s report, ‘faithfully’ explained ‘the position of the native population’.111 But they remained firm supporters of Tawhiao.112

During the following 12 months, Ngati Hako had ‘not by any means been idle’.113 At the beginning of September 1881, it was reported that

109 See paper on the Te Aroha murder.
110 G.T. Wilkinson to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 28 May 1881, AJHR, 1881, G-8, p. 8.
112 G.T. Wilkinson to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 17 May 1882, AJHR, 1882, G-1, p. 3.
113 G.T. Wilkinson to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 17 May 1882, AJHR, 1882, G-1, p. 4.
Paeroa residents were worried about the behaviour of the men who had shot McWilliams:

Within the last few days these scoundrels have shot a number of cattle belonging to settlers on the river, and in one instance destroyed a bullock belonging to a settler named Brown; cut off the animal’s head and placed it on a pole, afterwards directing the owner’s attention to the spectacle. They then ordered the man off the land, and threatened to shoot him.

Residents feared ‘an outrage’ would be committed on a Pakeha. ‘The native who shot McWilliams is said to be parading about the settlement boasting of what he has done, and of what he intends to do’.114 Later that month Ngati Hako were ‘very obnoxious’, cutting adrift a punt at Waitoki. The *Thames Advertiser* thought it was ‘quite time this nest of troublesome customers was cleared out by the strong hand of the law, which has hitherto dealt with them far too leniently'.115 Early in October, the chairman of the county council complained to the government about the shooting of McWilliams and the stealing of the punt.116 However, late that month the *Thames Star* editorialized against exaggerated complaints: this hapu had not stolen the punt, and they were interfering with kauri milling at Waihi only because the trees were on their reserve.117 Wilkinson reported that although they had written a letter threatening ‘to shoot all European cattle and horses’ found trespassing on their land, they did not carry out their threat, and he had ‘reasons for knowing’ that they were ‘fearful of being punished for what they had done. Since then they have not done anything for which they could be blamed’, and appeared to be starting ‘to see the error of their ways, or at least are fearful that they may go too far’.118

In March 1882, the government announced it would commence snagging the Waihou River and did not expect Maori to ‘now offer any objections’.119 To ensure there was no obstruction, John Bryce, the Native Minister, met with rangatira at Thames and told them that snagging would
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115 *Thames Advertiser*, 26 September 1881, p. 3.
116 *Thames Star*, 7 October 1881, p. 2.
118 G.T. Wilkinson to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 17 May 1882, *AJHR*, 1882, G-1, p. 4.
take place ‘where opposition was formerly offered. He hoped that no obstruction would be placed in his way, for if it was he would not permit it. The work was being done in the interest of everybody, and he intended to finish it’. He explicitly warned Ngati Hako not to be obstructive.\textsuperscript{120} Bryce held another meeting with Maori at Paeroa, where a Ngati Hako rangatira, Pineha Te Warekohai,\textsuperscript{121} said that, although he had been wrong to oppose snagging previously, he did not want Bryce to be hasty. Nor would he hand over those who had shot McWilliams. Bryce, who understood that the conflict over snagging was over obtaining money for eel weirs, assured them that these would be moved to the side, not destroyed.\textsuperscript{122} Having agreed to remove the snags, Pineha indicated the Ngati Hako boundary with another hapu; earlier attempts to clear the river had been hindered by jealously between them.\textsuperscript{123} When snagging commenced, a Paeroa newspaper reported Maori saying that they did ‘not so much object to the snags being taken out’ but thought Bryce ‘should have given them something in the shape of payment’.\textsuperscript{124}

Between May 1882 and June 1883, Ngati Hako were ‘exceptionally quiet’. Wilkinson considered this was partly because they were ‘not naturally a bad people’ and had shot McWilliams only because their land was ‘sold over their heads’ and they were ‘sat upon’ by other tribes. They were quiet partly because of the snagging, particularly because Tawhiao had ended his policy of ‘opposition and isolation’ as his power collapsed, but most of all because of ‘the arrest and trial of their two leading men, Pakara Te Paoro and Epiha Taha’, accused of shooting McWilliams.\textsuperscript{125} This occurred in May 1882, and when the policeman who had arrested them was next in Paeroa he was ‘treated to a considerable amount of abuse’ from some Ngati Hako, ‘of which he very wisely took no notice’.\textsuperscript{126}

\textsuperscript{120} *Thames Advertiser*, 21 March 1882, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{121} See *Thames Star*, advertisement, 10 May 1894, p. 2, 2 June 1894, p. 2; not involved with Te Aroha mining.
\textsuperscript{122} *Thames Advertiser*, 23 March 1882, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{123} *Thames Advertiser*, 7 April 1882, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{124} *Hauraki Tribune*, n.d., cited in *Thames Advertiser*, 10 April 1882, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{125} G.T. Wilkinson to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 17 May 1882, *AJHR*, 1882, G-1, p. 8.
\textsuperscript{126} *Thames Advertiser*, 20 May 1882, p. 3, 29 May 1882, p. 3.
For a long time after the crime was committed no attempt was made to arrest the culprits, and in all probability they began to think they were safe, but unfortunately for them their case was only another proof – and the Natives have now had several – that the law is patient and has a long and powerful arm. Their arrest by a party of constables when coming down the Waipa River in a canoe, within only a few miles of Tawhiao’s settlement, must have considerably opened their eyes as to the limit and power of the law, and must have also considerably lessened their estimate of the power of Tawhiao and of the gods, under whose protection they used to boast they were, to protect them. This exhibition of power and firmness evidently “staggered” them, and a subsequent act of mercy on the part of the Hon. the Native Minister “brought them down,” viz, the releasing from gaol of Epiha Taha, under the Amnesty Act, after he had been in prison only six months out of a term of three years allotted to him by the Supreme Court. I am of opinion that these people will not cause any further trouble by breaking the law out of objection and opposition to it, and that, by a little good management and recognition of their position as a tribe in cases where surveys and other matters emanating from the progress of civilization are concerned, there should be no difficulty in getting them to live as a peaceable and law-abiding people.127

In 1886, Wilkinson reported that Ngati Hako had stopped the survey for the railway line where it crossed their land at Te Rae-o-te-Papa, about three miles south of Paeroa. When he met them at their settlement, ‘it was plain from what was said that they were only carrying out their old policy of trying to see if they could block the work. But they are only prepared to obstruct up to a certain point’, which was ‘reached whenever the Government makes up its mind and takes steps to punish them for their obstruction’. He predicted that, as soon as they saw themselves ‘in danger of getting into trouble’, they would ‘withdraw their opposition, and console themselves with the fact that they did all they could to stop the work short of coming to blows or putting themselves in the position to be punished by the law’.128 One year later, he reported that Ngati Hako had ‘been on their

127 G.T. Wilkinson to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 11 June 1883, AJHR, 1883, G-1, p. 8.
128 G.T. Wilkinson to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 25 May 1886, AJHR, 1886, G-1, p. 10.
best behaviour, and no obstruction to surveyors or public works has taken place at their hands or at their instigation'.

BOTH ASSISTING AND OBSTRUCTING DEVELOPMENT

Taipari, who received ‘a most respectable income’ from the goldfield, on the first anniversary of its opening gave champagne toasts to the skipper who ran the first steamer between Auckland and Thames. ‘He would most emphatically assert, that had there been no “Enterprise,” there would have been no goldfield, a double entendre which created much laughter and showers of compliments on Taipari’s wit’. Early the following year, he was a member of a committee that sought to raise £200 to erect a wharf. Having benefited from mining at Thames, he was in the forefront of those seeking to open Ohinemuri for mining.

In the aftermath of the Waikato War and subsequent confiscations, government attempts to open Ohinemuri to mining and to construct telegraphs, roads and a railway met strong opposition. Taipari was ‘very zealous’ in getting agreement to erecting a telegraph line to Coromandel, but leading rangatira in Ohinemuri rejected his arguments about the benefits of Pakeha improvements. For instance, in 1873 he unsuccessfully urged upon Te Hira the usefulness of the proposed railway between Thames and Waikato. By 1878, after years of obstruction, Puckey was pleased to report that the county council had been ‘successful beyond the most sanguine expectations in dealing with the Native difficulties’, for the main road from Thames had reached Hikutaia. The road from Paeroa and Te Puke (at the junction of the Waihou and Ohinemuri rivers) was being formed ‘by a party of Natives who have always stood by us, and that in the face of the determined opposition which has so consistently been made by the anti-progress party’. A ‘bridle roadway from Ohinemuri to Te Aroha’ had been completed, and other roads were being made by Maori labour who, he was ‘pleased to say, with few exceptions, have given satisfaction to their
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employers’. At Ohinemuri, Te Ahiaataewa Tukukino (otherwise Tukukino Te Ahiaataewa and Tukukino Huhuriri) of the Kiriwera hapu of Ngati Tamatera and one of the main supporters of Te Hira, continued to oppose ‘progressive works’, and would not change his attitude until ‘more active measures’ were taken, which Puckey thought would be unwise. As Maori liked making roads, he recommended that they should always be employed when these went over their own land. If parliament would vote money, they ‘might be more largely and constantly employed than during the past year’. They were ‘anxiously waiting for employment’ on the railway to be built between Thames and Waikato, and the promise of work had been of ‘material assistance’ to Puckey in acquiring land for it, ‘assisted by an intelligent and influential Native committee’.

Even when they supported such developments, rangatira wanted special treatment for Maori. For instance, when Taipari, in speaking at the opening of the bridge over the Kauaeranga River in 1877, after saying he would like the road opened all the way to Ohinemuri he ‘hoped they would not be called upon to pay rates’. And they wanted rewards for assisting development. Rapata petitioned parliament in 1882 because three years previously the council had decided to build a bridge at Paeroa ‘at a place where the road would have injured his cultivations’. He had dropped his objections and gifted the land after the Native Minister promised that the government would build him a house at Paeroa, but as this had not been built despite the government prompting the council, he asked either for it or for £200.

Although Tukukino and Te Hira and others opposed the encroaching Pakeha, others in the same district assisted this encroachment. For
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instance, in 1874 Rapata Te Pokiha thanked the Superintendent for his circular cautioning persons not to cut Timber on Native Lands that have not passed through the Court – I approve of this law – it is right. Friend – I also approve of your communication to me of the 10th Decr requesting me to cooperate with you. I accede. I may state that I have already acted in similar matters – which you are aware of. Ist I endeavoured for the opening of Ohinemuri for gold mining. Next – I made the necessary arrangements for the Telegraph in which I was assisted by Mr Mackay – And lastly a short time since – Te Hira having directed that the Road should be made, I sent some men to make it.

Te Hira had stopped the work ‘like an insane person’, but having been told that the Superintendent had not ordered its construction he said it ‘would be proceeded with by and by – Friend, I am thoroughly disgusted at his proceedings’.141

Another example was Hoani Raharuhi,142 who worked for a surveyor delineating the boundaries of the Ohinemuri goldfield.143 In 1881, he assisted Wilkinson to sort out confusion over Maori reserves at Waihi.144 As an indication of his adjustment to Pakeha ways, in 1890 he married his second wife, a ‘half-caste’, in St George’s Anglican Church in Thames.145 Others assisted to make roads; Renata Tamati146 for instance applied to make the road from Paeroa to Waitekauri in 1875.147 Some Maori learnt the art of tendering for public works: Hunia Tamihana,148 for example, in 1896
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tendered (unsuccessfully) to the Ohinemuri County Council to cart sand needed for a footpath from the railway station.\textsuperscript{149}

In January 1880, Puckey visited Coromandel because Maori were being ‘troublesome and obstructive’ over rerouting the telegraph line, but after ‘delicate negotiations’ the work was completed, ‘the Natives owning the land over which the line passed gladly assisting at a fair rate of remuneration’,\textsuperscript{150} That year, when Tukukino met the Native Minister, William Rolleston, and for the first time explained ‘his pertinacious opposition’, Puckey anticipated that the road through his Komata land would now be made. But using Maori to construct the railway line between Totara and Kirikiri had been a failure because they considered the price to be too low.\textsuperscript{151} The following year, Wilkinson noted that Maori had taken ‘considerable interest in road-making’, and would seek to make ‘fair wages’ at this now that more were being made after the government had made the road through Komata despite Tukukino’s opposition.\textsuperscript{152} Later, Tukukino asked the Native Minister ‘for a spring cart to enable himself and people to utilize the newly-made road by taking their produce over it to Paeroa Township for sale, which request was granted him’. Maori were ‘amongst the first’ to use it, and also made use of the telegraph, which had been extended to Paeroa at the same time.\textsuperscript{153} Some other Maori continued to obstruct road making, once through a misunderstanding but in another case because of allegiance to Tawhiao.\textsuperscript{154}

In November 1885, Tukukino obstructed the survey of the railway line from Hikutaia to Paeroa ‘where it went crossed his land and went through his cultivations’. After Wilkinson negotiated with him, the survey was allowed to continue because it was agreed to establish ‘a small flag-station at Komata for the benefit of himself and the people of his settlement’ when
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they wished to send produce to Paeroa or Thames, and also because his hapu would construct the line over their land. In May 1887, Wilkinson could report that ‘our old friend Tukukino’, as he jocularly termed him, had not obstructed surveyors or public works during the past 12 months.

PREFERRING PAKEHA GOODS AND SERVICES

Paora Tiunga told the land court in 1893 about pre-Pakeha days:

The food supply of our ancestors was different from what it now is – fern root and Raupo root was good. Cabbage trees also. Maoris in those days were like Birds in their feeding; we also lived on eels and fish Birds and Rats – I say we were like Birds inasmuch as we only eat those things provided for us by nature.

The previous year, in describing his life in Ohinemuri and Piako as a young man, he said that his hapu grew potatoes, corn, and kumara. ‘After wheat was introduced we sowed wheat’ to earn money to buy a vessel. He later dated the planting of wheat for this purpose to 1866. Pera Reweti, after telling the court about having earlier lived at Owharoa and caught fish at Waihi, added that he did this no longer: ‘we buy fish from Europeans’. And Taipari stated that he ‘had not fished from the waters of the Gulf since the arrival of Europeans, but had caught flounders many times prior to that time’.
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As well as abandoning their former foods, clothing, and (more slowly) housing for Pakeha versions, Maori also used horses and steamers for transport. In 1872, Maori petitioned the government to keep ‘our favourite canoe’, meaning the steamer, plying on the Waihou River.\textsuperscript{164} Whilst canoes were still used, steamers were hired on important occasions and when large numbers had to travel. For instance, when one rangatira died in Piako, Paraku Rapana\textsuperscript{165} paid £25 for a steamer to bring his body back to Thames.\textsuperscript{166} In the 1876 electoral contest for Western Maori, the local candidate chartered two steamers to bring voters to Thames from up-country.\textsuperscript{167} The following year, when a woman of ‘some rank’ died at Te Aroha, a steam launch ‘conveyed the remains and a considerable number of the friends of the deceased to Puriri where a cry [tangi] is to be held’.\textsuperscript{168} Also in 1877, after thanking the organizers of the celebration to mark the opening of the bridge over the Kauaeranga River for inviting him to speak, Matiu Poono\textsuperscript{169} stated that ‘They were pleased to cross without the means of canoes’.\textsuperscript{170} When road building caused conflict, it was usually because the landowners did not want one built across their land, even if financial recompense was paid. When the road past Totara pa, just to the south of Thames, was made in 1877, Matiu Poono stated that he no longer opposed this because tapu areas and cultivations had been fenced off.\textsuperscript{171} He supervised working parties on this and other roads, and ‘very graciously
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refused to accept any compensation for the land taken for roads through his property, intimating that the road was for his benefit as much as others'.\textsuperscript{172}

THE THAMES NATIVE COMMITTEE

Under the Native Committees Act of 1883, a ‘very satisfactory’ Native Committee was elected in March 1884 from the 31 nominated, according to the \textit{Thames Advertiser}.\textsuperscript{173} When Wilkinson wrote his report in mid-May, it was about to hold its first meeting. ‘From the interest the Thames Natives take in the matter’ he had ‘every reason to believe that they will make the working of the Act a success’.\textsuperscript{174} This meeting, in the old courthouse at Shortland, ‘was the first of the kind held in the colony, and therefore possessed considerable importance in the eyes of the natives of the district, as being the first step towards the exercise of something resembling self-government’. The members ‘entered upon their duties with more zeal than usually characterizes the average European execution’; that they took an hour to choose a chairman illustrated to the \textit{Thames Advertiser} ‘their earnestness in selecting suitable officers’.\textsuperscript{175}

Their proceedings were rarely mentioned in the press. In 1885 it was recorded that the committee had written to the government asking that no licenses for guns or gunpowder be granted to Arawa, who were threatening other iwi.\textsuperscript{176} In June 1888, Wilkinson reported that the two committees in the Waikato district had ‘very much languished’ and were expected to collapse. One reason was that the districts were too large, with members having to travel long distances. Another was that they were not fully supported by rangatira, probably because they ‘appeared to usurp the power that principal chiefs think should rest only in them’, namely ‘the power of saying what shall or shall not be done with regard to matters which concern the whole tribe’. Yet another reason was ‘the very limited powers given to the Committees’, which could act only when both parties to a suit agreed

\textsuperscript{172} \textit{Thames Advertiser}, 28 January 1878, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{173} \textit{Thames Advertiser}, 8 March 1884, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{174} G.T. Wilkinson to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 14 May 1884, \textit{AJHR}, 1884, Session 2, G-1, p. 13.
\textsuperscript{175} \textit{Thames Advertiser}, 28 May 1884, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{176} \textit{Thames Advertiser}, 4 February 1885, p. 2.
their involvement. And so this alleged form of ‘self-government’ withered away.

VOTING

Property-owing Maori could not only vote in local body elections, as illustrated in the chapter on William Grey Nicholls, but also for Maori and ‘general’ electorates. For the latter, described as the ‘white roll’ by one parliamentarian, the qualification was to be a ratepayer or the holder of an individual Crown grant for land valued at £25 or over. In 1873, 16 Maori who would later invest in Te Aroha mining were included on the Thames electoral roll. There were occasional complaints that Maori voters were swamping Pakeha ones, as when ‘A Respectably White Man’ listed the names of Maori he claimed had been placed on the Ohinemuri roll by Nicholls and two Pakeha closely connected with Maori to swamp ‘legitimate’ voters. If this was the tactic, it worked for Nicholls, but the two Pakeha were defeated.

FESTIVITIES

Not only traditional gatherings such as tangi but meetings to consider important issues also required lavish hospitality, although these became rarer after the mid-1870s because of lack of resources. In 1875, 300 visitors attending a big feast at Paeroa were provided upon arrival with a heap of cooked potatoes and kumara 20 feet long, three feet wide, and two feet high, capped with ten pigs cooked in halves. At the main feast, the 1,800 kits of potatoes and kumara were estimated to total 31 tons, for the heap was 91 feet long by six feet wide and three and a half feet high. It was topped with 51 ‘good-sized’ pigs and eight bullocks cut into quarters, along with mats, clothing, and guns, all presents from Ngati Tamatera. Henry Dunbar
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Johnson recorded that Te Hira had spoken about the presents, ‘and suggested that they should stop at that. I think he is right too. This is in return for the feast given by Ngatipaoa, and will cost the natives here very dearly. Before the new crops are ready they will be starving’, unless they could obtain government assistance, ‘which, of course, will mean parting with more land’.\textsuperscript{183}

Seven years later, a tangi for a young Ohinemuri rangatira was noted as being both expensive and a health hazard:

> An enormous quantity of flour, tea, sugar, potatoes, and meat is being consumed by the dusky mourners, and the local tradesmen are said to be reaping a good harvest in consequence. Since the “cry” commenced there has been a deal of inclement weather, and a number of the natives have become seriously ill through exposure to the elements. Indeed, one woman has already succumbed, and two or three children are in a moribund state.\textsuperscript{184}

Despite Pakeha disapproval, during the 1870s and 1880s, as Michael King has noted, throughout New Zealand large and well-catered functions were becoming an increasingly common feature of Maori life now that fighting was no longer available to provide an incentive and a focus for community effort. The larger and more lavish the hui or gathering, the more mana accrued to the host community – prestige in Polynesian terms being measured by what was given away rather than by what was accumulated. And, of course, such occasions required reciprocation by guests.\textsuperscript{185}

In 1894 a commentator noted how a recent tangi illustrated how Maori were adapting to the new economic ways:

> The Maori has never been slow at following the example of his smart European brother in the art of “raising the wind.” For originality in devising ways and means whereby his exchequer may be filled, the intelligent aboriginal can, however, often give his pakeha friends a big start. Take, for instance, the novel method of defraying the costs of a big tangi which was adopted by a grief-stricken tribe [Ngati Maru] at the Thames the other day.

\textsuperscript{183} Ohinemuri Correspondent, Thames Advertiser, 17 August 1875, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{184} Thames Advertiser, 16 June 1882, p. 3.
A few days ago the well-known native chief Hoani Nahe\textsuperscript{186} died at the Thames, and of course the inevitable big tangi and feast followed. Hundreds of natives arrived from all parts of the Hauraki for the obsequies, and to assist in putting away the large supplies of pigs, sheep, bullocks, potatoes, kumeras, and the various comestibles beloved by the tangata Maori. Provisions were gathered in immense quantities, and the expense was a serious matter to the tribe which had the honour to own the “corpse.” The entertaining Maoris held a confab as to how they should augment their funds. They decided to hold a series of hakas and native concerts, and to charge the nimble “hikapene” [sixpence] or thereabouts for admission. The hakas were well patronized, and a substantial sum was netted at the doors. Then the enterprising mourners held a “concert” in the rununga house, and got crowded audiences on each night. The concerts were a great success, and the takings amounted to a good round sum in coin of the realm, which came in very handy to pay for the visitors’ victuals. All this while the old chief’s remains were lying in state close by. The wide-awake Maori collected his “utu” in a very canny manner before he considered it time to “plant” the old man’s remains. The honour of the tribe must be kept up by a big fine tangi, but such an opportunity of profitably combining business and grief was too good to be lost.\textsuperscript{187}

AGRICULTURE AND THE CASH ECONOMY

In 1872, Puckey reported that in ‘several’ kainga preparation for planting crops was on a ‘much larger scale than usual’. Many Maori, although poor, ‘purchased ploughs and harness, while some have spent considerable sums of money in the purchase of cows, and are going in for stock breeding on quite an extensive scale’.\textsuperscript{188} During the following year, Maori devoted ‘more time and attention to agricultural pursuits’, especially at Ohinemuri. There, ‘in addition to ordinary cultivation, they are taking a good deal of trouble to lay down such portions of land as are not immediately required for cropping, in English grasses, and in fencing it in with wire’. Puckey had been encouraging them to grow wheat, ‘the more so as they possess a mill at Ohinemuri, which is doing no one any good at present’ and might add ‘most materially to their comforts’.\textsuperscript{189}

\textsuperscript{186} See New Zealand Herald, 21 May 1894, p. 5; Auckland Star, 21 May 1894, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{188} E.W. Puckey to Native Minister, 9 July 1872, AJHR, 1872, F-3, P. 6.
\textsuperscript{189} E.W. Puckey to Native Minister, 30 April 1873, AJHR, 1873, G-1, pp. 3-4.
In 1875 he reported that ‘for the last year or so the means of obtaining food and supplies of various kinds has been so easy of access’ to all Hauraki tribes ‘by pledging their lands for sale to the Government, that but little attention has been paid to agricultural pursuits generally’.\textsuperscript{190} The following year, Maori were ‘retrograding rather than progressing in the cultivation of the soil’. They grew ‘food barely sufficient for a scanty subsistence, and trust to Providence and the chance of duping some unlucky pakeha for what else may be required’; the nature of the duping was not explained.\textsuperscript{191} In 1877 he reported that although there were ‘a few who during the planting season will cultivate a sufficient area of land to maintain themselves and their families’, most preferred ‘a sort of hand-to-mouth existence, on the principle perhaps of “little eat, little care” – a principle which is better in theory than in practice’.\textsuperscript{192} There was ‘no advance whatever’ in the following year, although an ‘exceptionally favourable’ potato crop placed them ‘beyond the reach of absolute want of food’.\textsuperscript{193} In 1879, he commented that it was ‘improbable’ that Maori would ‘settle down to industrial habits whilst they have land left to hypothecate to settlers or storekeepers; it is so much easier for them to get needful supplies in that way than by raising crops for sale’.\textsuperscript{194} In his final report, in 1880, he urged that ‘care should be taken lest they dispossess themselves of all their lands before it is too late’.\textsuperscript{195}

Wilkinson reported in 1881 that during the past year Maori had shown ‘a marked improvement’ in their ‘habits of industry, a greater number than previously having paid considerable attention to food-planting’.

