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Abstract

This thesis reframes the history of the Waikato from the late eighteenth to the early twentieth centuries through a spatial history approach using a visual archive. I argue that Pākehā images of the Waikato were both contemporary records and instruments of colonisation in the region, and that the discursive power of these images is undiminished. In this thesis I focus on spatial occasions represented by maps and photographs in order to reframe the history of colonisation in the Waikato.

First, I move visual sources of historical evidence, specifically maps and photographs, from the periphery to the centre of the frame. An exploration of the historical context of the selected maps and photographs serves as the narrative framework for the thesis in a strategy that replaces the more usual method of choosing images to illustrate a text that has already been written. This theoretical and methodological framework for what I consider to be a richer and more satisfying use of visual evidence in history is a key feature of this thesis. Second, I employ a colonisation lens to emphasise the negative consequences of colonisation for the indigenous people and landscapes, as well as the diverse and far from unproblematic experiences of the colonists themselves. This thesis positions three phases of Pākehā colonisation: Reconnaissance, Invasion and Occupation. These overtly militaristic labels apply to real military actions as well as to less obvious but longer-lasting and wider-spread discursive strategies of incursion and control.

While this thesis emphasises the negative impacts of colonisation, this is a history
from the colonisers’ point of view. The images that form the focus of the thesis were
created by Pākehā in the service of Pākehā intentions, actions and identities. But,
rather than serving to justify or excuse colonisation as an end that justified the means,
I undermine the inevitability inherent in the traditional settlement narrative. I do this
by highlighting the ambiguities and contradictions of the colonisers’ intentions and
experiences through a close and contextualised reading of the images they made to
record and represent themselves. In the process, I refute the legitimacy and validity of
Pākehā claims to control Waikato spaces.
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INTRODUCTION

Re-framing the Waikato

Mapping the territory of the thesis

In re-framing the history of the colonisation of the Waikato from the late eighteenth to the early twentieth centuries through a spatial history approach, this thesis reconsiders the value and uses of cartographic and photographic images as sources of historical evidence. The thesis also emphasises the problematic nature of Pākehā incursion into the region during this time by focusing a colonisation lens on the images and their contexts. Visual sources are seldom the subject of historical investigation, and are often relegated to add-ons in a history with pictures approach. In contrast, my strategy here is to focus attention on the visual sources that I have collected, and to examine them in detail for their contemporary and present meanings. As far as possible, an exploration of the historical context of the images serves as the narrative frame for the thesis. This approach challenges the meanings ascribed to the content within the frames of the maps and photographs featured here, and, furthermore, it seeks to re-frame the importance and relevance of the images to the study of this historical context. This thesis draws from a multidisciplinary literature to illuminate the discursive potential of images and, as a result, I offer historians a critical methodological approach to using visual sources. It is certainly true that some historians, or perhaps picture editors of illustrated histories, have tended to approach images as a means of providing visual support for points already
made in the text. Images have been framed by their placement within or alongside the relevant text, and by captions which point out what the author considers salient features. The image is then read and understood in the light of the associational and interpretive framework provided rather than on its own merits and this approach can be misleading. Therefore, I employ an alternative strategy of beginning with the images here instead. The images used in this thesis are contextualised by the circumstances of their creation in order that their meanings may influence the construction of the narrative, rather than the other way around.

The analysis of the images is carried out within a re-framing of the imperial and colonial context of the time period under study. Traditional accounts of New Zealand’s nineteenth-century history as a progressive development to civilisation, firstly at the hands of British imperialists, followed by settler-colonists who guided the colony through to nationhood, have been superseded by postcolonial approaches that have acknowledged the negative consequences for the colonised tangata whenua.¹ But there remains a void between Māori and Pākehā understandings of our past. This thesis represents an attempt, if not to bridge the gap, at least to shine a light into the void. To do this I consciously emphasise the negative consequences of colonisation as it relates to the analysis of the images. This approach is likely to jolt and jar the reader at times as images of Pākehā going about their business are disconnected from their complacent and comfortable associations.