This change has been brought about more through sheer necessity than the desire to prove the truth of an old Maori
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proverb which, translated, says, “The fame of a warrior is but fleeting, whereas the fame of one who is industrious in tilling the soil is lasting.” During the last eight years land-purchase operations have been carried on to such an extent in this district, and the supply of money from that source has been such a plentiful one, that the Natives of this peninsula, formerly noted for their industry, allowed themselves almost entirely to give up the planting of food, and relied mostly upon the proceeds of land sales to provide themselves with the necessities of life. These supplies have now, however, to a large extent failed, and it has therefore behoved the Natives to again resort to cultivating the small portions of land still remaining in their possession. It is gratifying, therefore, to be able to report that they are in most cases proving themselves equal to the occasion; and I expect next year will show even greater improvement in the way of agriculture.  

It did, for the same reason of ‘growing necessity’. In 1883 he described them as ‘industrious only up to a certain point’, namely ‘supplying themselves with food necessary for their subsistence’:

Beyond that they do not think it worth while to consider, and in some cases they even prefer to spend all their time in the bush-ranges searching for kauri gum, with the proceeds of which they purchase food, and thereby do away almost altogether with the necessity of growing it, or, at most, only to a small extent.

Once the price of gum fell, he expected they would ‘once more turn their attention to cultivating for their maintenance the land still remaining to them’. During the following year, Maori were fairly industrious and have had proportionately good crops – that is, those of them who have gone in for cultivating food. A great many of them, however, rely more upon the results of their kauri-gum-digging, and what revenue they can obtain from European
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sources, than upon what they get out of the ground, for a subsistence.  

In May 1887, Wilkinson repeated that Maori in Hauraki were not by any means an industrious people – that is, when compared with former years. Instead of living together in large numbers at their different settlements, and cultivating large areas of food in common, as they used to do, they now separate themselves into families or parties and go away into the hills to dig kauri-gum.

Later, when based in Otorohanga, he noted Maori earning money by making the road to the Waitomo caves. Their communal ways of working also applied to public works in Hauraki:

The aptitude and liking they have for this kind of work is almost surprising. They will desert food-cultivation, flax-cutting, or rabbit-killing for it. They take their contract sections at a lump sum previously fixed by the engineer in charge of works, and then go and camp alongside of their work with their wives and families, the women doing the cooking, washing, and getting firewood, whilst the men work early and late at their contract.

That Maori liked working together in large groups on road making was illustrated when the first roads were made in the Ohinemuri and Aroha blocks. In 1878, Henry Dunbar Johnson was indignant over the behaviour of ‘one of the native bosses’, Wikiriwhi Hautonga, a native assessor in receipt of a government ‘pension’ of £40 per annum. A party of Maori numbering between 40 and 50 were making part of the road between Paeroa and Mackaytown, but a few ‘did not give satisfaction to the Foreman

---
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of Works’, who weeded out ‘the dross and loafers’, whereupon Wikiriwhi ‘said that unless all hands were employed he would give up work, and induce as many of the others as he could to do likewise’. He had also stopped the contractor clearing the road from the Puke landing to Paeroa, and, Johnson considered, should be made an example of, for as a native assessor he received a government salary.204 Wikiriwhi wrote to the newspaper in his defence, arguing that his critics wanted ‘to give him a bad name’ because the Maori stance had been ‘ratified by the Native Minister’, John Sheehan:

The arrangement was that all the natives who wished to work were to be employed on the road, and they commenced to the number of about 30 or 40, but some of them were afterwards dismissed, and only twelve kept on…. The natives would not have this, and stopped the work until the original arrangement was carried out. The Hon. Mr Sheehan agreed that they were right, and they were now working again in full numbers. Wikiriwhi says that the pakehas of the Ohinemuri are jealous because the natives were in the right, and they had to give in.205

By the turn of the century, individual farming was increasing. Some became dairy farmers; Paraku Rapana, for instance, became a shareholder of the Thames Valley Co-operative Dairying Company in 1902.206 But for most Maori, the alternatives to subsistence farming were ‘irregular, unreliable, and highly contestable, thanks to the number of Pakeha employed’.207

GUM DIGGING

In 1881, Wilkinson stated that the only occupation apart from agriculture and road making that was ‘at all in favour’ with Maori was digging for kauri gum, ‘and when prices are high they will desert all other labour for it’. Those who ‘adopt this way of getting a living’ were extracting large quantities.208 During the following year ‘a great part’ of their time was

204 Ohinemuri Correspondent, *Thames Advertiser*, 3 April 1878, p. 3.
205 *Thames Advertiser*, 4 April 1878, p. 3.
206 Company Files, BADZ 5181, box 164 no. 1025, ANZ-A.
207 Oliver, p. 61.
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occupied in gum digging, ‘which takes them away from their homes for a considerable period during the year’. The industry was profitable and attracted ‘a large number of both Europeans and Maoris’ who preferred it ‘to any other kind of employment’. According to the Thames Advertiser, ‘the great majority’ of gum diggers were ‘members of the Waikato tribes’, who were ‘more disposed to this branch of industry than the local natives’. Between May 1882 and June 1883 they received high prices. Reporting the formation of the railway from Kopu to Hikutaia in 1886, Wilkinson was ‘not aware that the Natives have taken much part in the work – they prefer the more independent life of gum-digging, at which some of them earn very good wages’. They sometimes spent months in the hills digging. But this extractive industry soon extracted the payable deposits.

STANDING UP FOR THEIR RIGHTS

Even those Maori who supported the opportunities brought by Pakeha opposed the latter when their own interests were affected, and sometimes, to Pakeha, sought more than their due. In May 1869, Taipari and Rapana Maunganoa argued with a deputation of Pakeha about the rents for Shortland leases until two o’clock in the morning.

The demands of the natives were at first most exorbitant, and they were evidently determined on driving the hardest possible bargain. Gradually, however, they were overcome with pakeha persuasion and superior powers of endurance, and worn out with argument and incessant talking they became very sleepy, and at length came to something like reasonable terms.
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Because some miners were not paying their miners’ rights, later that year Taipari placed a notice in the Thames press reminding Pakeha of the arrangement whereby the goldfield was opened:

Perhaps it is because we the Maoris are people of low degree that you behave in this way to us.

Friends do not drive us back to the old customs, that is to say to the disregarding of law.

Now we begin to understand why the Hauhaus maintain possession of Ohinemuri. They have an understanding, but we were ignorant, in having given over our lands to you to work on them. And now you turn round upon us to deprive us of our lands.

The last point was a reference to the government taking the beach frontage. ‘Your one call has been come under the shelter of the Queen, and we did so. You said to us look at the laws, and we did so, and you said, do not trample on the laws, and we obeyed’.216 In 1870, when Taipari sued a tailor for the value of a house removed from his land, the magistrate ruled ‘that buildings in Shortland cannot be removed without the consent of the native owners’.217

Asked in the land court in 1877 whether he had mana over a block of land near Paeroa, Paora Tiunga replied: ‘I have – lately I destroyed a Pakeha house which had been erected on the land’.218 In 1894, asked about his land at Te Awaiti, he said that, when surveyors arrived without his prior knowledge, ‘I loaded my d b gun [double-barrelled shotgun] and sallied out’. Other Maori joined him in warning the surveyors to ‘clear out’, and the surveying ceased.219 In 1876, when a Pakeha was cutting firewood on a Pakeha farm near Paeroa, a party of Maori claiming to own the land took the axe off him.220 In 1884, a snagging party on the upper Piako River was turned back ‘on account of their interference with tapued logs’.221

Maori were quick to react to perceived insults. One told the press that he would be a better foreman on the road works at Kopu than William
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Sharpe McCormick,\textsuperscript{222} whom he described as an ‘idle on-looker’ who ‘stood with his arms a-kimbo, and used disrespectful and sometimes threatening language to the Maori workmen’.\textsuperscript{223}

The impact of development on Maori-owned land could cause resistance, especially if financial recompense was not given. In 1874 Matiu Poono objected to the Shortland Saw Mill being granted a license to float logs down the Kauaeranga River because the person asking for it is a very “hard” man and won’t pay – I asked the owner of the booms to pay 6d per log – he would not agree but he offered me twopence per log and I would not agree – he then went at once without leave and erected his booms before he had made an arrangement (with me), I would not like to go and work without leave on another persons land in the same way that that person did – now logs that come down on the foreshore and remain on our land ought to be paid for, and also land that is carried away by the logs striking them.

In addition, fences and houses damaged should be paid for.\textsuperscript{224} Taipari and other rangatira agreed that ‘timber lodged on this land’ should have been paid for ‘according to Maori custom’. Indeed, in earlier days ‘if a person destroyed food, land or houses belonging to another he would be killed and no blood would be shed in his defence according to Maori custom’.\textsuperscript{225} At a meeting with the Native Minister 11 years later, Matiu Poono complained that he had not been paid for the county’s water race crossing his land.\textsuperscript{226}

Surveyors were obstructed if they were working on land under dispute by rival hapu. Alfred Joshua Thorp,\textsuperscript{227} for instance, was obstructed several times, the first occasion being in 1873:
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A great deal of excitement was created here today by a report of a native having shot at a party of surveyors.... Mr Alfred Thorp, accompanied by Te Wano and two Europeans, went out last night to survey a block of land; on arriving at the place they were unexpectedly confronted by Te Hira, Mere Kuru, and a few others of that kidney, who were out gum-digging. Te Hira and the others were, of course, greatly incensed at finding their solitude disturbed. Horopapera, a slave of Te Hira, who was always very demonstrative, thought he would be doing well for his master if he could so frighten this party that it would be a warning to others not to cut survey lines in this district. He was carrying a gun, which he brought into use, and fired on the party three different times. He says there was nothing but powder in the gun, and he only wanted to frighten the men away. The Maoris blame Te Wano, he having agreed with the others publicly that no surveying should be done here at present; and he, to make things go as smoothly as possible, states he took Mr Thorp out to look at Riki Paka's boundary lines, he being in the belief that Riki had encroached on his property.

Horopapera was about 300 yards away when he fired, and Thorp stated ‘that he heard the whiz of bullets’. Horopapera was described as ‘an eccentric and excitable old fellow, a refugee from Taranaki’ who had lived with Te Hira ‘for a number of years’ and venerated him. Afterwards, Thorp ‘waited upon Te Hira and Co. to demand satisfaction’. Horopapera ‘wanted to deny having fired at all’, while Te Hira said Thorp had no business surveying there.

Mr Thorp said he had a perfect right to survey, as he was accompanied by the undisputed owner of the land – Te Wano, and would go again if he thought fit. He showed them his revolver, and asked if any of those present were game to take it from him. He also informed them that in future he would carry it with him when surveying, and warned them that if Horopapera or anybody else interfered with him they would get the contents.

The last report on this incident cited Maori saying the clash was premeditated. As Te Wano, the owner, had wanted Thorp prevented from surveying, he had told Te Hira where they would be, and Te Hira had

---

228 See Thames Star, 1 December 1874, p. 2; he had no involvement with Te Aroha mining.
229 Ohinemuri Correspondent, Thames Advertiser, 15 December 1873, p. 3.
230 Ohinemuri Correspondent, Thames Advertiser, 18 December 1873, p. 3.
loaded the gun with powder himself. The next obstructions, of Thorp’s surveying of the Aroha Block in 1875 and 1877, are covered in the chapter on the sale of this land. The fourth and last obstruction was in 1881, after he had been surveying the Tahanui No. 2 Block, at Turua, for a month. He had commenced the work on the orders of two Maori, one being Aihe Pepene, and had been assisted by Maori workers, but a rival party stopped him, some women taking his chain. As they only interfered once, he ‘finished it secretly’, again assisted by Maori from Ohinemuri.

Thorp was threatened with death again in 1879, when ‘one of the Kerewera tribe’ threatened to shoot him ‘because he would not stand quietly to one side and see him destroy his property’, presumably a reference to his farm. As Thorp did not involve the police in this dispute, the seriousness of this threat cannot be determined.

One way of airing a grievance was to write to the press. In 1876, for instance, Hohepa Kapene explained that the reason for opposition to constructing the road from Paeroa to Katikati was that the eastern boundary of the goldfield had not been defined:

When we opened the country for gold mining we reserved the flat land for our own use, and we now see the evil of the road which has been constructed across the land we reserved. The promise made by Sir Donald McLean was both sides of the road should be fenced, [but] has not yet been fulfilled. Lots of cattle and horses on this account wander over the native lands, causing great trouble to us, as the food which our horses would otherwise have is consumed by the horses of the pakeha.

Ministers visiting the main centres in Hauraki regularly received deputations seeking resolution of grievances. For instance, in 1892, Taipari,
the spokesman of a deputation to Seddon, ‘pointed out in a very lucid manner, the grievances of the natives, and asked that the agreement should be firmly adhered to, and that the natives should be paid the miners’ right money they had lost during the past six years’.237

Timiuha Taiwhakaea,238 who in 1879 assisted to drive the first pile for the bridge over the Ohinemuri River at Paeroa, two years later warned the native agent that he would stop the taking of kauri trees from his land at Waihi, and did so.239 In 1887, when he was a miner at Karangahake, he sued a Pakeha miner for the value of a horse.240

When they did not receive the interests they felt entitled to in the Prospectors’ Claim at Tairua in 1875, Maori made sure their grievance was not overlooked.241 After a year of not receiving miners’ rights revenue from this goldfield, the grantees petitioned parliament, warning that, if they did not receive their money, ‘we shall go and turn the Europeans off it’.242 Another petition, by 150 Maori headed by Taipari in 1894, urged the repeal of the Rating Act as applied to Maori, the Settlement of Native Lands Bill, and the Dog Tax Act, ‘as they press unduly on the Natives’.243 Nine years previously Taipari, on behalf of Hauraki Maori, at a public meeting with the Native Minister had ‘claimed exemption from the rates of local bodies, as such had been the understanding when their lands were given up for road purposes’.244 He and Hoani Nahe also insisted that the agreement to make

237 *Thames Advertiser*, 13 June 1892, p. 2.
239 *Thames Advertiser*, 15 March 1879, p. 3, 3 November 1881, p. 3; G.T. Wilkinson, Diaries, entry for 14 October 1881, University of Waikato Library.
240 Paeroa Magistrate’s Court, Plaint Book 1881-1896, 35/1887, BACL 13745/1a, ANZ-A.
241 Tauturu [otherwise Tautore Tawa] and Matiu Poono to Superintendent, Auckland Province, 17 April 1875, Auckland Provincial Government Papers, ACFM 8180, 1777/76, ANZ-A; *AJHR*, 1875, I-1, p. 25; *Thames Advertiser*, 16 June 1875, p. 3, 11 January 1876, p. 3.
242 Matiu Poono and all the grantees of Tairua to Superintendent, Auckland Province, 8 March 1876, Auckland Provincial Government Papers, ACFM 8180, 580/76, ANZ-A.
243 ‘Native Affairs Committee (Reports of)’, *AJHR*, 1894, I-3, p. 3.
244 *Thames Advertiser*, 13 February 1885, p. 3.
the road to Ohinemuri meant that Maori were never to pay for registering their dogs.\(^{245}\)

Maori sometimes stood up for themselves physically, fighting Pakeha who had offended them. For example, in 1875 Taituha\(^{246}\) was charged with assaulting a miner at Hikutaia with a bucket made from a kerosene tin, throwing him down and attempting to toss him into the river. The miner, having fought his assailant off, told Taituha that he would ‘bring him to the law at Shortland’. Taituha responded, in English, ‘B---- the law and Shortland too’. Taituha ‘had repeatedly threatened him, and sent him a message that the first time he caught him in the bush he would have his life’. Before the assault they had talked about a debt Taituha owed him. Taituha, in his evidence, called the miner ‘a companion of Satan’, and described their quarrel over the scales, which the miner had stolen but finally returned. Moewaka, Taituha’s wife, gave evidence that their house had been broken into and the scales stolen. Before giving judgment, the magistrate said that as Taituha ‘had no right to take the law into his own hands’ he should have seen the native agent and the police instead. If it had not been for the ‘suspicious circumstances’ about the scales, he would have sent him to prison, ‘but as the costs were heavy, he would fine him 10s in costs, or, in default, 14 days imprisonment. If any European stole anything from them they should take steps to acquaint the police, and the European would be fined. The costs amounted to £5 10s’.\(^{247}\)

In 1886 after a fight outside a Paeroa hotel between a Pakeha and Hunia Tamihana,\(^{248}\) the former stated in court that Hunia had struck an old Pakeha in the face. ‘I stood up and told him if he struck the old man again I would strike him, he stood up and said come on and I then struck him and knocked him down – he got up and came to me again – another Maori caught me by throat and pulled me back and others assisted them’. Hunia said he had been arguing with the older man about the return of a horse and had slapped him ‘on side of arm in course of argument’. Both were convicted and fined.\(^{249}\)

\(^{245}\) *Thames Advertiser*, 8 March 1894, p. 3.

\(^{246}\) See Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Books no. 28A, p. 50; no. 53, p. 83; no. 54, pp. 332-339.

\(^{247}\) Police Court, *Thames Advertiser*, 15 February 1875, p. 3.

\(^{248}\) See Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Books no. 28A, pp. 173-174; no. 28B, p. 46.

\(^{249}\) Paeroa Magistrate’s Court, Notes of Evidence 1884-1892, 18 January 1886, Police v. Thomas Webb and Hunia Tamahana, ZAAP 13790/1a, ANZ-A [punctuation added].
Four months later, Paraku Rapana sued Albert Wight, a farmer, for assault. According to his evidence, after digging potatoes for him he went to be paid. ‘In course of conversation defendant asked me to pay £1 for a bet I owed him. I said I could not pay it. I wrote down and signed a receipt for monies due to me showing a balance of £3.6.5’. After taking the money, Wight caught his beard and threatened to strike him ‘if I did not give up the money. He struck me when I refused in the face. I turned around to run away he struck me in the back and I turned around to defend myself’. After warding off blows, Wight ‘gave it up – and I said I would summons him’.

A witness recorded as Hone confirmed this account, and when cross-examined denied being ‘told by anyone what to say. Paraku did not challenge you to fight I was close by – Paraku did not tell you he would fight for the pound he owed’. Wight then gave evidence:

In the paddock I asked him about the bet and he would not pay me again. He said if I wanted a pound I would have to take it out of him and I said I would not do that but I would sue him. He said he would fight me – he pulled off his coat shirt and went at me and I hit him when he could not get hold of me. He wanted to stop when I struck him. I told him he could not summons him. He tackled me first. Defendant is a well-known fighter and has offered to fight me over and over again for a pound.

Cross-examined by Paraku, Wight said: ‘You have always been wanting to fight me. I can’t say if you have assaulted other pakehas’. Paraku’s reputation as a fighter was justified, as four years previously he had twice thrown a visiting Frenchman in a wrestling contest held as part of an ‘athletic entertainment’ at Thames. Afterwards he ‘issued a challenge to his opponent for £50 or £100 a side to wrestle with him in Maori style at any time within a month’, a challenge that was not taken up.

Even Taipari, when in liquor, could become violent when responding to a perceived insult, although the only occasion this resulted in a court case

---

250 For the Wight family, see paper on Hoera Te Mimiha.
251 Paeroa Magistrate’s Court, Notes of Evidence 1884-1892, 13 April 1886, Paraku Rapana v. Albert [recorded as Gilbert] Wight, ZAAP 13790/1a, ANZ-A [punctuation added].
was in 1881, when a half-caste, Thomas Webb,253 sued him and three others for £100 damages after being assaulted. This case indicated underlying tensions between Pakeha and Maori. The licensee of the Shortland Hotel gave evidence that ‘there were a number of Maoris in the back room of the hotel. They had exclusive right to the room’. Webb said that when he went into this room, one Maori said, ‘Go out of this; we’ll have no pakehas here’, pushed him, and struck him on the cheek. When Webb tried to defend himself, he was again struck on the head, ‘after which Taipari and others caught hold of him by the hair, and a great row ensued, in which he received a cut on the back of the head. Taipari was brandishing a pair of handcuffs’. His assailants took him to the lock-up, but the sergeant ‘refused to take him in charge’. Webb, a bush manager for contractors, could not work for a week because of his ‘very severe injuries’. He had been ‘perfectly sober’ and had not given his assailants ‘any provocation’.

In his evidence, Taipari said he received a salary of £250 a year from the government, and ‘had a pair of handcuffs which he used to arrest both Maoris and Europeans. He was authorised to do so by the government’. (No records of this authorization or examples of his having so used the handcuffs have been traced.) He denied striking Webb, but was ‘annoyed’ when Webb struck a Maori. He admitted taking Webb by the coat and assisting to take him to the lock-up, and stated he had advised the Maori struck by Webb not to summons him for assault, ‘as it would only stir up strife. It was not true that he went over to the hotel after the affray and ordered the Europeans out’. And if Webb ‘had remained quiet after he commenced the fight witness would not have taken him into custody’. A Pakeha giving evidence about the ‘great row’ said all four defendants were drunk and that Taipari had held Webb whilst others hit him and struck him on the head with the handcuffs. ‘Webb was then conveyed to the lock-up and on the way over was used shamefully by the natives. When Taipari came back from the jail he ordered the natives to clear the Europeans out of the house’. The jury took only 15 minutes to award Webb £20 damages for being assaulted by Taipari and the others, and Taipari was required to pay another £10 for ‘false imprisonment’. The costs against the defendants were over £20.254

253 Not involved with mining at Te Aroha; possibly he is the man referred to in Thames Advertiser, 23 September 1879, p. 2, 18 June 1888, p. 2, advertisement, 14 January 1890, p. 2.

254 District Court, Thames Advertiser, 15 June 1878, p. 3.
Despite Taipari being a strong supporter of Pakeha settlement, he resisted any infringements on his rights and those of other Maori. The Thames Sea Beach Bill of 1869, designed to stop speculation in land between high and low water mark (where miners were illegally pegging out) by enabling the Crown alone to acquire this land, provoked concern in parliament about whether Maori would suffer an injustice.255 In August, eight rangatira wrote to ‘the council of Wellington’:

Friends, greeting. Friends, hearken to our speech. We did not give up Waiotahe, Tarawhati, from Waiotahi on to Tararu extending to the sea beach. These pieces were not given up to the Governor, they are still being held by us. The localities given up by us were the mountains, and the line is there which marks your portion. Our sea beaches were left by us for the purpose of supplying ourselves with food. These places [the sea beaches] were not given up to the Government. And now on what grounds do you propose to take them [the beaches]? Make known to us the grounds. Is it on account of any wrongdoing of ours that you take them? We have been living with you in all friendliness, and now only do we understand that you and ourselves have been living at variance with each other, or that you are regarding us with aversion. Is not confiscating land an evil ground, or a ground for disputes? You already know that this is [i.e., confiscation] a cause of evil, or wrong, or quarrel; and when the evil effects become visible then you sit in judgment to condemn the Maoris, and you write to the other side [i.e., to England] and say, “The Maoris are a wicked people.” Not so; but it is your acts, and not those of the Maoris [that bring about the quarrels].

And now, O friends, leave to us the affairs respecting our own pieces at Tarawhati, Waiotahi, and Tararu. Mr Mackay is acquainted with our various speeches, from the commencement even up to the present day. We have not given up those pieces to the Governor; therefore we say to you all, let your work be just, for the Hauhaus are laughing at us and saying, “It serves you right to be driven off [your lands] by the Governor, for you gave up the gold to the Europeans.” We say, then, who could have divined that wrong could have come out of it [i.e., our giving up the gold to the Europeans]?

Now, at the first we were glad [i.e., when we first arranged with the Government for the working of the gold], but now we are greatly grieved at your acts.

O friends, these acts of yours towards us are unjust and baseless also. Enough.

From the council of Ngatimaru.256

Taipari wrote a separate letter to the Governor on behalf of his hapu:

We have heard that the Assembly is searching out a law in respect of our lands outside of our town at Hauraki. Now let the action of the Assembly in reference to that land cease, because that land does not belong to the Queen but to us only. It is a place from which we obtained flounders and cockles, and was a snipe preserve from the time of our ancestors even down to us. That land was considered valuable by our ancestors, it has been fought for, and men have been killed on account of these lands.... We still have the mana over these lands. The mana over the Island only was given up to the Queen. Now, let the Treaty of Waikato be justly carried out. That treaty declared that the Maoris were to live properly under the protection of the Queen, that she was to protect all their lands, and the places from which they obtained fish, mussels, cockles and birds....

Now, O friend, do not on any account let that Treaty of Waitangi be trampled upon. If that Treaty be abrogated, we will cease to have mana over our lands.257

In welcoming the Native Minister, Donald McLean, to a meeting at Shortland in December, Taipari came straight to the point:

Welcome to Hauraki. All the land that has been acquired by the Queen in Hauraki has been by purchase or lease. Confiscation has never extended thus far. I gave the land. I gave up the land for goldmining purposes; also the land for the town; but I did not then relinquish my claim to the mud banks and pipi grounds. Subsequently I gave up my claim to the Government through Mr Mackay. I, through the Treaty of Waitangi, hold to my right to the mud banks, the pipi banks, the kuwaka banks, and the

256 Letter from Aperahama Te Reiroa, Te Karauna Koropango, Rapana Maunganoa, Pirika Te Ruipoto, Erurera Te Ngahue, Te Kepa Te Wharau, Hohepa Tarawherawhera, Piripi Te Ngongohi to ‘the Council at Wellington’, 5 August 1869, translation printed in Daily Southern Cross, 18 August 1869, p. 6.

257 W.H. Taipari to Governor G.F. Bowen, 11 August 1869, Legislative Department, LE 1, 1869/124, ANZ-W.
fishing grounds. Now, lease the beach to me – that is to say – the surface, but you may have the right of mining under miners’ rights. These are matters to be discussed.

Te Moananui,²⁵⁸ whilst not citing the treaty, was equally clear about his rights. ‘The beach is mine, the pipis are mine, the fishing grounds are mine. You know our customs. No man would be allowed to gather pipis off a bank over which he had no right. No one would be allowed to fish on grounds not his own’.²⁵⁹ Despite their protests, the legislation was passed, and Maori owning adjacent land would receive miners’ rights revenue.²⁶⁰ As no gold was discovered, the issue ceased to be of concern. In 1885, although Matiu Poono did not mention the treaty, it was behind his complaint to the Native Minister that he ‘objected to the Europeans being allowed to capture flat-fish on the mudbanks’ of the Firth of Thames ‘without payment of royalty’.²⁶¹

In 1906, Parati Harawira²⁶² and others, in petitioning parliament, explained that in 1875 they had granted the right to mine but retained land beside the Ohinemuri River for their cultivations. As a consequence of the Waikino battery the polluted river destroyed their crops whenever it flooded, and whereas formerly it ‘was a good fishing-place for eels and whitebait, and fish constituted an important part of their sustenance’, now ‘the cyanide-deposits have destroyed the river as a fishing ground’. They reminded parliament that ‘by the Treaty of Waitangi the fisheries of the Natives were specially reserved’. Although they had ‘no wish to hamper the mining industry’, the ‘present situation fills them with dismay’.²⁶³ Four years later, supported by Pakeha farmers, they again complained about the impact of the Waikino battery on their land, stating that killing all the fish was a breach of the treaty.²⁶⁴

²⁵⁸ See Thames Advertiser, 4 October 1877, p. 3.
²⁶⁰ New Zealand Parliamentary Debates, vol. 6, p. 196.
²⁶¹ Thames Advertiser, 13 February 1885, p. 3.
²⁶² See Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Books no. 48, pp. 216, 219, 221, 223-224; no. 49, p. 162; no. 50, pp. 75, 81-85, 87, 89-90; no. 58, p. 308.
²⁶³ Goldfields and Mines Committee, AJHR, 1906, I-4, p. 2.
landowners and fishermen, the needs of the mining industry took precedence.265

USING THE COURTS

Increasingly, Maori turned to the police and the courts for redress rather than taking direct action themselves, having discovered that the latter could be used both to extract money owed by Pakeha and to sue Pakeha for criminal offences. Most court records for the first decade of Thames have been lost, but an 1870 comment by a lawyer justifying his suing rangatira noted that Maori made full use of the magistrate’s court. ‘They gladly avail themselves of European laws’ to recover rent in arrear ‘by causing distress warrants to be enforced, and by issuing summonses in the Resident Magistrate’s Court, Shortland (such things daily take place)’.266

For instance, in early 1872, in one of many of his cases, Taipari successfully sued a Pakeha for an unpaid promissory note, and several Maori unsuccessfully sued another man for damages they estimated at £30.267 Taipari sued several Pakeha who failed to pay their rent, in some cases ejecting them from his property.268 With other Maori landowners, he obtained £100 damages from Pakeha who removed stone from their land without authority and without paying even after being ordered to stop.269 In 1887, ‘deaf to all entreaties for time to pay’, he prosecuted an unemployed man who owed £4 on his rent, even though the legal process cost him £12. The *Thames Advertiser* considered this to be a ‘strange case’:

---


267 Thames Magistrate’s Court, Plaint Book 1871-1875, 463, 468/1872, BACL 13737/1b, ANZ-A.

268 *Auckland Weekly News*, 30 July 1870, p. 14, 6 August 1870, p. 15; Thames Magistrate’s Court, Plaint Book 1871-1875, 512, 513/1874, BACL 13737/1b; Civil Record Book 1883-1885, 226, 256/1883, BACL 13735/2a; Civil Record Book 1885-1887, 232/1886, BACL 13735/2b; Civil Record Book 1887-1890, 5/1890, BACL 13735/2c; Home Warrant Book 1881-1933, Ejectment Warrant dated 9 July 1890, BACL 13741/1a; Plain Book 1890-1893, Hearing of 28 April 1893, BACL 13737/2a, ANZ-A; Warden’s Court, *Thames Advertiser*, 11 March 1882, p. 3.

Very few years ago the same landlord was only too glad if he had a new blanket given to him, but since the pakeha has made his barren acres valuable, he must forsooth enact the part of the “lord of the manor,” and have his “pound of flesh.” Verily it is a queer world, full of ups and downs.\textsuperscript{270}

Taipari became adept at court proceedings, and the following year announced through the interpreter that he would conduct his own case. After giving his own evidence, he proceeded in thorough lawyer-like style to lead his own witnesses, all Maoris. His manner at the solicitor’s table when examining on his own behalf, and then taking notes of the answers in cross examination, all showed an observing mind, and would have even have done credit to one of the “devil’s own” \textsuperscript{[a lawyer]}, although the defendant himself was a solicitor of the Supreme Court. Taipari’s witnesses, however, got in a fog over a portion of material evidence, and the defendant gained the verdict of the court.\textsuperscript{271}

As examples of other Maori used the courts, in Paeroa between 1881 and 1896 some Maori who were involved in mining at Te Aroha sued for a variety of reasons: money owing, acting as a midwife, goods provided, damages to a fence and crops, ‘value of 4 pigs shot’, ‘Damages by pigs’, ‘Damages by Cow’, ‘Damages by cattle’, rent of a house, stones removed without permission, ‘timber cut’, ‘work done’, value of horses, value of a steer, hire of a machine, ‘services rendered’, ‘damages’, and wages.\textsuperscript{272} In 1898 Epiha Ngawiki\textsuperscript{273} reported the theft of his racing mare to the police and then took a civil action when it was found in a Pakeha’s stable.\textsuperscript{274}

When taken to court over unpaid debts, Maori accepted the judgment and normally paid immediately, if they had the necessary funds. Obtaining these was often at the expense of their descendents, as when Hohepa Kapene admitted owing £12 18s for goods supplied by a storekeeper ‘and

\textsuperscript{270} \textit{Thames Advertiser}, 19 July 1887, p. 2.  
\textsuperscript{271} \textit{Thames Advertiser}, 11 February 1888, p. 2.  
\textsuperscript{272} Paeroa Magistrate’s Court, Plaint Book 1881-1896, 2, 25/1881, 8, 51, 56/1882; 3, 7-9, 19/1883; 1/1884; 58, 64/1886; 35/1887; 4, 11, 55, 68/1889; 17, 122/1892; 45/1893; BACL 13745/1a; Plaintiff Book 1896-1901, 244/1896; BACL 13745/2a, ANZ-A; Paeroa Magistrate’s Court, \textit{Te Aroha News}, 30 October 1889, p. 2, 13 November 1889, p. 2.  
\textsuperscript{273} See Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Book no. 66, p. 184; \textit{Ohinemuri Gazette}, 15 March 1905, p. 3; Supreme Court, \textit{New Zealand Herald}, 27 May 1909, p. 17.  
\textsuperscript{274} \textit{New Zealand Police Gazette}, 13 April 1898, p. 63, 27 April 1898, p. 73.
said he would pay as soon as the Native Land Court rose, meaning he would sell more land.

Maori also used the magistrate’s court to sue other Maori. In the earliest surviving court records of civil hearings at Thames, in April 1869 Hare Renata sued a Te Aroha Maori for £20 but settled out of court. No other Maori involved in mining at Te Aroha used the Thames court until March 1871, when Taituha Kaingaroa successfully sued another Maori for £19. As examples of the cases heard, in 1894 £4 owing was sought, and in 1903 the value of a lost heifer. A dispute over the proceeds of timber sales went before the magistrate in 1897. Taipari sued to obtain the return of a watch, and when the person holding it claimed that it had been a gift the magistrate commented that one of the parties and their witnesses were lying and awarded it to Taipari. Later the same year, Taipari used the court to require the return of a war canoe, or, if not returned, payment of £150.

An example of the courts protecting Maori property was when Matiu Poono sued John Hendy, then a farmer, five of whose cows were inside my fence eating potatoes, my potatoes – Was driving them to the pound when I met Hendy. Deft sd what are you driving my cattle for – I sd we were chasg them to the pound. I asked payment 10/- per cow. He consented to pay 50/- for the lot. Thereupon the cattle were liberated – Up to that time I thought that was the damage. I went next day for the money. He refused and sd if he caught me again interfering with his cattle he wd smash me – the cattle got in again the next night and remd there 4 days – destroying the things – I claim £5 for damages....

275 Magistrate’s Court, *Thames Advertiser*, 7 September 1878, p. 3.
276 See paper on Eta Mokena.
277 Thames Magistrate’s Court, Plaintiff Book 1869-1871, 67/1869, BACL 13737/1a, ANZ-A.
278 See *Thames Guardian and Mining Record*, 17 May 1872, p. 3, 20 May 1872, pp. 2-3; Thames County Council, *Thames Advertiser*, 3 June 1897, p. 3.
279 Thames Magistrate’s Court, Plaintiff Book 1869-1871, 108/1871, BACL 13737/1a, ANZ-A.
280 Paeroa Magistrate’s Court, Plaintiff Book 1881-1896, 83/1894, BACL 13745/1a; Civil Record Book 1902-1905, BACL 13746/1a, ANZ-A; *Ohinemuri Gazette*, 22 May 1903, p. 3.
284 See *Thames Advertiser*, Licensing Court, 8 September 1875, p. 3, Licensing Court, 8 March 1876, p. 3, 15 December 1877, p. 3, 10 May 1880, p. 3.
The land belonged to other natives besides myself. The fence was mine and the crops belong to me – the land belongs to me where the trespass was committed. I claim the ground enclosed and the potatoes are mine... I claim for 1/2 ton of potatoes. We were at the time digging the potatoes and left them on the ground. I don’t know the price of potatoes. I claim for the shrubs destroyed.

After the farmer stated that he had promised £2 10s for renting the land grazed, judgment was given for this amount plus costs.\textsuperscript{285} When two boys stole peaches from Matiu Poono in 1879, they were charged with theft by the police and fined.\textsuperscript{286}

To make a political point, sometimes harsher penalties were imposed on Pakeha who stole from Maori than if they had stolen from Pakeha. The first criminal case heard in Shortland was of two miners who stole a sow belonging to Maori: both received one month’s hard labour.\textsuperscript{287} When Taipari caught a 13-year-old boy stealing a dozen apples and peaches, value 6d, from his garden in 1873, the boy was kept in custody for 24 hours and ‘once privately whipped’.\textsuperscript{288} In 1875 a Pakeha who broke into Hohepa Kapene’s dwelling, in a Maori settlement near Paeroa, and stole biscuits, beer, and preserved beef was sentenced to six month’s imprisonment.\textsuperscript{289} Three years later, two Pakeha settlers in Ohinemuri were charged with stealing four pigs, valued at £5, belonging to Renata Tamati. Their lawyer ‘admitted the offence, but pleaded in extenuation that they thought at the time the pigs were wild’. The Paeroa butcher who had bought the pigs, in answer to a question from the Bench,

said he would undertake to pay the natives the value of the animals. The Bench said it had no power to fine the defendants, and as it was necessary that the natives should have some protection, he would sentence the prisoners to three days imprisonment, in addition to paying the cost of the pigs and the case.\textsuperscript{290}

\textsuperscript{285} Thames Magistrate’s Court, Magistrate’s Notebook 1870-1871, Hearing of 22 March 1870, BACL 14457/2a, ANZ-A [punctuation added].
\textsuperscript{286} Police Court, \textit{Thames Advertiser}, 21 January 1879, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{287} Shortland Magistrate’s Court, \textit{Auckland Weekly News}, 17 August 1867, p. 16.
\textsuperscript{288} Police Court, \textit{Thames Advertiser}, 17 January 1873, p. 3.
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Maori were sometimes treated more leniently than Pakeha might be, especially if they were ‘friendly’. In 1879, Taipari had a case against him for shooting goats in a Thames street dismissed because he claimed not to know this was against the law.291

When a Pakeha settler at Hikutaia seriously wounded a Maori with a shotgun in 1874, the subsequent actions of Maori who had been present revealed to Puckey ‘their desire for law and order’:

Instead of inflicting a serious bodily injury, and it might have been a fatal one, upon the white man, when they had him down on the ground, the witnesses repaired at once to Shortland, a distance of about fifteen miles, and took the same course which in similar circumstances might have been expected from Englishmen in a European district. And although, upon the acquittal of the prisoner, there was a general outburst of dissatisfaction against our institutions, and a threat expressed that in case a similar attack was made by a white man upon a Native in the out-districts they would take the law into their own hands, it was nothing more than what might have been expected from a more enlightened people.292

A case of assault initiated by Taipari’s daughter Meri against a husband and wife, both Pakeha, in 1878 also revealed other aspects of Maori-Pakeha relations:

Meri Taipari deposed that she went to Tetley’s Hotel on the 4th inst. to find her husband Hamiora [Mangakahia]; but she did not succeed in finding him. She then proceeded at about 12.30 a.m. to Powell’s hotel by the Grey-street entrance. Thinking it was no use to go in as it was after hours, she was thinking of going home, when she met a constable, who told her that her husband was in the hotel. She went again to the hotel and heard both defendants talking to each other in their rooms. Witness called out to know if Samuel [Hamiora] was there and Mrs Powell said that he was not. Witness told Mrs Powell that she wanted Hamiora to go home with her. Some further words passed, and both defendants rushed out and Mr Powell hit her with his fist in the face. He also kicked her.

Under cross-examination, Meri denied being drunk, alleging: ‘Powell kicked her so hard that she believed he wanted to kick her up to her own

291 Police Court, *Thames Advertiser*, 7 April 1879, p. 3.
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settlement’. The blow to the head had ‘raised a large lump. The reason she believed Hamiora went to Powell’s was to find a sweetheart’. When Mrs Powell came out, she said: ‘Do you think I have anything to do with your black husband’, a rare use of the ‘black’ slur. Hamiora deposed that his wife was not drunk, and that he was staying at the hotel because ‘he had had a quarrel with Meri two or three days before’. The defence was that beds had been provided for Hamiora and his friend despite Powell being ‘rather reluctant, as he knew that Hamiora’s wife would come and look for him’. When Meri came asking for her husband, after ‘a few words’ were exchanged he and his wife ‘went out and loosened Meri’s hands from a small verandah post in the back yard. Witness also gave her a light touch with his fingers to her right cheek, with the purpose of making her go away. Hamiora and Meri were a quarrelsome couple’, and that night the latter ‘was very drunk and noisy’. The minimal fine of 5s, plus costs, was imposed.293

Maori increasingly used the criminal courts to resolve conflicts with other Maori. In 1877, one accused of ‘abusive and insulting language’ against Hohepa Kapene admitted the charge. He had cursed Hohepa ‘in the worst curse in Maori, viz, that he would kill him, split his head open, and cook it in the oven and eat it’. The accused was bound over to keep the peace.294 The following year, a Maori pleaded guilty to stealing Taipari’s coat from a hotel; ‘as there was a prior conviction against him, he was sentenced to three months imprisonment’.295 In 1903, when an Ohinemuri rangatira became ill, a relative, Tera Te Teira,296 accused Haora Tareranui297 of bewitching him, and threatened to shoot him if the maketu proved fatal. At a ‘native committee meeting’ held to discuss the issue, Teira withdrew his threat to shoot, but still maintained his accusation of “maketu,” and desired it to be left to the tohunga, or Maori prophet, for settlement. Haora Tareranui would not agree to this, and replied that he would leave it to the law of the
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Government to settle, and so he laid a complaint against Tera Te Teira asking that the latter be bound over to keep the peace.298

Maori women could use the courts against violent husbands, as one of Taipari’s wives did in 1893 (unsuccessfully).299

EDUCATION

Puckey found it ‘satisfactory’ to be able to report, in 1872, that Maori in Thames and Ohinemuri had a ‘growing appreciation of the advantages of education’. They were ‘becoming daily more alive to the great disadvantage’ of earlier failures ‘to avail themselves of the scanty means placed at their disposal for the education of their children’.300 But nearly two years later he reported the failure of his ‘repeated attempts’ to get a school established. As ‘within the past few years, something like £30,000 have been paid to the Natives in the shape of miners’ rights fees’, he considered ‘some provision might have been made for the education of their children’. Puckey did not consider providing education was a government responsibility, for ‘the more that is done for them the more dissatisfied and less self-reliant they become’, but he did ask that reserves for native schools be set aside whenever land was purchased.301 Two years later he regretted not only that no school had been established but also that only ten children had been ‘for the past year availing themselves of the generosity of the Government in furnishing them with the means of acquiring the English language as a means of access to the wide domain of literature’.302

When the first school, a half-time one, opened in Paeroa, in 1876, it had 18 Maori and ten Pakeha pupils.303 In the following year the school
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committee resolved to establish a full time school as soon as possible ‘so that the native children can attend. They at present refuse to attend the “half-time” school’. The Native Minister had ‘promised to help, on condition that native children are allowed to attend’.304

In his final report, in 1880, Puckey again urged the government to reserve ‘suitable blocks of land’ for schools.305 In his first mention of education, in 1881, Wilkinson regretted not being able to report favourably:

There are no purely Native schools in this district, but there are Government schools, not only at the Thames and Coromandel, but also at Puriri, Hikutaia, and Ohinemuri, all of which are open to Native children; but in very few cases only are they taken advantage of, and I cannot help thinking that the very fact of education being offered to them without their having to pay for it reduces its value in their eyes. I remember during the very early days of the Thames Gold Field, when there was only one school in the district, and that a private one, several Natives availed themselves of it for the education of their children, notwithstanding that the expense (in those days) was considerable. And now, when they can get education for nothing, they (or rather the parents) set very little store upon it.306

The following year saw no change, Maori seeming ‘to place little value upon it, preferring to allow them to remain idle at home, or to accompany their parents when they go on gum digging expeditions in the bush. I believe there are not more than two native children attending the district school, and those not very regularly’. This situation would not improve until parents were ‘held accountable for the regular attendance of their children at school for at least a portion of the year’.307

In 1883, Wilkinson was ‘pleased to be able to report a change of feeling on the part of some’ Maori. Those living at Kirikiri had applied, successfully, for a native school, which was ‘now daily attended by the Native and European children in the district’. Leading rangatira had given
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the land for the school and teacher’s residence, ‘and the regular attendance of the Native children’ showed that their parents appreciated the school. The teacher was ‘well liked’, and it was ‘likely to be a success’.\textsuperscript{308} The following year, he reported that this school was ‘well attended, and the parents of the children continue to look with favour upon it’.\textsuperscript{309} Two years later, it was ‘in a fairly-flourishing condition. The children attend as regularly as can be expected, seeing that their parents do not take the same interest in the education of their children as European parents do’. The teacher was still ‘very well liked by both Natives and Europeans’, indicating that Pakeha children continued to attend it.\textsuperscript{310} In 1887 this school was ‘in a state of efficiency’ and ‘fairly well attended by children of both races’. Government schools at Te Aroha, Paeroa, and Parawai were ‘attended by the children of some of the Natives who live near enough for them to attend’.\textsuperscript{311} The Kirikiri school was ‘fairly flourishing’ in 1888, 1889, and 1890.\textsuperscript{312} Attendance was kept up ‘fairly well’ in 1891, but Wilkinson repeated that parents did ‘not appreciate as much as they should do the generosity and forethought of the Government in providing schools for the special benefit of their children’ and in return ‘see that the children attend them more regularly’.\textsuperscript{313} In his last report, in 1892, the school was ‘fairly attended’, but many more children should be attending.\textsuperscript{314} Amongst these were the children of rangatira, for example Te Karauna Poono, son of Matui
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Poono, who stated in 1907 that ‘I did not go to school, and can only just write my name’.315

What Wilkinson did not mention was the language difficulty facing Maori children in a Pakeha school. A letter to the press from Hoani Nahe, on behalf of Taipari and others, mentioned a Maori boy who had attended the Parawai one between 1886 and 1889 but had not learnt anything because the teacher could not teach him in te reo. Nahe insisted that there must be a school at Kirikiri to teach their children in their own language.316 Only one Maori child was recorded as attending the Thames High School, his daughter Eliza, in 1881 and 1882.317

HEALTH

Lacking the necessary immunity and, partly, because of their standard of living, Maori suffered ‘persistent ill health’ and periodic endemic and sometime epidemic diseases.318 For instance, influenza struck at the end of 1836, although possibly without causing deaths, and in July 1838 a ‘titanic affection’ proved fatal to many.319 1853 was long recalled as being ‘the year of the measles’.320 In 1871, a ‘serious epidemic’ was ‘raging’ amongst Maori at Thames, although there had been only one fatality. It was ‘a sort of swamp fever, no doubt greatly increased by the wretched manner in which they live’.321 The Thames Advertiser, in a somewhat rosy assessment of the 1878 census, commented that in the Auckland region the Maori population had increased because they had ‘grown more civilized and cared for’:

The officers of native districts attribute the cause of decrease in population to the neglect of personal cleanliness, to herding together in wretched hovels which have not now even the comfort of the old Maori whare, to bad food, insufficient clothing, and last and worst to the growing habits of intemperance. These with whooping cough and typhoid fever find easy victims amongst
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people thus prepared, and the mortality among these diseases, more especially amongst the children, is very great. All these causes are greatly diminished in our own district when compared with others, although too rife even here. In the Upper Thames, and at Shortland and Parawai, the wretched hovels have given place to convenient dwellings, and bad food and clothing to comfort and even elegance.322

Dr Martin Payne was employed by the Native Office at £75 a year to provide free medical services to Maori from March 1874 until January 1879, when the position was abolished to save money.323 In January 1883, after consulting with Taipari, Wilkinson appointed another doctor to this position, but, after he moved to Auckland a year later, Payne became ‘Native Medical Officer’ again, for £50 a year.324 When the government reduced his allowance to £25 in 1888, he resigned because this amount would barely cover the cost of medicine. In his letter protesting at the reduction, he gave details of the 483 patients treated between 1 January 1884 and 31 March 1888. As well as Thames patients, others came from Puriri, Ohinemuri, Hikutaia, and even Waikato and Miranda, on the far side of the Firth of Thames. He took long trips into the countryside to see patients: 25 in the last six weeks.325 Between January 1884 and March 1885, most of those treated lived at Parawai or Kirikiri, but there were 13 from Miranda, one from Tapu Creek (who refused to accept treatment for his cancer), two from Ohinemuri, one from ‘Down the Coast’, and one who ‘Came from distance’. Not only ‘friendly’ Maori such as Taipari and his family took advantage of this free treatment, but also a leading opponent of Pakeha settlement in Ohinemuri, Mere Kuru.326

323 M.H. Payne to G.T. Wilkinson, 14 November 1883, Maori Affairs Department, MA 1, 21/19, ANZ-W.
324 G.T. Wilkinson to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 23 January 1883; M.H. Payne to Native Minister, 10 January 1884; C.H. Huxtable to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 11 January 1884, Maori Affairs Department, MA 1, 21/19, ANZ-W.
325 M.H. Payne to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 17 May 1888, Maori Affairs Department, MA 1, 21/19, ANZ-W.
326 ‘Report of Native Cases treated by me, from January 1st, 1884, to March 31st, 1885’, enclosed with Dr Martin H. Payne to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 13 May 1885, *AJHR*, 1885, G-2A, p. 4.
After his resignation, a petition headed by Taipari urged his reinstatement. ‘He was most attentive to his Maori patients.... The old people now no longer have medical relief afforded them owing to inability to go to the hospital’, the inability being lack of money to pay the fees. Payne was willing to be re-appointed after he took his ailing wife abroad, but as he did not return, the position lapsed. Some Hauraki Maori used the Auckland hospital as well as the Thames one.

In 1881 Wilkinson noted that the ‘general state of health’ for the past three years had been good, with no particular diseases or epidemics. Mortality occurred ‘principally amongst the very young and the aged, and not so much amongst those of middle age’ because of less drunkenness. The elderly died from ‘consumption and disease of the lungs’, and the young from ‘simple childhood diseases, accelerated by want of proper care and nourishment’. Later in the year, because of fear of a smallpox epidemic, he was instructed to ensure all Maori were vaccinated, at government expense, and arranged with rangatira to ensure full coverage, but achieved only ‘indifferent success’. At first, when fearing contracting the disease, ‘they entered heartily into the idea, and a considerable number of them, including children, were vaccinated’, but as the epidemic did not occur, those who had not been vaccinated ‘did not trouble themselves any more about the matter, notwithstanding that they were both written and spoken to on the subject’. The fact of ‘some of their children suffering considerably from the after effects’, which he blamed on their ‘unhealthy state’, made them dislike vaccination.

In 1883, Wilkinson reported epidemics of measles and scarlet fever. Fortunately, neither of these diseases committed as much havoc as it was feared they would do, thanks to the efficient medical

---
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assistance that was called in as soon as the diseases were discovered. Had scarlet fever obtained a firm hold amongst them it is difficult to say what would have been the result, as, what with the want of drainage always found round Native settlements, and the collective and confining way in which they live, such an infectious disease could not have been stamped out before it had carried off a large number of them as its victims.332

During the following year, Maori ‘had a fair immunity from sickness’, with ‘no disease of an alarming nature attacking them’.333 Asked to report on Maori health in 1885, Payne stated the ‘great majority’ of the 77 cases he had treated in the past 15 months were ‘tubercular and pulmonary’. A ‘very prolific cause of these diseases’ was ‘their manner of living’:

Take an instance in point: - I visited lately a mother and baby at Te Kopata: the mother was suffering from broncho-pneumonia, and was coughing so violently as to threaten the rupture of a blood vessel; the baby was suffering from acute bronchitis, and both were lying on a mat spread on the bare ground, in a small whare, some 6 x 8 feet, the walls being so imperfect as to admit the wind freely in all directions – indeed, to my mind, most uncomfortably so. Again, I have found the opposite extreme, some cabins being so close and stuffy, and so full of smoke from a fire smouldering on the ground, that it required some practice to see at all.

In contrast, some were ‘living in well-built houses, of a European type’. Their clothing should ‘be changed greatly for the better’, in particular wearing ‘heavy great coat, &c, &c, on a warm day’ but on a cold and wet one wearing ‘a shirt and a well-worn blanket’. Diet needed improving in some districts, notably in the Ngati Hako settlement near Paeroa, where they lived ‘principally, if not exclusively, on shell-fish and rotten corn, the odour of the latter being discernable at quite a distance’.

I think if they could be persuaded to live more on plain nourishing food, such as beef, mutton, eggs, and milk, and less on fish (more especially shell fish), and to abstain altogether from that native luxury – rotten corn - and, at the same time, to pay
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more regard to clothing in respect to seasons, and less in respect to show; and if their dwelling houses could be rendered more healthy with a few other sanitary precautions, there would be far less danger of the race becoming extinct than at present unfortunately exists.\footnote{M.H. Payne to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 13 May 1885, \textit{AJHR}, 1885, G-2A, pp. 2-3.}

In notes on the children of Matiu Poono, he recorded that on the same day he convinced Kate, aged 16, and Sarah, aged 18, who both suffered from phthisis, ‘to go to Hospital as her only chance, her habitat simply awful under the circumstances’. Kate died nearly three weeks later, and Sarah left hospital on 28 September, three days after the death of her brother Ned, aged 20, from this disease. Despite his father being a rangatira, Ned’s housing was ‘simply atrocious - & he would not go to Hospital’.\footnote{Medical Return for Quarter to 30 September 1887 for District of Thames, Maori Affairs Department, MA 1, 21/19, ANZ-W.} These two girls and three other children developed respiratory diseases over a 15-month period.\footnote{Medical Returns for Quarters to 30 September 1885, 31 December 1885, 30 June 1886, 30 September 1886, 31 December 1886, 31 March 1887, 30 June 1887, Maori Affairs Department, MA 1, 21/19, ANZ-W.} Matiu Poono had 15 children, of whom nine died while they were living on their land in a ‘shanty’ and then in a larger house. On some occasions he and his wife, and possibly some of their children, ‘lived in the stable’ attached to the house.\footnote{Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Book no. 56, pp. 336, 342, 374.} In 1873 he had a wooden house at Parawai;\footnote{Thames Electoral Roll 1873-1874, Auckland Provincial Government Papers, ACFM 8183, 3015/73, ANZ-A.} had this degenerated into the ‘shanty’? On this issue of appropriate housing, Wilkinson in 1892 warned that wooden houses were mostly built more from a feeling of pride on the part of the owners at being able to say that they own a wooden house than from any desire to occupy it permanently themselves. There is a want of sociability about a wooden house that makes it unsuitable to the Maori mind (and body) for permanent residence. They cannot sit all round the fire as in the case of the fire in the centre of the Maori whare. They do not feel so at home, or at ease, on the boarded floor of the pakeha house as on the fern and mat-covered
floor of the Maori whare; in fact, to occupy one for any length of time entails upon them a state of existence quite foreign to what they have been used to; so that, apart from the uncomfortableness (to them) of it, there is the fact that it is more difficult to keep clean.339

In May 1887, Wilkinson reported that Maori health had been ‘fairly good during the past year’.340 It was ‘fairly good’ once more in the year to June 1890, although both Maori and Pakeha were ‘attacked with the almost universal epidemic la grippe’, meaning influenza.341 ‘Fortunately for them it was not of a very virulent type, otherwise they would have suffered more severely than they have done, as the absence of all sanitary laws in connection with their mode of living makes them easy prey’. Now being fewer in number, they no longer congregated in large numbers but tended ‘to live apart in isolated hapos or clans, here and there’.342 In his final report, of June 1892, he recorded ‘fairly good’ health, avoiding epidemics in other parts of the North Island, although ‘they have occasionally been attacked by influenza, accompanied by a sort of low fever and general prostration’, which in a few cases, principally of children, proved fatal.343

Many Maori, including rangatira such as Taipari, who made much use of doctors for himself and his family,344 used traditional healers as well as Pakeha medicine. During Taipari’s father’s last illness, a doctor informed his relatives that he would not recover.
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His friends then resolved to try and work a cure in their own way, and a Maori wizard named Tupara was sent for from Te Aroha. On his arrival Hoterene was placed under his care, and then began the reading of lengthy prayers for his recovery. At first the natives had great hopes in the wizard, but the invalid grew daily worse, and expired.

When Wilkinson visited Taipari in 1881 because he was ‘in bed and hardly able to move with pain in his back and shoulders’, he found he would ‘not have any European medical advice’, preferring to be ‘doctored’ by a Maori ‘for some fancied Maori disease’. Wilkinson’s telegram to the Native Minister clearly caused alarm that the government’s most co-operative rangatira in Hauraki might be incapacitated, for on the following day he received a telegram ‘expressing regret’ and instructing him ‘to pay strict attention’. He visited Taipari on the next day, found him better, and three days later took two doctors, who agreed that he was suffering from muscular rheumatism. The following day Wilkinson revisited with one of these doctors. ‘We found that Taipari had not taken the medicine supplied to him last night on account of some misunderstanding in not sending the port wine with it. I gave him a dose of his medicine and remained talking to him some time and then gave him a glass of port wine before I left’. They returned on the following day, found Taipari ‘a little better’, and later Wilkinson returned to warn against drinking the poisonous liniment. One day later, the Native Minister sanctioned Taipari’s trip to Auckland to see another doctor, clearly at the government’s expense, which Taipari agreed to three days later but then cancelled because he felt better. Five days later Wilkinson again visited, to find him ‘very much better’.

---
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SOCIALIZING TOGETHER

Pakeha and Maori socialized from the earliest days of Pakeha settlement. As noted, Maori children could attend Pakeha schools, although few did, and Pakeha children could and did attend ‘native’ schools. Adults drank together in hotels, with only rare conflicts resulting. When leading Maori died, it was common to mention that they had been ‘much respected’ by Pakeha. Rangatira liked to invite their Pakeha neighbours to their homes on special occasions, such as one reported by ‘a native correspondent (Wana Taipari)’, one of Taipari’s wives, after a meeting of Taipari’s hapu at his house, Te Pukerahui, in 1873:

Many of them spoke of the benefits of living quietly and sociably, and that both people should refrain from disorder. About 10 people spoke to this effect. When Mere Taipari got up she was cheered by the whole of those present. She said she was going to give a dinner to all the people of Pukerahui and Te Kirikiri, as a farewell previous to her departure for Melbourne. She had ordered beef, mutton, bacon, ducks, sausages, beer, puddings, pudding-pies, and numerous other kinds of food. All the people were amazed at what she said about the preparation of this farewell dinner.

This dinner was to take place at Taipari’s house to celebrate the marriage of his daughter Mere, who gave ‘a general invitation to Maori and European friends’. It turned out to be ‘a select affair’, attended by 12 Pakeha, including the magistrate, the native agent, and the police inspector. ‘The Maori section of the guests were composed of leading chiefs’. The table ‘was laid and served quite in European style; even napkins were provided’. There were several courses, all ‘excellently served’. A more
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casual gathering had occurred on the second day of the Caledonian Sports in January 1868, when Taipari ‘invited several gentlemen to his residence (not a whare), where he entertained them most courteously’. In 1875, a house warming for Wikiriwhi Hautonga at Paeroa was ‘attended by a large number of the European residents of Paeroa and the neighbourhood. There was a very good spread (the preparation of which had been superintended by Messrs Dixon and party, the contractors), and afterwards dancing was kept up until a late hour.’

There was also much socializing in private and informal ways, rarely recorded for posterity. A story in a farming family recalled the 1890s in Paeroa:

One day when my Uncle Bill was down having a look around a big Maori man fully tattooed stepped out of the bush and said, “I me Te Kooti.” Uncle, who wore a hard-knocker and had a walking stick, just looked at him and then said, “I me Prince of Wales,” whereupon they both had a burst of laughter and were firm friends till the old man’s death. He was Epiha Ngawiki, who was one of the local chiefs.

Epiha was a leader of Ngati Hako, the hapu that had earlier caused so much concern amongst Pakeha through the shooting of Daldy McWilliams in 1879 by Epiha Taha and two others. Maori employed by Pakeha had contacts of varying degrees of intimacy, and as well some Pakeha were employed by rangatira, such as Taipari’s gardener. There were relaxed encounters such as jesting and practical jokes, again rarely recorded. One noted in 1876 referred to the practice of candidates for public office, in this case publican Charles Curtis, ‘treating’ voters in the expectation of receiving their vote:
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There were not many instances of interest worth chronicling during the election yesterday. One, however, would bear repetition as certain to show the Maori zest for a joke. The chief Taipari observed numerous strings of onions suspended in the shop occupied as Mr Curtis’s committee rooms. He walked up to Mr Curtis in the street, and sententiously informed him that he would take no beer. Mr Curtis, supposing that he wished for something stronger, told him he might have what he chose when Taipari informed him that he would take the onions. It so happened that they belonged to the storekeeper, and Taipari, who by this time had collected a considerable crowd to observe what to him was the wonderful sight of strings of onions hung up as an inducement to voters, had a clear laugh against the candidate.366

VOLUNTEERS

In March 1869 a Thames newspaper heard ‘that a movement is on foot to organize a Maori Volunteer Company for Shortland, a suggestion to that effect having been cordially acquiesced in by Wirope Hoterene Taipari, who is to be captain of the company’.367 The previous year, Taipari had told a large meeting he called at a Thames hotel that ‘if they were called out to protect the Queen’s rule as soldiers, they would do so’, and expressed his willingness to fight in Waikato for the Queen.368 He even joined a committee to collect money for Ferdinand von Tempsky’s widow.369 However, not till December 1874 did the Governor accept the service of the Thames Native Rifle Volunteers.370 At the meeting to establish this corps, ‘it was agreed on all sides’ that Taipari be elected captain, which he was, unopposed.371 This, the first Maori volunteer corps in New Zealand, had 41 foundation members. Taipari was to ‘have charge of all the rifles, which are not to be left in the hands of the natives after use’, the Thames Advertiser reassured its readers.372 The rifles would be lodged in the orderly room, officially because, while allegedly ‘nobody has any doubt of the men themselves’, it was ‘thought as well that the rifles should not be exposed to

366 Thames Advertiser, 6 July 1876, p. 2.
367 Times (Thames), n.d., cited in Auckland Weekly News, 29 March 1869, p. 3.
369 Auckland Weekly News, 26 September 1868, p. 4.
370 New Zealand Gazette, 1 July 1875, p. 438.
371 Thames Advertiser, 13 January 1875, p. 2.
372 Thames Advertiser, 12 January 1875, p. 2.
the risk of knocking about in native whares’. These men all favoured opening Ohinemuri for mining. The Native Minister, who vetted them, accepted all but three of the 44 who had put their names forward. Like their Pakeha counterparts, a meeting elected their officers, after which they all ‘adjourned to the Shortland Hotel, where the newly-elected officers “shouted” for the men’.

Within eight months, Taipari constructed a rifle range on his land. In 1881 there were 48 Ngati Maru members, and another 50 Ngati Maru living at Manaia obtained permission to join. Unlike Pakeha corps, none of these volunteers resigned before it was disbanded. In September 1880 Taipari placed his rifle range at the disposal of all the Volunteers. In the following year Taipari, along with Lieutenant Matiu Poono and 26 of their corps, attended the Easter Encampment of the Review of Volunteers at Te Awamutu.

In 1881 Taipari resigned as captain, for unspecified reasons, being replaced by Hoani Nahe. When this corps of ‘dusky warriors’, to quote the *Thames Star*’s slightly mocking reference, was disbanded in 1883 by the government, Taipari and other Maori felt ‘much bitterness’. As an indication of local gratitude for his forming this corps, the Thames Naval Brigade attended his funeral in 1897, ‘the outcome of a request made to the Minister of Defence’.

Other Maori joined Pakeha corps. At Thames, one joined the Hauraki Engineers in 1879, and five the Thames Rifle Rangers in 1885. Half-
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Maori were quick to learn the delights of horse racing. At the Matamata Races in early 1867, for instance, only Maori participated, modelling the event on Pakeha race days, including betting. In later races, run by Pakeha, some Maori were stewards, such as Rapata Te Pokiha in Paeroa in 1880. Some race meetings included a Maori horse race, but Maori-owned horses also raced against Pakeha-owned ones. The papers on Aihe Pepene and Reha Aperahama provide examples of rangatira who could afford to own their own racehorses, and sometimes they had good ones. Matiu Poono’s Native won the two-mile hurdle race at the Christmas Sports at Thames in 1873, and was still racing five years later.

In January 1869, Taipari was appointed to the committee to organize a race meeting at Thames, presented the race committee with ten guineas, and was elected to the committee drawing up the rules for the new Thames Jockey Club. His horse Ta Hori Kerei, clearly named after Sir George Grey, participated in races held in the following month. A satirical magazine noted that the ‘exertions’ of Mackay and Taipari were ‘much admired in galloping up and down the course, assuming the most grateful
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attitudes after their well-known style’. 395 Kerei, one of his horses, raced in the St Patrick’s Day Sports in Auckland in 1872. 396 At the Tararu Races on New Year’s Day, 1874, it won the Consolation Stakes, and his Fenian won the equivalent race for ponies. 397 Kerei came second in the Maori race at the St Patrick’s Day Sports at Parawai three months later. 398

Taipari’s daughter Mere won the hack race at the Thames races in December 1877. 399 Her Skylark won a prize at this event one year later. 400 In September 1879 she had to be sued to force her to pay £2 to the Pakeha jockey who had ridden this horse. 401 Despite her tardiness in paying him, the same jockey rode her horse again in the sports held at the end of that year. 402 After this event, she sued the stewards for £30, the stakes in the Thames Plate. ‘Skylark, plaintiff’s horse, came in first, but as it was considered that her rider “jostled,” she was awarded only half the money’, which she refused to accept, suing for the full amount. 403 As the stewards’ decision had been unanimous, she lost her case. 404

SPORTS

Other sporting events were popular. On New Year’s Day, 1868, and over subsequent days, Maori and Pakeha competed at Thames in the Caledonian Sports, with Maori winning some of the races. 405 In the Thames Regatta of January 1871, there was an eight-oared whaleboat race for boats owned and crewed by Maori. 406 To make one race even more exciting, a challenge of £100 a side was issued by the owner of one boat and accepted
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by a rival one. In the following year’s regatta, Taipari’s ‘Pacific’ participated in the sailing race for open boats. It was common for a few rangatira to be appointed to committees to organize sports events; for example, the executive committee for the Ohinemuri Sports on New Year’s Day 1877 had an equal number of Maori and Pakeha.

Although rugby was particularly popular, Maori players were usually a minority in Pakeha teams. For instance, in 1883, the team selected by the Thames Football Club to play Auckland included Aperahama, Watene, and Hoani Nahe; the latter umpired when Thames played Te Aroha four months later. When Thames played Te Aroha again that year, there were three Maori players: Aperahama, Watene, and Ngara. The two former were prominent during the game, and at the after-match dinner held for all players one of the toasts was ‘Aboriginal Players’, made by a Pakeha ‘on behalf of the natives’.

THE DRINK PROBLEM

One missionary’s reminiscences regretted that opening the Thames goldfield had resulted in his Maori congregation halving. ‘Vice was rampant. Again and again have I heard thoughtful Maoris in this district lament the evils we carry amongst them’, and they petitioned against the establishment of hotels. ‘I have heard them say, “Why do you bring these evils amongst us? Why do you tempt us? We cannot restrain our young people” ’. In 1872, Puckey referred to drunkenness as ‘a vice growing fast upon them’, for only ‘rarely’ was a meeting held without ‘a very considerable quantity of ardent spirits consumed’. He could cite only one example of a leading rangatira, Te Moananui, becoming ‘a reformed hard-drinker’ and
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teetotaller.\textsuperscript{415} That year, after a Pakeha died from drink at Hikutaia, another reported that he had ‘got the grog from a Maori whare. The Maoris sell any amount of it’.\textsuperscript{416} In 1875 drunkenness was reportedly ‘not as rampant as it was’, and the following year there was ‘far less drunkenness’.\textsuperscript{417} In August 1878, ‘amongst the good things provided for the mourners’ at a tangi ‘were some casks of beer, the contents being carried away wholesale in billies and other utensils. Partly owing to that, and the money paid on account of the Aroha block, several natives got on the “spree,” but there was very little rowdyism’.\textsuperscript{418} Disapproval of drunkenness led to attempts to reduce the number of liquor outlets: Ropata Te Pokiha, for instance, signed an 1880 petition to cut the number of hotels at Paeroa.\textsuperscript{419}

In 1881 Wilkinson noted that drunkenness was not ‘so prevalent as in past years’.\textsuperscript{420} The first, and ‘perhaps the greater’ reason, was that ‘the supply of money formerly obtained through the sale of land has failed’, forcing Maori to abandon heavy drinking ‘through want of funds’. The second reason was that Te Kooti’s religion, ‘which a great many of them have adopted, prohibits them from too much indulgence in spirituous liquors; in fact, a convert who has real faith in the doctrines he professes is generally found to be a total abstainer’.\textsuperscript{421} The ‘increased habits of sobriety’ at Thames and nearby were noted in 1883, but those living at Ohinemuri and Te Aroha did not ‘deserve such a good character as regards sobriety’.\textsuperscript{422} In March 1884, a visitor to Hikutaia noted ‘the excellent drinking qualities of the Maoris around this quarter, who took it out the day I was there, not
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in pints and quarts, but in gallons’. 423 A year later, not only had most Maori been ‘very temperate’, but ‘a good number’ had joined the temperance movement’s Blue Ribbon Army. 424 In 1887 Wilkinson wrote about Maori in Waikato and Hauraki:

Temperance continues to be a very marked feature amongst the Natives, and for which they are entitled to great credit, as the means and sources for obtaining intoxicating drink are as numerous as ever. As a rule the Europeans supply the hotels and intoxicating drinks, with all their evils, and also, as a set-off, perhaps, the teetotal lecturer; but whilst the Natives have unlimited access to the former, the influence of the latter hardly ever reaches them, as nearly all the temperance lecturers speak in English only, and only address English-speaking audiences; so the temperance principles of the Maori have in most cases originated with himself, possibly from knowledge, dearly acquired, that intoxicating liquors are bad things for them both physically and socially. 425

In 1890, Wilkinson reported that Maori in these districts were still temperate. ‘With very few exceptions, and unless on special occasions, it is rather an unusual thing to see intoxicated Natives, and, when those who do indulge in an occasional “spree” get the worse for liquor, it is very rarely now that they commit themselves in such a way as to necessitate the interference of the police’. 426 Despite this positive assessment, sobriety was not a common feature of Maori settlements, and an amendment to the Maori Council Act of 1903 made it illegal to take alcohol into these. ‘The object of this section is to prevent the orgies that take place amongst the natives’, a Paeroa newspaper noted; it also explained that Maori could still purchase alcohol in hotels to drink on the premises. 427
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In ‘outlying areas’ some Maori were publicans in the 1870s and 1880s, the first hotel at Te Aroha being an example. In 1877, Hori Matene constructed a wooden hotel at Kirikiri, which the licensing committee required to be enlarged before granting a license. When his new hotel was opened there in 1882, rangatira from as far away as Te Aroha were invited to the celebrations. In outlying areas, rangatira helped to decide whether public houses should be permitted: for instance, Phillip Bennett had to obtain approval from the Native Assessors for his Travellers’ Rest at Ohinemuri.

CRIME

Despite some different concepts of criminal behaviour, such as Maori belief in sorcery, in general there was ‘considerable correspondence between Maori concepts of wrong and those recognized in English law’. Maori did not argue, therefore, that the behaviour punished by magistrates should not be treated as crimes. Puckey reported in May 1875 that since 1869 only four Maori had been imprisoned in Hauraki, ‘two for petty larceny, one for horse-stealing, and one for aggravated assault’. In 1880 the magistrate, Harry Kenrick, wrote that, ‘with a very few exceptions’, Maori were ‘law-abiding, orderly, and comparatively industrious’. In the following year Wilkinson noted a decrease in crime, due to less drunkenness; there had
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been only two criminal convictions at Thames.\textsuperscript{437} The following year he again noted that crime was rare, the three magistrate’s courts recording ‘only four convictions for drunkenness, two for petty larceny, one for assault, and one for breach of the peace’. Considering that the district ran from Cape Colville to Te Aroha, this record spoke ‘well for the character and behaviour of the natives’.\textsuperscript{438} ‘Very little crime’ was reported a year later, mostly ‘drunkenness, petty larceny, and the minor crimes’: threatening and obscene language, disorderly conduct, and one case of assault.\textsuperscript{439} Only five cases were considered by the Thames magistrate’s court in the following year. ‘The Natives of the Thames District, with the exception, perhaps, of the Ngatihako, were ever a good specimen of law-abiding Maoris, and this year has shown no exception to that rule’.\textsuperscript{440}

In 1887, Wilkinson listed the number of convictions, which was, as he noted, ‘a very low’ average, the largest number of convictions for one offence being for ‘Breach of Borough By-laws’.\textsuperscript{441} Crime during the following year was ‘very small indeed’ and ‘very small’ in the subsequent one.\textsuperscript{442} In the year to June 1890, ‘no crime of any magnitude’ was committed, offences ‘being mostly of a trivial nature, the most serious not exceeding the degree of larceny’. Wilkinson’s explanation was ‘an increase in sobriety’.\textsuperscript{443}

ORTHODOX AND UNORTHODOX RELIGIOUS BELIEFS
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Kerry Howe has pointed out that Maori selected what they found ‘most exciting, useful or relevant’ in Christian concepts and rituals. Their ‘enthusiasm for innovations’ meant that they were more interested in the novelty of the new faith than adopting it, and their ‘lack of spiritual rigour’ upset missionaries.\textsuperscript{444}

In 1871 the Church of England established a Native Church Board for the Archdeaconry of Waitemata, and rangatira from Hauraki attended its annual meetings.\textsuperscript{445} Leading rangatira supported the building of churches, notably Taipari, who provided the site for St George’s Church.\textsuperscript{446} In 1869 Taipari collected subscriptions for the enlargement of the Maori church at Shortland, giving a ‘handsome donation’ himself, and in 1883 headed the subscription list for enlarging and improving the Maori church at Parawai with a ‘very generous donation’.\textsuperscript{447} He also gave a church site to the Primitive Methodists.\textsuperscript{448} But despite his support for Christianity, in 1882 he went ‘on a mission to Ahipara’, in Northland, ‘for the purpose of consulting a Maori prophetess, whose predictions and opinions are much sought after by natives in all parts of the island’.\textsuperscript{449} When his father died, his ‘clothes, mats, chattels, and everything belonging’ to him were burnt because of being tapued by death.\textsuperscript{450} Clearly acceptance of old beliefs and customs had not ceased even among those most attracted to Pakeha ways.

In the 1870s, according to Puckey, the Hauhau faith was declining, being ‘succeeded by the Tariao, a belief, if I may so term it’, that would not ‘elevate the Native mind, being, I take it, one step further removed from the sublime truths of Christianity than Hau-Hauism’. The ‘form of prayer’ he appended to his report was really a whakapapa.\textsuperscript{451} The reason given by one hapu on the Coromandel Peninsula for becoming Hauhau was that ‘so many of them have died recently whilst professing Christianity, and that some notable Tohunga has attributed it to that cause, and they wish to know whether it is so or not’. He also cited, as an illustration of their ‘Moral
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Condition', that the Hauraki tribes’ endorsing of a murder at Tairua indicated that they still believed in witchcraft and were ‘more willing to adopt the remedy provided in the Mosaic law for the suppression of the alleged evil, than they are to take the word of the civilized people ... that no such evil exists’.\footnote{452 E.W. Puckey to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 16 June 1876, \textit{AJHR}, 1876, G-1, p. 21.} Two years later he reported that ‘a free-love movement’ promoted by a Ngati Paoa chief had ‘found little favour’. Te Kooti had been touring ‘to promulgate his own peculiar views of theology’, holding ‘a sort of camp-meeting ... somewhere between Te Aroha and Katikati. His wife had, prior to that, been conducting special services at different places in this district’.\footnote{453 E.W. Puckey to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 3 June 1878, \textit{AJHR}, 1878, G-1A, p. 1.}

Wilkinson shared the opinion that ‘the Maori mind is often much agitated’ by belief in makutu or witchcraft, and that this firm belief was ‘very hard – I was going to say, impossible – to shake’. This 1881 comment was provoked by an example of this belief and of Pakeha attempts to avert serious consequences:

Some four years ago an elderly Native named Te Pukeroa was accused of causing the death of the great Ngatitamatera chief Te Moananui;\footnote{454 For details of his death, see \textit{Thames Advertiser}, 24 October 1877, p. 3, 12 November 1877, p. 3.} in fact the man (who is really a harmless monomaniac,) confessed that he had exercised the black art, the result of which confession was a threat by Te Moananui’s people to take his life; and, to show that their rage was genuine, several of them surrounded his house one morning at daylight, and poured a volley into it. I do not think, however, they really meant murder, as they took the precaution the day before to send word to the Thames about their proposed expedition, so that the opportunity was taken to have the old man removed from his house to a place of safety. But, although saved for the time being, his life was still thought to be in danger; therefore the Government had him removed for a time to the Chatham Islands, where he had relations. He, however, after remaining there some time, returned to New Zealand, and, after residing for a short time at Otaki, again turned up at the Thames. His return was the signal for another outburst of injured feelings on the part of the Ngatitamatera, and they again threatened to take his life; but the old man in the mean time had found friends amongst his own
people, the Ngatimaru, and also the Ngatipaoa; who, now recognizing clearly that the man was partly an imbecile, and therefore nor responsible for all his actions, considered that his banishment to Chatham Islands was atonement enough for his crime, and therefore let it be pretty generally known that any attempt upon his life would be resented by them. This, at first, looked like causing trouble, but in reality it produced the best possible results; for now that each saw that the other was determined, they did what many others have done before them – thought it best, now that a difficulty was pending, to consider how to get out of it. The result of which was they forgave the old man (but cautioned him not to do the like again), averted the threatened tribal quarrel, and, metaphorically speaking, a general hand-shaking took place – not on the quiet, or in secret, but in grand style, according to most approved Maori custom. The meeting was held at Ohinemuri, and the Natives from the Thames (with whom was the wizard) were conveyed thither in two war canoes, one steamer, and numerous boats, all the men being armed; the whole, when they landed and joined with the Ohinemuri people in their war dances, &c, making quite an imposing spectacle. The speeches that were made were very few, being merely expressive of forgiveness on the part of the late Te Moananui’s relatives and of peace-making on the part of the others; an exchange of muskets took place to show that the wrong inflicted was forgiven, and the peace made a genuine one; after which the meeting ended and the Natives returned to their different homes apparently satisfied that, if a long and bloody war had not been brought to an end by their action, at least a threatened catastrophe had been averted.455

In 1887, Wilkinson cited another example of belief in witchcraft held by Ngati Maru after three Maori, including the Member of Parliament for Northern Maori, died after eating twice cooked canned meat.

It seems that just previous to their partaking of the food at Auckland which caused their death, they had been paying a visit to the Thames as members of the Church Synod, the meeting of which was held in the Native church at Parawai. Their untimely death so soon afterwards gave the imaginative and suspicious Native mind a good chance to attribute it to witchcraft caused by the agency of some of the Ngatimaru people, in retaliation, so it was said, for the Ngapuhi attack, under Hongi Hika, on the
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Totara Pa, at the Thames, and the wholesale slaughter of the Ngatimaru by treachery in 1822.

This rumour ‘caused pain and annoyance to the Ngatimaru people, and a number of them, including their principal chief, W.H. Taipari, paid a visit to the Bay of Islands,’ which resulted in everything being ‘satisfactorily explained, and good feeling restored’. In 1893, Taipari himself was accused of witchcraft, but at the meetings held in consequence the accuser was forced to admit his accusation was false.

The Anglican Church Gazette printed an extract from the journal of Archdeacon Edward Clarke, then based in Waimate, describing his 1883 visit to Paeroa ‘where there was a large gathering of Hauhaus from all parts of the district’ to attend Te Hira’s tangi:

On arriving at the place, my companions were welcomed with the usual haere mai. After half-an-hour’s tangi (crying), speech-making commenced, but I, a strange pakeha, was not even noticed. When my friends had replied, I rather astonished the meeting by getting up and pretending to resent their want of courtesy, complaining that they had welcome Ngatimaru but neglected my tribe, Ngapuhi. I had come to join them in their tangi over one dead body, and wanted them to help me to exhume and resuscitate another – that of Christianity. In reply, one chief, after formally welcoming me as the representative of my tribe, said that the body in which I was interested was too far gone to be exhumed, that the very bones had crumbled into dust. Another said that they were all the slaves of Satan and strong drink. The arguments of another were that the Hauhaus and followers of Te Kooti and Te Whiti worshipped the same God as did Church people, Wesleyans, and Roman Catholics. After partaking of food we talked in an informal manner for an hour or two; and I was glad to have confirmed the conviction I have previously entertained, that the time is not far distant when Hauhauism will have died a natural death. They told me plainly that they had no fault to find with Christianity in itself, but that they had given it up, at the same time as they did the laws of the Government, just because it was a pakeha (foreign) institution.

---

456 G.T. Wilkinson to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 19 May 1887, AJHR, 1887, Session 2, G-1, p. 8.
They then agreed to Clarke's offer to conduct a service and 'listened attentively to the parable of the lost sheep, and afterwards joined in the General Confession and the Lord's Prayer. After the service was over, some of them remarked that it reminded them of old times, as it was twenty years since they had heard the words'. The archdeacon left 'hopeful and thankful for the success of the opening of my campaign against Hauhauism and its kindred'. He was over-optimistic, for alternatives to Christianity continued to exist; for instance, Te Kooti was 'continually being visited by Natives from the Thames' and elsewhere 'who have adopted his karakia or form of worship, and who believe in him as a prophet'.

In 1886, Wilkinson reported that Maori living at Shortland and Parawai had built a new church upon land near the former mission station at Parawai:

I have not seen it myself, but have heard from those who have, and who are qualified judges, that it is well and truly built, and would not disgrace either a European architect to design or a European carpenter to build. It has been built entirely by the Maoris, even the plans and specifications being drawn by them. The making of the plans and the labour of building have been under the superintendence of Hore Matene, a young Native of Te Kirikiri, and Hoani Nahe, of Omahu, near Te Puriri (formerly member of the Western Maori Electoral District), and from all accounts the work is very creditable to them.

Maori religions based on reinterpretations of Christianity combined with elements of earlier beliefs are not dealt with here, for no followers have been traced at Te Aroha. Mormonism, by contrast, in the late nineteenth century acquired a strong hold on many living there. Mormon missionaries first appeared in Hauraki in early 1883, travelling on foot upriver from Thames distributing tracts at Maori settlements. Wilkinson reported in 1890 that Mormonism was almost the only religion of Maori living in the
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462 Alma Greenwood, diary, entries for 26, 27 January 1883, Brigham Young University Papers, MS 4292, folder 16, Alexander Turnbull Library.
King Country and the Waikato and that a ‘considerable number’ at Te Aroha and Thames had adopted it. In January 1896 it was estimated that ‘upwards of 3,500’ Maori throughout New Zealand had become Mormons. When the president of the church in the Hauraki district (covering the area from Coromandel to Te Aroha) returned to America in February the following year, it was reported that he had spent two years in this district, in which 175 Maori were Mormons. At Kirikiri, 45, comprising nearly all the residents, were Mormons, but at Thames and in the Kauaeranga Valley Maori continued to be Anglicans. But by 1905, Maori at Thames were reportedly ‘almost completely under the influence of the clean-shaved Americans’.

In the nineteenth century, Mormonism attracted Maori almost exclusively; only one Pakeha was a Mormon in 1891, according to the census. The first two Mormon missionaries in Hauraki complained that Pakeha ‘refused at many places’ between Thames and Cambridge to give them ‘the slightest morsel to eat’. When they approached people in Paeroa and Te Aroha for assistance, it was refused. At Paeroa, when they were about to be given permission to use the public hall it was revealed that they were Mormons; they were then told that the chairman of the hall committee would have to be consulted first. As nobody would give them a meal, they left for Te Aroha. The first success of Mormon missionary endeavours in this region occurred, according to an official church history, ‘near Cambridge’ in late December 1882, after they had successfully ‘rebuked’ an illness from the daughter of the man who became their first convert. In April 1883 it was reported that about 80 Maori in that district had joined

---
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the new faith, under the leadership of an ex-catechist of the Church of England.\textsuperscript{471}

Wilkinson, in 1890, was relatively sympathetic to the Mormon ‘elders and teachers who have now been living for several years’ amongst Maori, for the objections raised against them in America and elsewhere, presumably a reference to its earlier practice of polygamy, did not apply to New Zealand:

Whatever was objectionable about their religion and practices there has not been introduced here. The result of their teachings amongst the Maoris has certainly been good. One reason why these people and their teachings have found favour with the Maoris is because of their evident sincerity, their humility, the cheerfulness with which they put up with hardship, and the readiness with which they adapt themselves to the Maori style of living. They also practice themselves what they teach to others, and they strictly carry out the Scripture injunction to carry neither purse nor scrip. They never make collections, or ask for money; neither do they seek to acquire land, nor mix themselves up in any matters that do not belong to their particular sphere. No wonder, then, that the Maoris become converts to their teachings. Maoris, as a rule, are very discerning, and also very good judges of character, and they evidently appreciate the disinterestedness of the Mormon teachers now working amongst them. Maoris never cared for, or understood much about, our distinctions between different creeds, sects, doctrines, and dogmas, and the importance with which some of us treat these matters, to the exclusion sometimes of the true elements of Christianity, makes the Maori wonder whether the religion that we have been trying for years to get him to adopt is really religion in its strictest sense, and whether, if to adopt it would cause them to act as we sometimes do, they would not be as well without it..... When they find any one putting up with personal loss and discomfort all for the purpose of doing them good, and that without expectation of any earthly fee or reward, they at first view him as a curiosity, after that, if he proves to be genuine, they believe in him, and become converts to his teachings.\textsuperscript{472}

Important reasons why Mormonism had become so popular were explained in 1899:

\textsuperscript{471} Auckland Weekly News, 7 April 1883, p. 18.
\textsuperscript{472} G.T. Wilkinson to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 5 June 1890, AJHR, 1890, G-2, p. 6.
A travellor was passing through a native district the other day, and he asked an old Maori what religion he belonged to. The Maori replied “Mormon.” The travellor said, “Is it because you are allowed a number of wives?” “No,” said the Maori. “The missionary came to my people long ago, he looked after their souls, then the land. More particularly the land. The Mormons come to my people now, and he lives like a Maori, works like a Maori, preaches his religion, and he leaves me my land. That is the reason why I am a Mormon.473

Wilkinson doubted that Anglicans and Wesleyan efforts to respond by renewing their missionary work after a lapse of 30 years would succeed. Since their ‘falling-away’ from Christianity just before the Waikato War, ‘the only experience; Maori had had of a so-called religious nature’ had been ‘with the many forms of Hauhauism, Te Whiti-ism, Te Kooti-ism, and the numerous other faiths that have been introduced amongst them, all of which partook, more or less, of fanatical actions, unintelligible sayings, and unhealthy excitement’. He doubted that ‘the more quiet and subdued actions and influences of the Christian religion’ would ‘find much favour with the Maoris at first’. As Maori liked ‘to have something novel and exciting even in their religion’, ‘Salvation Army tactics’ would be more effective.474

INTERMARRIAGE

When Marare Hikori sought ownership of a block of land in 1883 to enable her, by selling it, to be able to erect a tombstone, ‘Hakipine Hura said that the others distrusted Marare on account of her having a pakeha husband’.475 Of those who invested in mining in the Te Aroha district, the following Pakeha married Maori, either officially or unofficially: George Prior Donnelly, John William Richard Guilding, Alexander Hogg, George Lipsey, John Alexander McInnes, William Buchanan Maxwell, William Nicholls, Joseph Rickit, George Simpkins, Richard Stubbing, William David Tilsley, Daniel Tookey, and William Sullivan. Others Pakeha who married Maori and either settled in the district or had official associations with it

474 G.T. Wilkinson to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 10 June 1891, AJHR, 1891, G-5, p. 6.
475 Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Book no. 15, p. 41.
were Henry Dunbar Johnson and George Thomas Wilkinson, while Charles John Dearle married a half-caste. The following shareholders in mining claims married part-Maori: Charles Alley, William John Bain, John Bramley, Robert Esther Moore Campbell, George Crocker, Alexander Watson Edwards, Guilding again, Francis Vardon Hennah, Thomas Alfred Hines, Arthur Edward Langley, Herbert John Osmond, George William Rogers, Joseph Harris Smallman, and Allan Wallace Wight, the latter being of quarter-Maori descent.

James Gordon, a half-caste, married two Pakeha women and had fertile sexual relations with several more, whilst another half-caste, Albert Edwards, was a faithful husband of a Pakeha woman. John Alexander McInnes, a miner and mine manager who died in 1915, was recorded on his death certificate as being born in Waikato in 1844 to John, a chemist, and an unknown mother. His being also known as Hone Te Aho implied that his mother was a Maori, and an obituary explained the link:

He was well connected. His father was one of a quartet of which Messrs Logan Campbell, Brown, and another were the others. His father married a sister of the late King Tawhiao, and there are many natives as well as pakehas who will regret the loss of one who had many friends, and no enemies.... He was born in Waikato and was as well known throughout that district as he was at Thames.

John Logan Campbell mentioned McInnes’ father, known as ‘Makiniki’ to Maori, only in passing, even though he was one of his three companions when he first settled at the site of the future Auckland, and made no mention of his liaison with Tawhiao’s sister. Before arriving in Thames by 1871, if not earlier, McInnes was for a time in Australia, presumably as a

---
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miner, where he acquired a wife, who like so many other Pakeha women did not find his Maori heritage repugnant.

Some inter-marriages failed very quickly. For example, when a newspaper correspondent visited Rapata Te Pokiha’s settlement near the future Paeroa in 1868, he met one Schafer, ‘the great pedestrian traveller’, who complained about his treatment by the hapu.

He had been living amongst the tribe for a period of two months, and that shortly after his arrival in the settlement he had had allotted to him a young Maori lady in marriage. That they had lived very happily together until recently, when his fair lady, without assigning any reason for so doing, expressed a wish to leave him. In consequence of this she had been taken away by her parents.

His wife, ‘a young lady of very modest appearance, and remarkably good-looking’, then appeared. ‘She informed us, in excellent English, that her name was Lizzy, that she was fifteen years of age, and that she had only left Mrs Kissling’s school’, a missionary school at Taupiri, ‘nine months ago, and that she was a near relative to the chief Ropata’. After discussion amongst those present, mostly Maori, it was agreed to form a jury of eight, half Pakeha and half Maori, selected by Schafer and his wife. ‘Perhaps the most remarkable trial on record’ ensued, starting with arguments over the property Schafer had contributed to the marriage, he saying he was willing to leave his wife in the settlement upon having the ring, the £2, the shawl, and cooking utensils’. Rapata’s wife said that, ‘as she had cooked for Schafer the whole time he had been in the settlement, she thought she was fairly entitled to retain the cooking utensils, which were of a very trifling value’. The evidence revealed that Schafer had Pakeha rivals for the affections of Lizzie. When a cutter crewed by two Pakeha had arrived at the settlement she had been enticed aboard: ‘Schafer felt proportionately aggrieved, and went on board to induce her to return, but was unable to persuade her’. In a ‘scuffle’ with the mariners, he received what he described as ‘some very serious injuries’ but what others said was ‘nothing more serious than a smack in the face’. A tribal council had decided that Schafer should leave

____________________________

482 Thames Warden’s Court, Warden’s Note Book February-June 1871, Hearing of 8 March 1871, BACL 14457/2c; ANZ-A; Thames Star, 6 April 1915, p. 4; Death Certificates of Alathia McInnes, 29 January 1905, 1905/1002; John Alexander McInnes, 5 April 1915, 1015/3049, BDM.
the settlement ‘for being a nuisance, and disturbing its otherwise peaceful
repose’, and take his wife with him, for they were considered legally
married. Lizzie’s friends ‘refused to allow her to go with him, and he refused
to leave the settlement without the things being returned’. Schafer’s being
‘being very partial to ladies’ society’ had provoked his wife’s jealousy.
Evidence also revealed that Schafer had been provided with a whare, and
‘had furnished nothing towards his own and his wife’s support’ apart from
the few items he demanded be returned. The unanimous verdict of the jury
was that he would receive none of his property, and was to leave on the
following day. ‘The verdict was delivered in both English and Maori, and
appeared to give very general satisfaction’. The report concluded that ‘the
whole proceedings connected with this memorable trial were conducted with
the most rigid decorum’. 

CHARLES ALLEY AND HIS FAMILY

In 1875 and later years, Henry Alley was involved in conflict with both
Maori and the government over Maori driving his cattle off the
Waiharakeke block, upriver from Te Aroha. Despite their father’s
squabbles, two of his sons married half-caste daughters of Albert John
Nicholas, for 40 years a trader on the Waihou River. After the death of
his first wife, a daughter of Te Waharoa, in 1857, Nicholas married
Ngahuia Ngakaho, the mother of these daughters, and formerly the wife of

October 1868, p. 7.
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Allan McCaskill of Hikutaia.\footnote{See Death Certificate of Albert John Nicholas, 20 April 1888, 1888/2056, BDM, which records neither wife nor children; Waugh, ‘Nicholas, Early N.Z. Trader’, p. 153; Waugh, ‘Nicholas of Hikutaia’, pp. 16-17, and, for photographs of the two wives, facing p. 18.} Charles was the first to marry, in 1885, when a bushman aged 27 and living at Hikutaia: his bride, Emily, otherwise Mere Ngakaho and Emere Nicorahi, alias Herewini, was 21.\footnote{Marriage Certificate of Charles Alley, 11 July 1885, 1885/2105, BDM. For her Maori names, see Aroha Block XII Section 33A, Maori Affairs Department, Hamilton, Block Files, BACS A102, 1910/457, ANZ-A; Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Books no. 52, p. 49; no. 56, p. 278.} Alfred married Clara two years later, when he was 22 and she one year younger.\footnote{Marriage Certificate of Alfred Alley, 3 October 1887, 1887/1024, BDM.} As Charles invested in a Te Aroha mine in 1880\footnote{Te Aroha Warden’s Court, Register of Te Aroha Claims 1880-1888, folio 166, BBAV 11567/1a, ANZ-A.} but Alfred did not, only Charles’ life with Emily has been traced.

It must be assumed from an item of gossip published in July 1883 that they had met in the previous month: ‘Who was the blushing beauty of sweet eighteen that captivated Charlie A. during his month’s sojourn at Te Aroha? Take care of your back hair, Charlie – though I have heard grave doubts about your possessing any’.\footnote{‘Thames Tittle Tattle’, Observer, 7 July 1883, p. 248.} After their marriage, Charles was the sole general storekeeper and butcher at Hikutaia as well as a purchaser of kauri gum.\footnote{Ohinemuri Gazette, 15 September 1897, p. 2, 11 November 1903, p. 2, 8 February 1905, p. 3, 18 March 1905, p. 3; Thames Advertiser, 10 January 1895, p. 3.} Their first child, Albert Henry, was named after both grandfathers.\footnote{Birth Certificate of Albert Henry Alley, 12 August 1886, 1886/9873, BDM.} There would be 11 other children, two of them with Maori second names: James Pakaurangi, born in 1888, and Nora Ngahuia, born in 1897.\footnote{Birth Certificates of James Pakaurangi Alley, 13 June 1888, 1888/17114; Charles Robert Alley, 22 February 1890, 1890/5737; Alfred William Alley, 29 July 1891, 1891/8872; George Edward Alley, 13 September 1893, 1893/16211; David Clifford Alley, 2 June 1895, 1895/16162; Nora Ngahuia Alley, 5 April 1897, 1897/8445; Eric Alexander Alley, 2 September 1898, 1898/812; Edna Helena Agnes Alley, 25 April 1900, 1900/6924; Hector John Alley, 13 October 1901, 1902/1417; Francis Nicholas Alley, 1903/18930; Lesley Walker Alley, 1903/18931, BDM; Francis Nicholas and Leslie Walker Alley were}
two weeks, and Leslie Walker a year later, both of marasmus or wasting away, Leslie having faded for six months. Giving birth to these twins caused the death of Emily at the age of 39, leaving ten sons aged from 12 days to 16 years and two daughters aged three and six. A Paeroa correspondent reported that Hikutaia was ‘thrown into a state of gloom’ owing to her death, for Emily was ‘a well-known and highly-respected resident’ and ‘a great favourite of all’. An obituary made her ancestry clear:

The deceased lady was a half-caste. She claimed Hikutaia as her birth-place, and was a hereditary chieftainess of very high rank and prestige on her mother’s side. She was educated by the late Rev Mr Chambers at Rarotonga, and returned to her native soil to brighten it by her life and example. The proceedings connected with the last rites to the deceased bore ample testimony to the esteem she commanded while living, the funeral being attended by representatives of both races in very large numbers from Te Aroha to Coromandel. At the grave the Rev Mr Cowie, of Paeroa, read the Church of England burial service in a most impressive manner, which was also repeated in the native language by the Rev Mr Ford, of Puriri.

As another indication of the blending of the two cultures created by such marriages, her will was written in both Maori and English.

After Alley’s youngest two children died, the next youngest, Edna Alice and Hector John, were adopted by his parents. His father-in-law died in 1888, and in February 1907 his mother-in-law, Ngahuia Ngakaho, died. Six months after her death, he gave evidence against his brother-in-law,
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Frederick, her son by Allan McCaskill, in an argument over her will. ‘It is we only who looked after the deceased, and found money for Court work, etc. Dec. has always lived with my wife, and myself. Before that (25 yrs) she lived with Mrs Waugh’, who was ‘well off’ and living in Australia, a reference to Parauihia, another daughter of Ngahuia, who was living in Melbourne before 1899. ‘McCaskill has never contributed to the support of his mother. She was in need of support, before I went to live with them. She & her daughters had to dig gum for a living’, and although McCaskill was ‘about’ and knew her circumstances ‘I never saw him assisting his mother. He could have got plenty of work if he had liked, as he was a good tradesman. He only works when he wants a £ or two. I have paid him for work he has done for his mother’. By contrast, Alley and his wife ‘supported Ngahuia for the last 25 yrs’, whereas McCaskill and his children did no work. ‘His mother has spoken to me of ill treatment’ from him, despite her giving ‘large areas of land to his father’, which had been sold, and the McCaskills did not cultivate the remaining seven acres. ‘I cleared it & cultivated it for 3 yrs. It had been lying idle 15 to 20 years’ before the McCaskill family returned and took possession of it with his wife’s permission, although they cultivated only about a third of it. ‘My wife has paid all the Court expenses regarding these lands’, and McCaskill owed him ‘money for fencing wire’. Under cross-examination, he stated that McCaskill’s ‘mother never cared to speak to me’, presumably about McCaskill. ‘Don’t know that he assisted her’. He had given McCaskill’s children ‘clothes to go to school in’.

Ellen Houghton, a first cousin of Emere (as she called her), gave evidence of ‘living with her since my marriage’ and taking care of the children since Emily’s death:

Ngahuia lived with Mrs Alley for many yrs, 16 yrs or more. Mr & Mrs Alley provided her with everything. She never had to work. Emere & I did all the work. McCaskill never provided for her. Have heard her say that he left Hikutaia because he had ill-treated her by personally striking & beating her.

Under cross-examination, she explained that he had attacked Ngahuia because ‘she complained about his wife’. She had never asked McCaskill for
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assistance, having ‘no need to do so, being well provided for by the Alleys’. \(505\) Tamati Paetai\(506\) then gave evidence about Ngahuia living with Emere after Nicholas’ death.

Her daughter well looked after her, relieving her from the necessity of working. Up till 1885, Ngahuia could work. After that, she could not. After that, Emere & her husband Alley looked after her. Before she went to live with the Alleys, she had to work – at gum–digging etc. Prior to Emere marrying Alley.

McCaskill did not assist his mother, and she had told Tamati that he had ill-treated and struck her. ‘After that, she never lived with McCaskill’.

When McCaskill returned in 1902, Tamati asked Ngahuia to give him a small piece of land, but she said ‘she had no aroha for him, as he had disobeyed her’ by not abandoning his ‘frivolous’ wife. ‘So I turned to Emere’, who said he could live on the seven acres, which he did, and ‘took up the crops Alley had planted’.\(507\) After listening to this evidence of Alley’s kindness to his mother-in-law compared with McCaskill’s neglect and violence, the court did ‘not consider it necessary to award any part of this estate to McCaskill’.\(508\)

Alley never recovered from his wife’s sudden death. Previously he had revealed an uncontrollable temper and a fondness for drink when changed with assaulting a gum digger over a debt of £3 10s 3d. When offered £1 in payment, Alley ‘ordered him out of the store, and assaulted him’, and then chased him on a horse with a stock whip crying ‘Come back here, you black b----. I’ll knock your brains out’. (The gum digger’s ethnicity was not recorded, but probably was Maori.) Alley, ‘a man of pugilistic propensities’, admitted earlier assaults, but claimed not to have hit anyone on this occasion, and insisted he was only a ‘moderate drinker’. Because of provocation and the trivial nature of the assault, he was fined 5s.\(509\)

After his wife’s death, his behaviour became worse, perhaps caused in part by financial worries. After a ‘Private Assignment’ of his estate whereby

\[505\] Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Book no. 56, pp. 282-283.
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his debts were paid with his family’s assistance, he became bankrupt in 1909. When he did not attend the first meeting of creditors, ‘the Assignee expressed the opinion that possibly as on a previous occasion’ he was ‘hiding with the Maoris’.

In 1913 he was arrested in Thames for being drunk. As he had twice breached a prohibition order issued in September the previous year, after using obscene language to the landlady of the Hikutaia Hotel, the case was deferred for consideration by the magistrate, who was absent. After failing to appear, he was arrested at Hikutaia just as he was about to leave for Whangamata to avoid the hearing. The magistrate committed him to be treated with the drunkards on Rotoroa Island, in the Hauraki Gulf, after hearing evidence from two of his sons and his brother William. They wished him sent there to make it ‘impossible to obtain liquor, as all other means had been tried without success’. The magistrate was sorry to send him to the island, ‘for, apart from his drinking habits, he is a man of good repute in the community’ and a ‘well known resident’ of the district. ‘Since his wife died’ he had ‘given away to drink, and no efforts of his relatives or friends can restrain him. He had consistently disregarded his prohibition order, and even during the interval in which he was on bail he was under the influence of liquor’.

Alley’s downward spiral led to his being committed to the mental asylum in September 1914 for delusional melancholy. Heredity was believed to be a ‘predisposing cause’ because a brother had been admitted to the hospital twice because of alcohol and an aunt was insane, allied with the abuse of alcohol and drugs. In June 1915 he died in this institution, aged 60.

ALEXANDER HOGG AND HIS FAMILY
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According to his 1917 death certificate, Alexander Hogg married Te Arani Watana in Thames when aged 30, and they had three sons and two daughters.\textsuperscript{515} In fact, he never married her under Pakeha law. Proud to call himself the ‘pioneer storekeeper’ at both Thames and Karangahake, Hogg had fought against Maori in the Auckland Naval Volunteers.\textsuperscript{516} He was a prominent member of the Church of England.\textsuperscript{517} In early Thames, he managed the land agency of James Mackay and Wirope Hotere Taipari until it went bankrupt, after which he established a large flax mill at Puriri.\textsuperscript{518} These occupations brought him into close association with Maori, and when Te Hira was convinced to visit Thames in 1874 to view the advantages brought by Pakeha settlement Hogg helped to show him around.\textsuperscript{519} After managing the Thames brewery owned by Brown and Campbell for some years, he left in 1881 to be managing agent for their Auckland brewery, to the regret of both his ‘large circle of friends’ and the \textit{Thames Advertiser}:

He was a good citizen, having taken an active part in matters tending to further the advancement of the district, although his business engagements prevented him from joining in the active work of local bodies to an extent which he might have desired in the interests of the field. He was a member of the Parawai Highway Board and of the local school committee, and was always foremost in promoting outdoor sports, acts of charity, and social undertakings.\textsuperscript{520}

As an example of his personality, in 1884 a note was found in a bottle floating in the Waihou River:

\textsuperscript{515} Death Certificate of Alexander Hogg, 10 June 1917, 1917/2415, BDM.
\textsuperscript{517} \textit{Auckland Weekly News}, 2 March 1867, p. 10, 20 July 1867, p. 6; \textit{Thames Advertiser}, 14 July 1870, p. 3, 17 August 1870, p. 2; \textit{Church Gazette}, 1 July 1881, Supplement.
\textsuperscript{519} \textit{Thames Advertiser}, 5 September 1874, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{520} \textit{Thames Advertiser}, 22 September 1881, p. 2.
11th September, 1880 – Thrown overboard from the SS Riro Riro, on the Waikou river. Bread and cheese almost done; just broached the last bottle of beer; don’t know what will become of us before reaching civilization; nothing left for us besides potatoes and cheese, and but little of that. No whiskey, no beer, and what is worse, we have all been raging lunatics for two months. Several incurables thrown overboard, along with all the dead marines [empty bottles].

12th September – On a snag, but all hands saved. The captain’s conduct was very courageous. – ALEX HOGG, (or all that’s left of him). – By his attorney, JS.

None of the many accounts of his career mentioned his domestic arrangements, although they were hardly a secret. Born in Scotland in 1838, he had arrived in Auckland with his mother and maternal grandfather in 1855. The latter, James Bain, died in Auckland in 1866, aged 81. His mother died at Parawai in 1894, also aged 81; Hogg was her only child. If his death certificate was correct, very shortly after he arrived in Thames in late 1867 he had entered into an unofficial (from the Pakeha point of view) liaison with Te Arani Watana. Her whakapapa recorded her descent from Warau through his second child Toto, whose second child was Parehauhanga, whose son Watana Te Wharara had three children, of which Te Arani was the eldest. Another whakapapa recorded her mother as Heni, one of whose parents was Atiu.

On her death, in April 1898, she left five children. As recorded by the land court when they inherited her interest in Komata South, they were Tarawhikato Watana, an adult male (who must have been born in late 1867?), Rangiwera Heni, an adult female, Hemi Watana, a 17-year-old male, Tahimere Te Rangituangahuru, a 15-year-old male, and Pare

---

522 *Thames Star*, 7 October 1884, p. 2.
524 Death Certificate of James Bain, 12 November 1866, 1866/4633, BDM.
525 Death Certificate of Mary Hogg, 19 November 1894, 1894/805, BDM; *Thames Advertiser*, 20 November 1894, p. 2.
526 Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Book no. 47, p. 176.
527 Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Book no. 59, p. 284.
528 Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Book no. 47, p. 141. In 1901 Hogg incorrectly recorded the date as February 1896: Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Book no. 50, p. 285.
Whakaararangi, a 13-year-old female. Three Maori, one male, Hohepa Mataitawa,529 and two females, Meri Rewiti and Harehare Ripeka Te Pea, were appointed as trustees for the under-age children.530 (None of these births had been registered.) Less than a week after this decision was made, James Mackay applied on Hogg’s behalf for him to become a trustee in addition; his argument in the land court revealed details of his personal life that were ignored by the press.

He, as the father, ought to be one of the trustees. He brought up the two eldest, and wished to have charge of the other girl. But he separated from Te Arani some years ago. Since the death of Te Arani, he had taken the youngest, Pare. He always wanted the chiln, but owing to the persistence of the mother, she took them. He had not ceased to take interest in them. I cannot say whether he had contributed to their support.531

Nikorima Poutotara532 then gave evidence:

There are many reasons why we object to Mr Hogg. True, they are his chil. But he has not contributed to their support, from their earliest infancy. Nor has he supported the mother. It was not till the eldest son grew up that Mr Hogg took him. The mother alone brought him up. And we all contributed to the support of the children.

The eldest daughter was supported by Pare Watana. When she grew up, the mother took her. Afterwds, Mr Hogg took her. While these two elder ones were with Mr Hogg, the mother helped to support them. It is about 12 yrs, since Mr Hogg & the mother separated. Since then, Mr Hogg has not helped to support the other children.

Much money has been given to Mr Hogg by Te Arani. She gave him £300 to build a house with, but he did not properly finish the house. Te Arani did not know how the money was spent. She also lent him money to build a store with at Karangahake. This was while they were living together. It was £200. He never paid it back.

529 See Auckland Star, 28 March 1899, p. 2, 1 March 1900, p. 2, 7 August 1900, p. 2; New Zealand Herald, 21 September 1900, p. 5; he had no involvement in Te Aroha mining.
530 Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Book no. 47, p. 141.
531 Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Book no. 47, p. 166.
532 See Thames Star, 21 April 1880, p. 2, 9 September 1903, p. 2; Wanganui Herald, 10 September 1903, p. 5; ‘Mercutio’, ‘Local Gossip’, New Zealand Herald, 19 September 1903, Supplement, p. 1; he had no involvement in Te Aroha mining.
Te Arani left Mr Hogg, for the above reasons. While she lived with him, he wished to leave her & marry a European. Mr Hogg did not constantly live with Te Arani. So she left him, because he did not treat her or the chil. properly. So we say that we should be appt trustees, as regards lands the chil. get thro their mother. Mr Hogg took the youngest child on 5 May 98. He took it forcibly, by aid of the police.

At the death of Te Arani, we spoke to Mr Hogg, & said that he could have the chil. if they wished. Or they could go back & forth. But we did not wish him to take them altogether. Pare went with him on May 5, much agst her will. She cried, & resisted. We asked him to let the child have her own wish. But he would not, & claimed it, as being his daughter.

Hohepa cultivated the lands of Te Arani, while he was living with her. And supported the children, & looked after their business in the Court.533

Mackay denied some of these statements. ‘I am instructed that Hogg found most of the money to put up the home with. The money for the store was £150, not £200. They were then living together. Later, he had business at Karangahake, & did not visit her so often’.534 (Hogg had erected his store at Karangahake by late August 1885.)535 ‘Not long afterwards, she left Hogg, & lived with Hohepa Mataitana. Hohepa has I believe been kind to the children’. Mackay then referred to Hogg’s youngest daughter, Pare:

Mr Hogg & I were both present at the funeral. It was agreed that the two boys should continue at St Stephens school. I understood Mr Hogg would provide them with clothes. It was the mother [who] arr. that they should go to St Stephens. He wanted to take Pare, & have her brought up properly. He has a good house, & his eldest dau. lives with him. I saw the two daughters last week. Pare was going to school at Karangahake.

It was also agreed that Pare was to stay a month with the natives, & then go & live with Mr Hogg; but would be allowed to visit her Maori relations. As the child did not come, Mr Hogg sent the sister to fetch her; but she would not come. Hearing that the child was getting into bad habits,

the magistrate was consulted; he advised that Hogg ‘was the proper person to have charge of the child’. Hogg then took her, ‘with the aid of a

533 Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Book no. 47, pp. 166-168.
534 Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Book no. 47, p. 168.
535 Thames Advertiser, 18 August 1885, p. 3, 18 November 1885, p. 2.
policeman’. Mackay could produce several letters from Te Arani plus an agreement, written while they were living together, stating that she would place all her property in Hogg’s hands. Hogg was ‘in a fair position’ financially, and there was no evidence ‘he lived on his wife’. Hogg’s mother had brought up he two eldest children, and as they were not ‘favourably disposed towards Hohepa’ he wanted the latter replaced as a trustee by Hogg, for although Hohepa was ‘honest’ he and Hogg ‘could not get on together’.536

Hohepa Mataitana then gave evidence that the trustees were ‘sanctioned by the tribe’. In 1885 he had learnt that Hogg and Te Arani had separated, and, after his own wife died two years later, ‘in 1889, I took Te Arani’. Four of Hogg’s children lived with them and the eldest son with Hogg. Hogg’s mother ‘asked for Heni Rangiwira’, and it was agreed that, when she died, ‘Heni was to come back to us’, but this did not happen. Hohepa sent the children to school, two of them to St Stephens, and ‘supported them: & treated them as well as Te Arani did herself. We often sent food to Heni, while she was living with Mr Hogg’. Not till four years after Hogg’s mother died did Heni go to see her mother. ‘She came back with the two boys, who went to Karangahake to visit their sister. I gave Heni £2. After this, I sent for Heni to come & look after Te Arani. She came’. He claimed that between 1889 and 1898 Hogg ‘contributed nothing’ to support the children living with him. ‘We gave money to Heni to buy mourning clothes for herself, when Te Arani died’. Hohepa had paid some of her debts so that the children would be free of them, and, if not appointed a trustee, Hogg should refund him £25. He did not object to Hogg being a trustee, if Te Arani’s relatives were willing. He claimed the two boys at St Stephens objected to their father being a trustee.537

Mackay denied the last statement, saying that Hogg’s mother had ‘brought up the two elder children. If natives only are appt trustees, they will not deal fairly by the chil. who live with their father; for they will look on these latter as pakehas’. Hogg wanted ‘to do his duty to the children’, and was willing to have Maori co-trustees ‘to see that the estate is properly dealt with’.538 Ripeka Te Pea then gave evidence that the reason Te Arani left Hogg was that he did not provide her with money.539

536 Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Book no. 47, pp. 168-169.
537 Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Book no. 47, pp. 173-174.
538 Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Book no. 47, p. 174.
539 Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Book no. 47, p. 175.
The following day, Hohepa told the court that he wished to withdraw as a trustee ‘to avoid unpleasantness’, and suggested two alternative trustees, one Maori and one Pakeha, ‘Capt. [Gilbert] Mair’. After the court noted his ‘honourable spirit’, Ripeka said the relatives still objected to Hogg. Mackay asked for an adjournment until Hogg arrived, and the court stated its desire that the case ‘be settled outside, if possible’. After discussions outside court, Hogg declared himself ‘satisfied’ if Ripeka and Meri were trustees along with Mair, but thought he should also be one. Over Ripeka’s renewed opposition, the court made Hogg a trustee, along with the two women and Mair. It would not consider whether Hogg had ‘acted as he should have done’ towards his children since he separated from Te Arani, but thought the children’s interests would best be served by appointing trustees ‘from both the European and Native sides’.

By the 1890s Hogg’s eldest son was known as Bain Hogg (Bain being Hogg’s mother’s maiden name); he had been born in Thames in 1875. Trained in the Thames School of Mines, in 1896 he was appointed manager of a cyanide plant in New South Wales. Not till 1900, when he was working in a Victorian cyanide plant, was he referred to in the Thames press as Hogg’s son. He would marry an Australian in Kalgoorlie in 1907. He gained ‘much experience mining in Nicaragua’ in 1912 before returning to New Zealand to be both a mine and battery manager for the Rising Sun, at Owharoa. He was a member of the Karaka Sluicing Syndicate at Thames in 1932. When he died in Kalgoorlie, Western Australia, in 1940 it was reported that he had been in charge of ‘several mines in various parts of Australia, and had latterly been mining in

---

540 Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Book no. 47, p. 178.
541 Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Book no. 47, p. 181.
542 Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Book no. 47, p. 166; New Zealand Herald, 13 July 1940, p. 12.
543 Thames Advertiser, 26 January 1893, p. 3, 29 June 1896, p. 2; George Wilson to Minister of Mines, 12 May 1898, AJHR, 1898, C-3, p. 9.
544 Thames Star, 20 February 1900, p. 2.
545 Death Certificate of Flora Hogg, 20 February 1931, 1931/3117, BDM.
546 New Zealand Herald, 8 June 1912, p. 1, Death Notice of unnamed two-month-old son of Bain Hogg [the death was not registered], 13 July 1940, p. 12; Observer, 15 April 1916, p. 17, 19 July 1929, p. 21; Thames Star, 11 June 1917, p. 1.
547 Thames School of Mines, Correspondence Inwards File 1932-1933, letter dated 7 May 1932, School of Mines Archives, Thames.
Kalgoorlie’.548 His son Alexander was then ‘in charge of large tin mines in the Malaya Peninsula’,549

His second son, Watana or Walter,550 was charged in 1898 with under-age betting at the Boxing Day races at Parawai. This case revealed that he had been born in October 1881.551 His later life has not been traced. The third son, born on 8 August 1883, his death certificate revealed,552 became known as Tasman or ‘Tas’. Educated in mining at the schools of mines at Karangahake and Waihi, he worked at Waiuta on the West Coast of the South Island from 1916 onwards, first as a surveyor; he was appointed manager of the Blackwater mine in 1935 and was still mining there in 1969; he died in 1974.553

His elder daughter was known as Janie, and his younger daughter, who married a Pakeha in 1916, was known as Pauline.554 Janie succeeded her father, the first postmaster at Karangahake, in 1886, when she was a teenager.555 His obituary reported that he had lived with her ‘for a number of years’ in Thames; it failed to mention either the mother of his children or their Maori ancestry.556

‘HALF-CASTES’

‘All along the borders of civilization the number of half-caste children who can swear to their mothers, but only know their putative fathers by repute, is a striking proof of the cordial relations, which, under normal circumstances and removed from political influences, subsist between the

548 New Zealand Herald, 13 July 1940, p. 12.
550 Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Book no. 47, p. 176.
552 Death Certificate of Tasman Rangi Hogg, 1974/31229, BDM.
554 Marriage Certificate of Pare Whaarorangi Pauline Hogg, 1916/9037, BDM; Probate of Alexander Hogg, BBAE 1569/11403, ANZ-A.
two races’. Thus the Observer, writing in 1883. Thirteen years later, it cited Hamiona Mangakahia, husband of Mere Taipari and Premier of the ‘Native Parliament’, about Pakeha abandoning their offspring by Maori mothers:

One of the measures passed by us had for its object the protection of our women from pakeha men. If I were to take you through this pah I could point you out upwards of twenty half-caste boys and girls, many of whose fathers are in good positions in your cities, some of them high officials under your Government. More than one stipendiary magistrate … has children here amongst the Maoris. Do they ever think of them? Do they ever make enquiries as to their condition? Do they ever remember that these children are their flesh and blood, and that they are being brought up in blind ignorance – without a name, without hope, without anything except God’s free air? Is it any wonder, then, if some of us, in the discussion of this measure, used burning words? I think you will admit that there is some cause.

Pakeha did not always abandon their children. For instance, in 1929 Mere Te Mihi died at Tirohia, near Paeroa, aged 97. On her death certificate her father was listed as unknown, but it was recorded that he was a half-caste Ngati Mahu who lived at Wairoa. Her mother, of the same address, was Temihi, of Ngati Tahu. Mere Te Mihi was the widow of Paora Tiunga, a rangatira of Ngati Hako. The following day, the Te Aroha News carried a long article on the severing of an ‘interesting link with old New Zealand’ of a woman who was reputed to be 107 years old. This was her correct age if, as stated, she was born in ‘about 1820’ to a Captain Cooper, an English officer, and Temihi, ‘a daughter of a prominent northern chieftain. Shortly after the marriage’ (was there a formal marriage?) Cooper was recalled to England, ‘and little Mere Temihi, the child of the marriage, was christened in the first Anglican church built at Korororeka (Russell)’. Later ‘the little girl drifted down to Auckland’, for reasons not explained: had her mother abandoned her? There she was adopted by Ngati Tamatera, then ‘trading in cereals between Auckland and the Coromandel Peninsula. Meanwhile Captain Cooper sent out from England an emissary to locate his

557 Observer, 20 October 1883, p. 2.
558 Observer, 13 June 1896, p. 19.
559 Death Certificate of Mere Te Mihi, 20 October 1929, 1929/12238, BDM.
child, but although she was traced as far as Paeroa he returned home after being repeatedly assured by the natives that the child was dead'.

That Mere Temihi grew into a beautiful young woman there can be no doubt, as her Maori tribespeople after some deliberation decided to tattoo her in order to lay definite claims to her Maori origin. The whites, seeing her bearing the tribal marks, were no longer curious and passed her by for as true a Maori as her own dusky sisters.

She would have three husbands, all Maori. The first deserted her after the birth of her first child, but she had ‘several years of happy married life’ with her second before he was ‘drowned in a storm when one of the trading canoes was lost on its way to Auckland’. Her last husband, Paora Tiunga, was lauded as ‘one of the loyal Maories who fought for the Queen in the later Maori Wars’. A son-in-law was ‘a prominent Maori scout’ in the hunt for Te Kooti, and four of her descendants fought in the First World War. She had lived her life as a Maori, including smoking heavily, ‘even as a girl’ smoking a clay pipe ‘and only enjoyed the strongest of Irish twist. Later she grew her own tobacco’. Near her house a ‘good patch of healthy potatoes’ was ‘witness to her industry, and she was working on this bed when she was seized with illness’. Her eldest daughter claimed ‘her mother owed her longevity to the fact that she always ate the plainest of foods and never entertained imported products. She lived a life of the simplest kind’.560

In 1895, the Observer noted a ‘peculiarity of the Maori half-castes, which is certainly not shared by other hybrids (as, for instance, the Eurasian and the Creole)’, namely ‘their pride in their coloured ancestry’.561 Certainly none of the half-castes living in Hauraki seemed apologetic about their ancestry, and it did not prevent them from marrying Pakeha. In Hauraki, as elsewhere, Maori women married Pakeha men rather than the reverse. Censuses from 1881 to 1906 revealed about 200 Maori women living in wedlock with Pakeha men.562 Throughout the colony, a large number of ‘mixed blood’ children intermarried prolifically with Maori.563

561 Observer, 28 December 1895, p. 11.
563 Belich, p. 251.
The half-caste children of Pakeha Maori integrated into the new settler society with a rapidity and absence of bigotry that was remarkable for a British colony. A.S. Thomson calculated in 1854 that there were about 2000 half-castes with 1860 living as Pakeha. These men and women blended into European society with relative ease, for the colonists generally considered them mentally and physically superior to Maori and acceptable marriage partners.564

This generalization applies to the Hauraki district, as the chapters on Pakeha Maori living at or near Te Aroha illustrate. Another generalization, by Ward, that ‘mixed-race offspring usually identified more strongly with the Maori side of their parentage’, 565 does not apply to most of those born in the Te Aroha district. And Angela Wanhalla has shown that in southern New Zealand such families blended in with Pakeha society and lost contact with their Maori heritage.566

There were government regulations about whether a half-caste was to be regarded as Maori or Pakeha. As ‘some confusion’ existed in 1881 over which of them was subject to the Marriage Act of the previous year, which only applied to Pakeha, the Registrar General of Births Deaths and Marriages was asked to clarify. He explained that a half-caste ‘brought up with one Maori parent as a member of an Aboriginal tribe’ was considered a Maori, but if ‘brought up as a European, or with the European parent’, was defined as of the latter race.567 When the census was taken in 1900, an enumerator was told that Maori were not to be included ‘unless married to living Europeans’, whereas ‘Half Castes if not living with their tribe’ were to be recorded.568

During the wars of the 1860s, some half-castes so identified with one or other side of their ancestry that they fought for it. James Gordon was one

565 Ward, p. 310.
566 See Angela Wanhalla, In/visible Sight: The mixed-descent families of southern New Zealand (Wellington, 2009).
567 Thames Advertiser, 21 May 1881, p. 3.
568 J.C.R. Evans to W.G. Batt, 26 December 1900, Paeroa Magistrate’s Court, Registrar of Electors Letterbook 1897-1906, p. 224, ZAAP 13297/1a, ANZ-A.
example of a half-caste who fought for the Crown, at a very early age;\textsuperscript{569} Henry Southey, a Waiorongomai miner and farmer, was another.\textsuperscript{570} In 1895 Southey gave the local newspaper the details of his experiences as a sergeant in the Forest Rangers, when he fought with Ferdinand von Tempsky and saved a wounded comrade from being tomahawked.\textsuperscript{571}

The obituary of Captain William Sullivan, who died in 1925 after being ‘for many years a popular master in command of vessels of the Northern Company’, made no mention of his parentage. It reported that he had been born at Mahurangi, north of Auckland, in 1848, and had spent most of his life in charge of coastal and river vessels apart from five years learning the shipbuilding trade.\textsuperscript{572} Nor did the summary of his life, accompanied by a photo, published in the Cyclopedia of New Zealand in 1902, mention his ancestry.\textsuperscript{573} He was sufficiently notable to feature in the Observer, once with a photograph, and once when his only daughter was married; again, his family background was neither relevant nor mentioned.\textsuperscript{574} Josiah Clifton Firth, in 1890, mentioned in passing that when his small steamer ‘Kotuku’ started running on the Waikou River, it was under the command of ‘Captain Sullivan, a half-caste’, and ‘a more capable man I never had in my service’.\textsuperscript{575} His father, John, had married, under Maori custom, Merehai Kaipaka.\textsuperscript{576} Sullivan first married, again under Maori custom, Miriama Houkura, who died in 1906.\textsuperscript{577} Nearly three years later, in March 1909, when aged 60, he married another Maori, Ngarewa Roa, aged 22, whose father was Maori but whose mother may have been a half-caste.\textsuperscript{578} (They had already produced two sons, one in February 1908

\textsuperscript{569} See paper on his life.
\textsuperscript{571} Te Aroha News, 17 August 1895, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{572} New Zealand Herald, 15 June 1925, p. 10.
\textsuperscript{573} Cyclopedia of New Zealand, vol. 2, p. 447.
\textsuperscript{574} Observer, 28 March 1896, p. 9, 23 April 1904, p. 9, 7 September 1907, p. 11, photograph with caption, 2 October 1915, p. 19.
\textsuperscript{575} J.C. Firth, Nation Making: A story of New Zealand: savagism v. civilization (Auckland, 1890), p. 240.
\textsuperscript{576} Death Certificate of William Sullivan, 12 June 1925, 1925/2898, BDM.
\textsuperscript{577} Death Certificate of Miriama Houkura Sullivan, 7 June 1906, 1906/2738, BDM; Death Notice, New Zealand Herald, 8 June 1906, p. 1.
\textsuperscript{578} Marriage Certificate of William Sullivan, 13 March 1909, 1909/571, BDM.
and one in February 1909, just a month before the wedding; whilst
necessarily they were listed as illegitimate, Sullivan registered the births
and was listed as the informant, and in 1913 legitimized them.)579 None of
these marital and family details were or could be hidden; but neither was
they publicly noted, apart from Firth’s comment and his first wife’s death
notice.

Before she lived with Te Watene as his wife, Kate Watson was known
as Kiritiana Tamehana or Kate Thomas.580 From the mid-1870s she ran the
Ohinemuri Hotel at Mackaytown, but her husband Watene was not
involved in this business.581 In 1875, Watene assisted the development of
the Ohinemuri goldfield by assisting in cutting a track from Mackaytown to
Waitekauri, receiving a reward of £10.582 The following year he cut another
track, but a Pakeha received the reward for a better one.583 He also worked
on a Pakeha’s farm.584 After Daldy McWilliams was shot in 1879, ‘a half-
caste woman named Kate Watson’ was named as one of those who carried
him to safety.585 ‘Watson, a Maori’, along with Aihe Pepene,586 ‘both well-
known friends of the pakeha’, offered to guide Paeroa residents to raid the
Ngati Hako settlement to capture McWilliams’ assailants, but just before
midnight Watene vanished, whereupon Pepene refused to lead the party.587

579 Birth Certificates of William Ngarewa Sullivan, 7 February 1908, 1913/27657; Lee
Francis Davis Sullivan, 20 February 1909, 1913/27590, BDM.
580 Ohinemuri Goldfield, Notes and Memoranda by R.J. Gill, Paeroa, May-June 1882, p. 74,
Maori Affairs Department, MA 1, 13/54b, ANZ-A; Thames Advertiser, 7 January 1882, p.
3.
581 Mackaytown Armed Constabulary Letterbook and General Order Book, 1875-1877,
entry for 16 March 1875, BAVA 4895/1a; Mackaytown Police Station Diary, entry for 5
June 1876, BAVA 4898/1a, ANZ-A; Thames Advertiser, 7 January 1882, p. 3.
582 Albert J. Allom, Report to the Mackaytown and Waitekauri Track committee, 7 October
1875, Auckland Provincial Government Papers, ACFM 8180, 501/76, ANZ-A; Thames
Advertiser, 11 October 1875, p. 3.
583 Thames Advertiser, 14 September 1876, p. 3, 23 September 1876, p. 3.
584 Thames Advertiser, 3 August 1877, p. 3.
585 Thames Advertiser, 1 September 1879, p. 3.
586 See paper on his life.
587 Thames Advertiser, 2 September 1879, p. 3.
In the early 1880s one Watene, possibly the same man, played in the Thames rugby team, and in 1891 had a football ground at Kirikiri.\(^{588}\) In 1875 he pegged out at Karangahake and was a shareholder with Pakeha in five Ohinemuri claims and one company.\(^{589}\) He was a shareholder in a Tui claim in 1880 and one at Waiorongomai two years later, selling his interest for £20.\(^{590}\)

Despite their close involvement with, and support for, Pakeha, both Watene and his wife went to court to defend their financial interests against Pakeha. In 1875, Watene ‘lodged a protest’ against an agricultural lease being granted on land he claimed was reserved for his cultivations and opposed Mackaytown being included in the goldfield.\(^{591}\) Six years later, he was one of those preventing the cutting of kauri at Waihi because it was taken from their land.\(^{592}\) In 1898, he sued contractors for wages.\(^{593}\) Kate refused to sell her interests in the Ohinemuri goldfield at the price offered, and received extra money plus an interest in the reserves, and also obstructed the cutting of kauri at Waihi.\(^{594}\) In press reports, her ancestry was noted, but not in a demeaning way.

Undoubtedly there was prejudice against half-castes from both sides. For instance, in 1904 a family of half-castes living at Paeroa complained to parliament that, having been brought up as Pakeha, they had been deprived of their full share of Maori land.\(^{595}\)

\(^{588}\) *Thames Star*, 29 August 1883, p. 2; *Thames Advertiser*, 24 September 1883, p. 3, 31 October 1891, p. 2.

\(^{589}\) *Thames Advertiser*, 9 April 1875, p. 3; Te Aroha Warden’s Court, Register of Ohinemuri Claims 1875, folios 35, 46, 61, 71, 98, BBAV 11568/1a, ANZ-A; *New Zealand Gazette*, 13 May 1875, p. 329.

\(^{590}\) Te Aroha Warden’s Court, Register of Te Aroha Claims 1880-1888, folio 203, BBAV 11567/1a; Register of Licensed Holdings 1882-1887, folio 55, BBAV 11500/9a; Transfers and Assignments 1882, no. 494, BBAV 11581/2a, ANZ-A.

\(^{591}\) Ohinemuri Correspondent, *Thames Advertiser*, 23 August 1875, p. 3.

\(^{592}\) Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Book no. 28B, p. 56; *Thames Advertiser*, 3 November 1881, p. 3.

\(^{593}\) Paeroa Magistrate’s Court, Plaint Book 1896-1901, 391/1898, BACL 13745/2a, ANZ-A.

\(^{594}\) Ohinemuri Goldfields, Notes and Memoranda by R.J. Gill, Paeroa, May-June 1882, pp. 74, 89, Maori Affairs Department, MA 13/54/b, ANZ-W; G.T. Wilkinson, diary, entries for 9 February 1881, 2 November 1881, University of Waikato Library.

\(^{595}\) *Ohinemuri Gazette*, 28 October 1904, p. 2.
PAKEHA MAORI

One historian of Pakeha Maori has defined them as ‘strangers turned into Maori’. In the period up until 1840, they ‘had significant political, economic and social importance in tribal New Zealand’. After 1840 their role as ‘intermediaries between the races’ continued, but declined in importance. The role of individual Pakeha Maori always varied depending on their usefulness and whether they had married into a hapu; before 1840 some were treated as slaves, or even eaten. That fate did not befall them after 1840, but as Pakeha settlement progressed fewer and fewer were ‘turned into Maori’. Increasingly, although they might live with Maori and adopt some Maori ways, they and their families absorbed elements of both cultures, sometimes with their children if not their wives being ‘turned into Pakeha’, as illustrated in the lives of Pakeha Maori involved with mining at Te Aroha.

Cynical Pakeha had a simple explanation for why some of their fellows married Maori, and it did not involve love. In 1874, one described how some of his fellows acquired land. ‘Perhaps the surest means of all’, which at Thames was ‘far from uncommon’, was ‘to take unto thyself a Maori wife, and always rub noses with their dark-skinned relatives; and if lady no. 1 does not please you in possessing the required influence, why get one or two more from different tribes’. The Observer was told that during the mining boom of the 1890s, at Whangamata ‘all’ (an exaggeration that should have alerted its critical faculties) the local Maori women were married to Pakeha, who hoped thereby to acquire auriferous land as a dowry. In fact, as indicated in the chapters on men who were Pakeha Maori for at least part of their lives, Charles John Dearle, John William Richard Guilding, Henry Dunbar Johnson, George Lipsey, William Nicholls, Joseph Harris Smallman, and George Thomas Wilkinson, all were genuinely in love with the Maori women they lived with (more than one in the case of Guilding and Wilkinson).

596 Bentley p. 10.
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600 Letter from ‘Only “Three Possum Power”’, Thames Advertiser, 1 September 1874, p. 3.
601 Observer, 14 November 1896, p. 11.
In 1869 one ‘old California miner’ provided an explanation of why these liaisons were formed. ‘A certain clique have learned the Maori language, acquired the Maori habits, and quasi-married Maori wives; they with their associated, wish to stand between the Europeans on the one hand, and the natives on the other, honeyfuggle the former, and share the spoils with the latter’.  

(To honeyfuggle, to give the correct spelling, was ‘to deceive, impose upon, and obtain something thereby’.) In January 1876, ‘Old Settler’, who like many others blamed Pakeha Maori for preventing easy purchase of Maori land, asked a rhetorical question:

How long will Britons be slaves – aye, slaves to a few men that have raised themselves from living among the natives, and acquired their first knowledge of this business by a Maori moving dictionary? It is surprising how adroitly they and their friends work together; if one of them purchase a piece of land, the other assists with it through the Native Land Court at a low price.

The alleged consequences for living closely with Maori were exaggerated by a visitor who observed John Wallonora Thorp on his farmland at Opukoko, near Paeroa, in 1870. He was unimpressed with how he had developed the land, and found Thorp singularly uncommunicative, and, as I thought, extremely reticent. From information, I found out it is his way only, he having been so long among the Maoris he is completely Maorified, treating them as brothers, keeps open house for them, and denies them nothing; they, in return, keep him poor, and bleed him like leeches.

Thorp had arrived in Ohinemuri in 1842, aged six. In 1849 a visitor noted that his father Joshua’s farm was in ‘very fair order’ and that all the
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604 Letter from ‘Old Settler’, *Thames Advertiser*, 26 January 1876, p. 3.
605 See *Cyclopedia of New Zealand*, vol. 2, p. 855.
607 *Auckland Weekly News*, 4 June 1870, p. 9; Margaret Lynds, ‘Thorp Family Celebrates 150 Years in New Zealand’, *Ohinemuri Regional History Journal*, no. 33 (September
work on it was ‘done by his own sons with occasional assistance of some natives in the planting and harvest seasons’. Their life in the 1860s was complicated by conflict over land and the prospect of mining. John had to leave his farm for nine months during the Waikato War, and claimed £789 for his losses; he was awarded £291. He also claimed, in 1879, that Rihitoto Mataia’s father had promised his daughter to him in marriage in 1863, when she was about 14. Rihitoto, who later married William Grey Nicholls, denied that this arrangement had been made. In early 1867 he had what a correspondent headlined as a ‘Narrow Escape’ when riding up-country. ‘On nearing Manawaru, he was met by six armed natives in their fighting costume, who turned out to be a party of the Twelve Apostles belonging to Ngatiporou’, who had ‘sworn to kill any European’ they met.

When the natives saw him they loaded their guns, and then advanced to meet him. As the leading man, Riawai, was raising his gun, he was told by another of the party that it was Tapa, a pakeha of Taraia and Te Hira; upon which Riawai lowered his gun and advanced, and shook hands with Mr Thorp, who, it must be admitted, had had a very narrow escape. Had he not been recognised in time he must have been most certainly murdered, as he was unarmed.

Because he supported opening Ohinemuri to mining, a meeting of Maori of that district decided, in March 1868, that Thorp should leave his land, which he ‘quite disregarded’. Later that year this order was repeated, but ‘P.C.’ considered that he was not likely to be expelled because of his store: Maori ‘cannot bring themselves to do without a more proximate

---


608 G.S. Cooper, Journal of an Expedition Overland from Auckland to Taranaki by way of Rotorua, Taupo, and the West Coast: undertaken in the summer of 1849-50, by His Excellency the Governor-in-Chief of New Zealand (Auckland, 1851), p. 18.
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store than Shortland’. 614 In December a Thames clergyman noted a miners’ encampment on Belmont, his farm; in going to it, he had to pass by Hauhau angered by other tribes trying to open Ohinemuri. ‘If it had not been for Mr Thorp, who having lived all his days among them in like one of themselves, we should have been turned back’ – or worse. 615 Early the following year, Te Hira insisted that Thorp leave because of these miners. 616 That July it was reported that he was ‘living quietly on his leased land. After giving the natives a cold collation of wine, biscuit, and flour, they unanimously agreed not to molest him for the space of three years, after which the terms of his lease will have to be enlarged’. 617 In 1873, Te Moananui informed his tribe that he had ordered Thorp to leave, 618 but he remained, and when the goldfield opening in 1875 was accused of manipulating Maori to enable them to obtain mining claims. 619 Conflict over claims and where he had found gold before the field was opened led Thorp to threaten to use 50 Maori to drive rivals off their claims. 620 Despite conflict and posturing, he had clearly become close to Maori.

A woman recently arrived in Thames from England was visited by his younger brother, Alfred Joshua, in 1869. She described him as ‘a great strapping handsome young fellow but decidedly colonial with a coat a great deal too small covering a flannel shirt which had evidently shrunk into a very uncomfortable shape. He was very pleasant and told us a good deal about the Maoris against whom he enlisted in the war’. 621 Having lived as a Pakeha Maori almost from birth did not therefore prevent him, like others, from taking the side of the Crown against Maori when it became a fight for dominance. And so doing did not make him hated by Maori he lived amongst. When he stood for the Ohinemuri Riding of the Thames County Council in 1876, he was reported to have ‘a large Maori support’ and was

615 The Thames Journals of Vicesimus Lush 1868-82, ed. Alison Drummond (Christchurch, 1875), pp. 41, 43, 44.
617 Ohinemuri Correspondent, Thames Advertiser, 7 July 1869, reprinted in Auckland Weekly News, 10 July 1869, p. 10.
618 Thames Advertiser, 8 May 1873, p. 3.
619 Thames Advertiser, 13 March 1875, p. 2.
620 Thames Advertiser, 15 March 1875, p. 3.
621 Ellen Fox to her sister Mary Elizabeth, 12 December 1869, Ellen Fox Letters, in possession of Annette Solly, Hamilton.
expected to ‘stand well with the Maori voters’ who were expected to ‘control the result of the election for this riding’.\footnote{Thames Advertiser, 9 December 1876, p. 2, 21 December 1876, p. 3.} They supported him despite his having clashed with some Maori when surveying disputed land, as noted elsewhere. Certainly he was distrusted by some Pakeha electors for having ‘too much of the Native Office about him to suit this district’,\footnote{Letter from ‘An Elector’, Thames Advertiser, 21 December 1876, p. 3.} implying he was too sympathetic to Maori interests. He was elected, to the surprise of the local correspondent;\footnote{Ohinemuri Correspondent, Thames Advertiser, 25 December 1876, p. 3.} whether Maori votes had secured this result was not investigated.

‘ZZZ’ (an unsubtle hint at the relaxed life of the Pakeha Maori?) gave an even less flattering picture of other Pakeha Maori at Ohinemuri:

They look old and emaciated, unshorn and dirty – a sort of neglected, lost appearance, feed mostly on potatoes, smoke “Torore,” a vile compound of tobacco native grown and manufactured, pass their lives as Maoris do, in whares ... full of smoke and fleas, miserable specimens of humanity, looked down upon by both races.\footnote{‘ZZZ’, ‘A Holiday at Ohinemuri’, Thames Advertiser, 31 August 1870, p. 3.}

‘Te Aroha’ rebuked this writer’s criticism of both Pakeha settlers and Pakeha Maori:

What a lot of information to glean in such a short time. One gentleman’s place he found in a fearful state of dilapidation; another (who, by the way, has not been here for the last month) he found very uncommunicative, and another he finds to be a Pakeha Maori (a Frenchman) who is too cute. I wonder if he owes him any money.... We will only say as this holiday-seeker is likely to have a holiday at the expense of some of his friends soon, we will have to wait patiently until he pays us another visit to present him with a testimonial, to show the regard in which he is held here, both by Europeans and Maoris.\footnote{Letter from ‘Te Aroha’, Thames Advertiser, 3 September 1870, p. 3.}

The French Pakeha Maori, Louis Dihars,\footnote{See Ronald Clifton, ‘Louis Dihars’, Ohinemuri Regional History Journal, no. 41 (September 1997), pp. 32-33.} allegedly illegally occupied the property of a Pakeha storekeeper, ran horses and pigs on others’ land,
and lived contentedly ‘so long as his family gets potatoes and korau (a sort of thistle cabbage), with a bit of pork now and then’. Dihars was recalled, fairly or otherwise, as living ‘the life of unostentatious comfort common to many a Pakeha Maori, who neither toiled nor spun, but for whom their wives and marital connections generally provided plenty of food’. 

THE LIFE OF ONE PAKEHA MAORI: DANIEL TOOKEY

Pakeha Maori living in the Te Aroha district have separate chapters devoted to them. Daniel Tookey, a large investor in Hauraki mining, was probably the most prominent Pakeha Maori living at Thames. Born in England in 1832, by profession he was a chemist before becoming a ‘quartz reefer’ in Victoria. After arriving in New Zealand in 1856, he lived on the site of the future Thames since either that year or the following one. He ‘purchased wheat, maize, pigs, and corn from the natives, grown on the Waiotahi Flat’, mostly before the Waikato War. During the late 1850s, when most Pakeha had abandoned Coromandel, he and the magistrate were amongst the few to remain. By 1865, he was the official interpreter for the warden and magistrate at Coromandel, and was regarded as knowledgeable about Maori. When his services were dispensed with in May 1866, the magistrate sent his ‘Sincere thanks for the Services and assistance rendered’, adding that ‘doubtless your Services would still have been retained had it not been that certain retrenchments were to be made by the Government with the view to reduce the expenditure in the District’.
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He offered to provide a reference, being ‘prepared to state from what I have ... known of you that I have always found you intelligent, steady, obliging, diligent, respectful and trustful’.\footnote{635}{H.C. Lawlor to Daniel Tookey, 31 May 1866, Coromandel Warden’s Court, Warden’s and Resident Magistrate’s Letterbook 1862-1867, 57/1866, BACL 14446/1a, ANZ-A.}

During the early 1860s Tookey leased Waimake Island, near Coromandel, from its Maori owners.\footnote{636}{Maori Land Court, Coromandel Minute Book no. 1, p. 138.} In 1865 he ran pigs at Taketoto Bay without the permission of the Pakeha landowner, and was non-suited when he sued for 18 of his pigs being attacked and killed by the owner’s dogs.\footnote{637}{Coromandel Magistrate’s Court, Civil Cases Notebook 1863-1868, Hearing of 6 November 1865, BACL 14442/1a, ANZ-A.}

When charging another man of stealing £1, Tookey stated in evidence that he was Government Native Interpreter at Coromandel and ‘agent for the Cutter Curlew’.\footnote{638}{Coromandel Magistrate’s Court, Criminal Cases Notebook 1863-1868, Hearing of 15 June 1865, BACL 14442/1b, ANZ-A.}

He moved around the district, one of his daughters being born in ‘Thames’ in 1865;\footnote{639}{Death Certificate of Eliza Tookey, 8 January 1884, 1884/3619, BDM.} possibly this was not the site of the future town. In 1867, as master of the cutter ‘Fly’ he carried passengers and goods between Coromandel and Auckland.\footnote{640}{Auckland Weekly News, 20 July 1867, p. 12.}

In February that year, when still living at Coromandel, he was sued by John Morgan for £10 5s. Morgan, a master mariner of Coromandel, in May the previous year had fitted out the ‘Fly’ for him and served as its master. He told the magistrate that when it was nearly ready he told Tookey, ‘You require somebody to go with you’, and offered his services. ‘Defendant replied all right you can come. When the vessel was ready for sea the defendant sent me to Papaaroha as master of the Cutter after corn. I returned next day I took in about 3,000 shingles and proceeded for Auckland’, returning with ‘general cargo’ for Coromandel. ‘Since that time I have been trading along the coast with pigs, corn, potatoes, timber and gum. I have killed pigs, sold them and collected the money’ for Tookey. When the cutter was not working, ‘there was always work found to be done which I was always willing and did do, such as building and cultivating. I consider that during the time I have been with defendant, that he has had sufficient money to pay me wages’. Cross-examined, Morgan said that Tookey ‘considered and treated me as a servant’ but had ‘never stipulated
any wages’. His evidence in response to the magistrate’s questions revealed that Tookey’s protective attitude to his wife had caused a breach between them:

On my entering in defendant’s service, he said I can’t give you the highest of wages. I left it to him to give me what he thought fit. I was in his employ from August [1866] to the 6th of February. I consider my wages in that sort of employment to be worth £1.0.0 per week. Defendant never dismissed me.... He never expressed any dissatisfaction at my work. I never applied to him for wages. £1.15.0 is the whole sum I received while having charge of the cutter. £1.0.0 from Mr [Edward] Wood is included in this. On one sailing from Kauaeranga [Thames] the last trip, the wind blowing from the Nord and Westd [northwest], his wife thought it prudent to put back. I said no, it was only a nice working breeze. Defendant made answer “You have no feeling for anybody.” We put back the same day into Kauaeranga and sailed next morning for Coromandel. In consequence of his wife being rather alarmed at the look of the weather we came to an anchor to the Nord of the Miranda Redoubt. In the evening as the tide turned she wished again to go back to Kauaeranga. We got under weigh and proceeded accordingly. On our arriving off Tararu point, she altered her mind and said we will proceed to Coromandel. The vessel’s head was turned in that direction. I made remark – This is regular humbug, and defendant told me that if I did not like it I could leave when I got to Coromandel.... It was about a week after this that I left. During that time I was doing work for defendant.... I never had a reckoning with him.... I asked defendant to settle with me. This he refused to do, saying he would give me no wages. He offered me £1.0.0; this I refused to take. I never led defendant to understand what wages I expected from him.

Other witnesses confirmed that Morgan had worked for Tookey, including one man who dug gum for Tookey and was authorized to draw rations from a Coromandel store. Tookey stated that he had returned from ‘Hauraki’ to Coromandel in August to find Morgan living in his house and obtaining goods from the store, all at his expense. Having given Morgan a letter of recommendation to another vessel at the beginning of July, he considered Morgan ‘was then no longer in my employ as the cutter which he wished to get was for his entire benefit’. Morgan had assisted him ‘for a few

641 See paper on Lavinia and Henry Dunbar Johnson.
stated to me that he should very much like to get away from Coromandel. I told him I could not afford to pay any one and did not require him, to which he remarked that he would rather accompany me for nothing than work about the shore for trifling wages. But that in the event of my speculations paying I should perhaps be able to give him some remuneration. This was his own proposal and wish. But that if the speculation did not pay he would not ask me for anything. On the 6th Febry after having breakfast I told him I was off. He said I am not going with you – I said all right I can go without you – He said I require a settlement, I said very well make out your share of the profits and I will pay you. I assured him that the whole speculation had been a very losing affair to me, but I did not require him to be at any loss – I frequently told him that he would do better to look for something to do as I did not require a master mariner on board my vessel. I proceeded direct to Hauraki without the assistance of Morgan and next day received a summons for amount of wages due which I deny all knowledge of whatever. Pltff knowing himself not bound to me by any agreement thought proper to leave me at the moment his services were required. During the whole of the time he was with me he never gave me to understand that he should require wages. I have always found him in for clothing, tobacco and grog; I became responsible for a debt of his in Auckland and have always treated him well.

Judgment was given for £3 19s and costs of £3 14s.642

This hearing provided information about the various ways that Tookey earned money and that he was solicitous to his wife’s fear of sailing. As he did not marry under Pakeha law, when he died, aged 64, he was recorded as being unmarried;643 his children’s births were not registered. When his daughter Eliza died, aged 19, in 1884, her father’s name was included on the death certificate along with his occupation, ‘settler’, but her mother was not mentioned.644 Tookey’s wife was mentioned in the press only on the occasion of her death, in April 1874:

642 Coromandel Magistrate’s Court, Civil Cases Notebook 1863-1868, Hearing of 21 February 1867, BACL 14442/1a, ANZ-A [punctuation added].
643 Death Certificate of Daniel Tookey, 9 October 1896, 1896/3794, BDM.
644 Death Certificate of Eliza Tookey, 8 January 1884, 1884/3619, BDM.
Mrs Tookey, the wife of our respected fellow-citizen, Mr Daniel Tookey, died yesterday morning at her residence, Parawai Road. Mrs Tookey had been ill for some time, never having quite recovered from her last confinement. Mrs Tookey belonged to the Ngatimaru tribe ... and was a very quiet, respectable woman. She was the daughter of Te Matahau, and was a woman of considerable rank, according to native estimate.... Deceased leaves a large family.645

Whilst clearly Pakeha did not regard her as being of ‘considerable rank’, the patronizing-sounding references to her being ‘a very quiet, respectable woman’ were also commonly used when regretting the deaths of Pakeha wives and mothers. What the newspaper did not reveal was that this wife, Tauhinu, was Tookey’s second wife, and was the sister of his first one, Hera Matahau.646 It is not known when Hera died or when Tookey married her sister. Tookey had four or five children by his second wife, according to a vague estimate made by one of his sons.647

Through their mothers, Tookey’s children obtained land. In 1869, their uncle, Hare Renata, husband of Eta Mokena,648 appeared in the land court and obtained the Te Kopako block for them, Tookey being ‘appointed trustee under the Maori Real Estate Management Act 1867’.649 The following year, Hare Renata and Taipari Tawa650 asked that Opapango No. 2 should go to their sister, Tauhinu, Tookey’s wife, and her children. Taipari explained the agreement that money raised from its sale would be divided, half going to Tauhinu and her children and half to the other owners.651 Some of their children acquired interests in other land.652 In 1878, when a judgment summons for £56 was taken out against him, no order was made because, as he told the magistrate, ‘He had no property, although he was entitled to about half of New Zealand. Did not receive any property with his present

645 Thames Advertiser, 23 April 1874, p. 2.
646 Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Book no. 15, p. 134; Death Certificate of Alfred Gibbs Tookey, 29 September 1930, 1930/10406, BDM.
647 Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Book no. 15, p. 134.
648 See paper on their lives.
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651 Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Book no. 3, pp. 311-312.
wife’. However, he did benefit from her owning land, according to an obituary of James Carnell, a lawyer in Thames and Coromandel:

Just after the opening of the Thames goldfield, Carnell was a power in the district as business manager for Dan Tookey, the powerful pakeha-Maori. Tookey had married a Maori woman of rank, who owned a large area in the business portion of the town, then known as Tookey’s Flat, and he leased it out on her behalf in residence sites and business lots. Not being a business man himself, he leaned heavily upon Carnell, who fulfilled the general functions of private secretary, legal adviser, and general manager for the Tookey properties.

In 1868, the houses on the Waiotahi Flat were known as Tookey Town; Tookey’s Flat comprised most of the Grahamstown portion of Thames. In a recollection of the early goldfield he was described as ‘a pakeha-Maori who owned by right of his Maori wife a considerable portion of [the] goldfield site’. In 1869 and 1870 he was recorded as owning several portions of Thames, which he had mortgaged. In 1872, he gave a ‘convenient and commodious site’ for a school at Parawai, where many Maori lived. His bankruptcy in 1875 revealed that he had five acres at Parawai fronting the Kauaeranga River, ‘highly cultivated, securely fenced with white thorn hedge, planted with about 600 choice fruit and ornamental trees’. He had built a six-roomed house plus three cottages and other buildings on this land. At ‘Tookey’s Flat’ he had ‘180 feet [of] frontage to the foreshore of Hauraki Gulf, Grahamstown, by 300 feet seaward, nearly all filled in and ready for the erection of buildings’. He expected that in about 1879 he would ‘fall on to property situated on the Goldfield of the Thames’, but there is no evidence of this occurring. His 1,000 acres of ‘first-class land’ on Great
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Barrier Island may have been purchased and not given to him by his wife’s family.660

When Tookey was living at Coromandel in 1863, a miner showed him specimens of quartz found at the site of the future Thames goldfield.661 One recollection of the opening of this field described him as ‘almost the only white resident’ there. When the first miners arrived from Auckland, he ‘went off in a dinghy from what was afterwards known as Tookey’s Flat to meet the steamer with an offer of piloting her up the creek to the Kauwaeranga landing’.662 He took out the 65th miner’s right at Thames on 18 August, eight days after the discovery in the Kuranui Stream of what became the Shotover bonanza.663 According to the recollections of an ‘old Golden Crown miner’, ‘Dan Tookey had known through the natives for years previously that the gully where Hunt’s party’ found this ore was auriferous.

As the natives would not let him prospect, he went to Coromandel. When he heard of Hunt’s party prospecting in the locality, he left Coromandel in a whaleboat, with some natives, but was delayed on the passage by rough weather, and on reaching the Thames found that Hunt’s party had pegged out their prospecting claim – the famous Shotover. Such is the romance and vicissitudes of gold mining.664

At the end of August 1867, he was reported to have found a payable reef above the Moanataiari Stream.665 In 1868, an attempt was made to jump his share in what was reputedly the most valuable claim in that part of the field.666 As recalled by a Thames resident, ‘at least a dozen jumped shares in Tookey’s claim. Mr Tookey very wisely remarked, after this, that

662 Thames Advertiser, 1 August 1873, p. 2.
665 James Mackay to John Williamson, 31 August 1867, Auckland Provincial Government Papers, box 18, Session 22, MS 595, Auckland Public Library; Auckland Weekly News, 31 August 1867, p. 5.
his claim ought to have a good name, so many were running after it’.\textsuperscript{667} A year later, there was a fight over the boundary between their claims between his workers in the Imperial Crown and rival claimants. When the rival party commenced a shaft, Tookey’s men began to fill it in; ‘several blows were exchanged’, and Tookey received ‘an ugly rap on the head from one of the many fists that were flourishing wildly in the air’.\textsuperscript{668}

At the end of 1868, ‘Tookey’s tramway’ at Moanataiari was turned into a company, with Tookey as manager.\textsuperscript{669} As an example of how he sought to profit from mining, in 1869 he invested in claims in all portions of the field.\textsuperscript{670} A correspondent noted that in that year he also ‘invested largely in some of the best claims’ at Coromandel. ‘Judging from his experiences in mining matters, I have no hesitation in saying that he is in a fair way to realize a very handsome sum’. He had his own battery, and carted and crushed ore for three years before selling it.\textsuperscript{671} In May 1870 a Coromandel correspondent wrote that he had made ‘several investments in mining shares here this week, and, unless I am much mistaken, will be richly rewarded. A few more enterprising men like Mr Tookey would do good to the district’.\textsuperscript{672} Owner of the successful ‘Tookey’s mine’ at Thames, ‘he was also largely interested in many of the richest gold-producers which so largely boomed the Thames in the late sixties and early seventies’. Because of living with Maori at Thames ‘long before the opening of the field’ and being one of the first prospectors he had been able to acquire large parts of the field.\textsuperscript{673} In 1871, he was one of the leading negotiators who arranged
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with the Maori owners of Shortland for opening more of this area for mining, and then, with others, leased the ground.\footnote{Auckland Weekly News, 8 July 1871, p. 4.}

From 1871 onwards, Tookey invested in the revived field at Tokatea, at Coromandel.\footnote{For his Tokatea investments in 1871, see Auckland Provincial Government Gazette, 29 June 1871, p. 160, 8 July 1871, p. 172, 11 July 1871, p. 178, 18 August 1871, p. 212, 15 September 1871, p. 237.} He also owned several batteries at Thames, and in 1873, with a partner, took over the Manukau battery, an investment that led to their bankruptcy.\footnote{Thames Warden’s Court, Register of Agreements 1868, folios 459-460, BACL 14417/2a, ANZ-A; Auckland Weekly News, 16 April 1870, p. 4, 3 June 1871, p. 9; Thames Advertiser, 3 February 1877, p. 2, 4 April 1878, p. 3; National Bank, Grahamstown Inspection Report, 24 July 1874, Current Accounts Overdrawn, Manukau Battery Crushing Mill, Tookey and Webb, National Bank Archives, Wellington; Thames Advertiser, 6 September 1873, p. 3, District Court, 4 February 1876, p. 3; Mercantile Gazette of New Zealand, 10 June 1876, p. 43, 8 July 1876, p. 60.} He was a director of four mining companies.\footnote{For example, Auckland Weekly News, 9 October 1869, p. 3, 6 July 1872, p. 5, 24 August 1872, p. 16; Thames Advertiser, 19 July 1872, p. 2.} When mining commenced at Tairua in 1875, he was a shareholder in three claims, one of which was converted into a company.\footnote{Thames Warden’s Court, Register of Claims 1875-1876, folios 24, 33, 75, BACL 14397/9, ANZ-A; New Zealand Gazette, 22 July 1875, p. 648.} One claim had 22 owners, of whom 19 were Maori; in the second, of 32 owners, 29 were Maori; and in the third, 28 of the 30 owners were Maori. Tookey and a Maori then became the sole partners in one of these.\footnote{Thames Warden’s Court, Register of Claims 1875-1876, folios 24, 33, 75, BACL 14397/9a; Register of Licensed Holdings 1875-1882, Licensed Holding no. 89, BACL 14397/10a, ANZ-A; Thames Advertiser, 25 August 1875, p. 2.} As late as 1887, when mining had faded at the Hape Creek at Thames, Tookey took up a large area there.\footnote{Thames Advertiser, 2 March 1887, p. 2.} His only involvement with mining at Waiorongomai was to be one of three owners of two claims, selling his interests three months later.\footnote{Te Aroha Warden’s Court, Register of Licensed Holdings 1881-1887, folios 12, 27, BBAV 11500/9a, ANZ-A.}

Tookey, reportedly popular with miners,\footnote{Coromandel Correspondent, Auckland Weekly News, 30 July 1870, p. 13.} was a prominent figure in the community until the poor health of his last years. For instance, in 1868...
he was a member of the cricket club and on the committee that organized the Christmas sports. When the Duke of Edinburgh, Queen Victoria’s son, visited Thames in 1869, he was elected to the committee to arrange a reception. In 1871 he was a steward in the Caledonian Games. The following year he was on the committee to organize the St Patrick’s Day Sports, and convened a meeting to organize the regatta, for which he was a judge. For a time he was the licensee of the Prince Alfred Hotel. He was on the committee that supervised the erection of an Anglican church and schoolhouse at Parawai.

Tookey had at least eight children. When an unnamed son, ‘a fine chubby boy about five years of age’, died of sunstroke in 1868, ‘all his Maori relations held a tangi over him’. The following year, the following children were listed, in order of age: George Grey, Alfred, Elizabeth, Daniel, and John. Alfred Gibbs was born in 1859, Elizabeth in 1864, and Daniel in 1865. In 1883, Alfred listed two other children: William, aged 12, and Charlotte, aged 10. Charlotte, otherwise Lottie, whose birth was the cause of her mother’s death, was born in 1874.

Like other Pakeha Maori, Tookey wanted his children to have successful careers in Pakeha society. His daughters as well as his sons were educated. John died before October 1883; his occupation is not known.

---
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George and Alfred prospected with their father from 1878 onwards near the old Otanui goldfield, behind Hape Creek, where years previously Tookey had had a small battery before removing it to Grahamstown. Their claim was named the Anglo Maori. In 1881, he obtained money from the council to repair the road so they could bring down quartz. Tookey continued to mine there until at least 1887, although Alfred left in 1886 to prospect for gold in the King Country. Alfred was a miner all his life, dying in 1931 of miners' complaint. George soon ceased prospecting to be an operator for the telegraph department between 1878 and 1880, when, despite passing his examinations well, he was retrenched after working at Riverton, near Invercargill, for 18 months. Two months later he had obtained a lucrative position in a mercantile establishment in Dunedin. Three years later, he was living in England. Daniel was a bushman at least until 1901. No other details of his children’s lives have been traced.

As an obituary noted, Tookey ‘in the prosperous times’ of the goldfield was ‘a man of means, but – as generally happens – evil days followed, and the latter portion of his life has been spent in seclusion’. Another recorded that he ‘made money when he owned what was known as Tookey’s mine, and in the early “seventies” he was a comparatively wealthy man. Of late years, however, fickle Fortune had deserted him, and he dragged out the last years of his somewhat eventful life as native interpreter’. Officially re-appointed a licensed interpreter in 1869 and 1888, in 1878 he said that
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he ‘earned about £3 a week at interpreting’.\footnote{New Zealand Gazette, 2 October 1869, p. 536, 27 December 1888, p. 1425; Auckland Weekly News, 20 April 1878, p. 8.} On one occasion when money received from miners’ rights was being paid to Maori landowners, ‘Tookey witnessed most of the signatures’.\footnote{G.T. Wilkinson, diary, entry for 26 January 1881, University of Waikato Library.} A Thames directory referred to ‘Daniel the Prophet – The fame of Tookey is world-wide. Parties negotiating with the natives will do well to secure the services of Daniel the Interpreter’.

Because of his position in the Maori community, Tookey sometimes became involved in its concerns. For example, when an elderly rangatira, Te Pukeroa, claimed to have killed Te Moananui by bewitching him, three executioners were appointed to kill him; to save his life, his friend Tookey enticed him to Thames to place him under police protection.\footnote{Thames Advertiser, 12 November 1877, p. 3.} He was also involved in some land transactions.\footnote{For example, District Court, Thames Advertiser, 3 August 1881, p. 3.} On behalf of the government, he negotiated the sale to the government of land adjacent to the Thames foreshore.\footnote{Daniel Tookey to T.B. Gillies (Superintendent, Auckland Province), 19 November 1872, Auckland Provincial Government Papers, ACFM 8180, 3991/72, ANZ-A.} On at least one occasion his veracity in land dealings was challenged: in 1892 he assured the land court that a Maori had been in sound mind when signing a will that Tookey had drawn up for him, but the court did not believe him.\footnote{Maori Land Court, Hauraki Minute Book no. 28, pp. 27, 46.}

At the time of the opening of the Tairua district for mining in 1875, Tookey was acting for Maori who opposed this, although it was alleged that he was willing to withdraw his opposition if given 250 scrip shares and £100.\footnote{Thames Advertiser, 11 January 1876, p. 3.} Three years later, writing as ‘You Know Who’, he urged Ngati Rahiri not to let the government obtain their land.\footnote{Letter from ‘You Know Who’, Thames Advertiser, 10 April 1878, p. 3.} The \textit{New Zealand Herald}, which did not reveal his name, described him as ‘a well-known European, of good standing’, and considered that he was advising them to be dishonest by not giving up land they had sold, which was very ‘obstructive to the advancement and prosperity of the country’.\footnote{Editorial, New Zealand Herald, 9 April 1878, p. 2.}
Thames Advertiser described the author as ‘a gentleman well known in Shortland, who has had a great deal to do with the natives in this and other districts’, and described officials attempting to obtain a copy of the letter to discover its author.\textsuperscript{717} Tookey then admitted that he had written the letter, as an amanuensis for a rangatira with a large interest in Te Aroha. Despite claiming to have had ‘nothing whatever to do with’ the content, he then alleged that English speculators ‘intimately connected with a well-known Auckland land ring’ were trying to profit from acquiring the land ‘providing they work the oracle with the Government’.

I say, looking at this matter from a Maori point of view, is there any wonder that the natives should be cautious how they allow their lands to pass out of their jurisdiction, especially when it is well known to the same natives that the Government is selling these lands for about six times the amount they have received.

After wondering how a private letter had been published before reaching its destination, he noted that a Thames newspaper wanted its author discovered, and subjected to some sort of condign punishment. Now, for the information of the Thames public, I beg to state that the individual can be found at any time at Butt’s Corner, Shortland, and would be happy to meet any comer who disputes his right to express his opinions. In conclusion, I should wish to state that neither Jack Government nor Jim Broomhall\textsuperscript{718} will have the pleasure of working any little game in this block of land without consulting DANIEL TOOKEY’.\textsuperscript{719}

Whether anyone took up his offer is not known, but a letter to the editor suggested that he was ‘playing a desperate game to regain his influence’ in Maori land dealings because it was ‘quickly passing away’.\textsuperscript{720} The Herald, whilst accepting his right to express his opinions to Maori, considered that ‘discretion should be specially exercised’ when dealing with them. Being a licensed interpreter, his letter would be seen by Maori, who

\textsuperscript{717} Th\ae ms Advertiser, 11 April 1878, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{718} For the abortive Broomhall Settlement, see paper on special settlements.
\textsuperscript{719} Letter from Daniel Tookey, Th\ae ms Advertiser, 11 April 1878, p. 3; reprinted, as Tookey requested, in New Zealand Herald, 13 April 1878, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{720} Letter from ‘New Chum’, Th\ae ms Advertiser, 13 April 1878, p. 2.
were ‘somewhat in the position of children’, as having some official ‘sanction and authority’. It interpreted the letter as urging them to hold on to the land ‘by force’, and indeed ‘advising them to plunge into war, unless the Government refrain from demanding fulfilment of agreements on which money has been paid’. It then moderated its accusation to one of his advising them ‘to an act of gross dishonesty, which must result in mischief to themselves, and will certainly greatly impede the settlement of the Thames’, making his conduct very censurable. We hope the Government will not deprive him of his license – we disapprove of the Ministry taking the bread out of a man’s mouth, - but if they take that course it can be said of them that they are doing what they can to deprive one of power to mislead the natives who has shewn that he is so disposed.721

A subsequent editorial, commenting on his justifications, considered that there had been ‘too much of this interference’ by interpreters. It was ‘no excuse’ to claim to be an amanuensis, for his license was not given ‘to enable him to injure the Government policy, and sow disaffection and trouble’. His letter admitting writing the anonymous one was ‘not less insolent and offensive’ than his first. ‘The example he sets is a bad one; it is one that may be too readily followed by pakeha-Maoris who have little reputation to lose’. As for Tookey, ‘Poor man! he has at the least shewn himself to be a fool’.722

Tookey had the last word, in the Thames Advertiser; his letter is given in full because of the insight it gives into his personality:

Your Auckland contemporary, commonly known as the “Old Woman of Wyndham-street,” has furnished its readers with a long sea-serpent sort of yarn, the object of which was to show what a very wicked, revolutionary, and foolish spirit was still in existence at Butt’s Corner, Shortland, known as Daniel Tookey. This yarn of hers was doubtless swallowed by a few of her readers as Gospel truth, but the more intelligent portion of them will estimate it at its proper value, bearing in mind as they do the general style and accuracy of her statements and arguments. She puts in her columns, both written and verbal statements that were never made by me, and then proceeds in her peculiar style to draw deductions from the same, and finally winds up a long and uninstructive effusion by declaring that at the least I have shown myself to be a “fool.” Well, Mr Editor, I confess to one little

721 Editorial, New Zealand Herald, 13 April 1878, p. 2.
722 Editorial, New Zealand Herald, 17 April 1878, p. 2.
weakness, and that is, that I prefer the name to that of “an
economiser of the truth.” No more on the subject from yours
faithfully, Daniel Tookey.
[Our correspondent will perceive that we have substituted the
words “an economiser of the truth” for the very rash expression of
four letters in the original. – Ed.]723

Five months later, he informed the government that Ngati Rahiri had
‘expressed a desire that he should assist in conducting necessary
negotiations’ over the Aroha block, and submitted proposals on their
behalf.724

Tookey’s popularity with Maori was such that Maori voters were
denied access to the polling booth when he stood against Jerome Cadman
for the Coromandel seat in the Provincial Council in 1870. When Cadman
won by 148 votes to 139, a newspaper considered that the result would have
been reversed had not his supporters prevented voters, especially Maori
ones, from voting.725 In 1870, at a korero at Piako about the Thames
mudflats, one leading rangatira, Riwai, said ‘I gave my land to Tookey’,726
possibly meaning to protect it rather than being a gift. To obtain a
recreation ground for Thames, Tookey assisted negotiations with its owners,
one of the main ones, Nikorima, being related to him by marriage.727 To
obtain sufficient capital to purchase a battery in 1873, he borrowed money
from Matui Poono, a Ngati Maru rangatira.728

Tookey was associated with other Pakeha Maori. For example, he and
David Stewart, who was living at Thames, jointly owned a claim at Hape
Creek for two years.729 They also owned a quarry there.730 When his

723 Letter from Daniel Tookey, Thames Advertiser, 19 April 1878, p. 3.
724 Daniel Pollen to Native Minister, n.d. [received 14 September 1878], Maori Affairs
 Department, Register of Correspondence, MA 2/16, 78/3261, ANZ-W.
1870, p. 2, editorial, 29 July 1870, p. 2, 30 July 1870, p. 3; Thomas Beckham to Colonial
Secretary, 27 October 1870, Auckland Provincial Government Papers, MS 595, box 21,
Session 26, Auckland Public Library.
726 Thames Advertiser, 28 September 1870, p. 5.
727 Thames Advertiser, 21 June 1872, pp. 2-3.
728 District Court, Thames Advertiser, 4 February 1876, p. 3.
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daughter Elizabeth died early in January 1884, aged 19, she left a daughter, Gertrude Stewart, aged 14 in 1898, whose birth may have been the cause of Elizabeth’s death. Stewart was trustee for her during her legal infancy.\textsuperscript{731} Tookey was a witness at the wedding of a George Lipsey,\textsuperscript{732} a Te Aroha Pakeha Maori.\textsuperscript{733}

Tookey died in 1896, aged 64, of a ‘general break-up of the system’ that had made him an invalid ‘mostly confined to the house’ for his last two years.\textsuperscript{734} His death certificate recorded the cause of death as ‘paralysis’.\textsuperscript{735} An obituary noted that in his life ‘an immense variety of incidents has been crowded, and it would take columns to fill in all the details of the career of varying sunshine and shadow which he had led’.\textsuperscript{736}

CONCLUSION: THE IMPACT OF COLONIZATION

Belich’s generalizations about the impact of colonization certainly applied to Hauraki. Undoubtedly Maori were subject to ‘swamping’, defined as ‘the massive outnumbering of a shrinking or static Maori population by a growing Pakeha one’.\textsuperscript{737} Having access to consumer credit (‘a slate at the store’) but not capital credit, because of their perceived lack of creditworthiness,\textsuperscript{738} was a serious handicap. ‘With economic opportunities limited by swamping, the way out of debt was increasingly to sell land’.\textsuperscript{739} Yet, despite economic deprivation and loss of land for most, coupled with political emasculation for almost all of them, some aspects of Maori life continued. Some land remained under Maori ownership, tribal life continued, and assimilation was only partial.\textsuperscript{740} As Howe had argued, ‘the processes of acculturation do not necessarily lead to disintegration. The Maori cultural system had great capacity to accept change and innovation
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Rituals such as tangi and the construction of meeting houses symbolizing group identity continued. Pakeha conquest was ‘limited’, and the impact was not fatal, although Maori society changed ‘massively’.  

As Alan Ward has pointed out, ‘it is utopian to expect that a relationship between ethnic communities can ever be in perfect harmony’. Hauraki was certainly not an example of a utopian outcome; but compared to other parts of New Zealand, quite apart from the rest of the world, the result of Pakeha settlement was comparatively benign. Discussing New Zealand as a whole, Ward considered that the ‘resilience and adaptability’ of Maori leadership and society ‘were to be sorely needed, and strikingly demonstrated, as European and Maori society began to interact’.Maori sought ‘to engage with the incoming Western order and share its advantages equally with Pakeha’. Russell Stone has argued that ‘economic penetration broke Hauraki’ because Maori became locked into the western economic system and ‘their traditional society was laid waste’. It is hard to imagine how they could have avoided becoming part of the international capitalist system or how ‘traditional society’ could have continued unchanged. Stone noted that Maori ‘living standards became subject to the ebb and flow of the cyclical fluctuations characteristic of western industrial capitalism’; perfectly true, but experienced by Pakeha as well.

Bill Oliver gave an equally bleak picture. Hauraki Maori suffered ‘a loss of authority, standing and well-being; they became a small and overshadowed minority as well as an economically insignificant and socially disadvantaged one’. In the new economy, they were ‘disadvantaged dependants. Maori were relegated to the bottom of the socio-economic
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heap’. Again, true; and to avoid this, native agents and other Pakeha with the best interests of Maori at heart (as they interpreted them) had, as noted, urged the value of education on them. Again, more positively, and correctly, Ward argues that Maori made a ‘conscious adaptation, but not an acceptance of total assimilation to the Pakeha mould’.  

Appendix

Figure 1: Tribal movements, 1820-1840, mapped by Max Oulton, University of Waikato, and published in The Hauraki Report: Wai 686 (Wellington, 2006), vol. 1, p. 45; used with permission.

Figure 2: Maori settlements recorded by European visitors pre-1840, mapped by Max Oulton, University of Waikato, and published in Hauraki Report, vol. 1, p. 68; used with permission.

Figure 3: Hauraki tribes, circa 1840, mapped by Max Oulton, University of Waikato, and published in The Hauraki Report, vol. 1, p. 36; used with permission.

Figure 4: Location of the natural resources procured and cultivations mentioned in the Hauraki Minute Books, in Caroline Phillips, Waihou Journeys: The archaeology of 400 years of Maori settlement (Auckland, 2000), p. 56; used with permission.
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