In this thesis, the negative impacts of colonisation are seldom far from the centre of attention, even as Pākehā actions, ideas and attitudes are examined and described. This will already have become evident through my explicit and deliberate choice of language. The thesis is organised into sections describing phases of colonisation

¹ Māori for ‘locals’ - literally, the ‘people of the land’ (see glossary, p. 368)
entitled ‘Reconnaissance’, ‘Invasion’, and ‘Occupation’. I have consciously employed these labels, with their overtly militaristic connotations, in order to re-frame more traditional, Pākehā-centric terms such as exploration and settlement. In this I have been influenced by the New Zealand historian Peter Gibbons, whose work has a central role in my thinking and this thesis. Gibbons used the designations ‘An Archive of Exploration’, A Literature of Invasion’, and ‘A Literature of Occupation’ for sections of his chapter ‘Non-Fiction’ in *The Oxford History of New Zealand Literature in English*. Here Gibbons consciously implicated Pākehā writing in the processes of cultural colonisation. Dividing colonising activity into these categories has the benefit of avoiding a monolithic approach to colonisation. It should be noted, however, that these categories are not entirely discreet, fixed or linearly sequential in their realisation. For Gibbons’s ‘Exploration’, I prefer ‘Reconnaissance’. Not only does this more consistently apply the military metaphor across the phases, but it more usefully implies that the earliest stages of Pākehā contact with Aotearoa New Zealand did form part of an overall colonialisit strategy. To hear James Cook described as a ‘Pākehā’ might be jarring, as it was to me at first, but it has the benefit of locating him as an outsider peering in. In contrast, Cook’s status as a master mariner, navigator and explorer in the European world, most commonly has him at the centre, and indigenous people, including the Māori of New Zealand, acting as bit parts in *his* story. As is shown below, reconnaissance undertaken by the Pākehā, James Cook, and other scouts, was an integral link in the momentum of colonisation of and in this country.

The term ‘invasion’ is outwardly less controversial in my thesis, as it is well known that the British Army invaded the Waikato in 1863. However, my use of the term

---

transcends its military connotation. If armies invade to gain control of territory and resources, to quell resistance and to impose power, the term befits perfectly the purposes and impacts of colonisers in other senses as well. The control of the space ‘Waikato’, what it meant (means), how it was (is) configured and conceptualised, were (are) some of the fruits of this discursive invasion. Moreover, it is impossible, in my view, to separate words like ‘settlement’ from a positive and progressive narrative. Using a post-colonial approach, I might try to reframe ‘settler’ as a less benign concept and character, but it is exceedingly difficult to escape the feeling that ‘settlement’ is a process with a settled destination, and that any unsettled aspects are bound to be overcome. In this sense, ‘Occupation’ is a far preferable term, implying as it does a temporary, contingent, and probably illegitimate presence.

Another important goal of this thesis is to address criticisms from Māori scholars about the disconnect between Pākehā and Māori accounts of our shared past. Nēpia Mahuika has issued a challenge to ‘close the gaps’ between Māori and Pākehā understandings of, and practices around, New Zealand history. Mahuika argues that he and his Māori colleagues remain isolated on the fringes of the New Zealand historical community, their methods and motivations serving as counterpoints to the mainstream. It is disturbing that this remains so. It is beyond timely for a new approach to New Zealand history. Perpetuating colonising practices, such as the marginalisation of the colonised, is completely untenable.

This thesis does not, however, offer a fully formed, or even fully articulated, model in replacement. It does, however, take an important step towards acknowledging that, even from a Pākehā point of view, the effects of colonisation are tightly connected

to the intentions and actions of the colonisers and the ends did not necessarily justify
the means. By disconnecting the actions and events of the nineteenth century from
the trajectory of progress and focusing on their diverse spatial occasions and discursive
contexts instead, I aim to avoid recolonising the past. Spatial history is, therefore, both
a method and metaphor for this thesis. Paul Carter wrote that spatial history ‘explores
the lacuna left by imperial history’.⁴ Carter’s ‘lacuna’ and Mahuika’s ‘gap’ are, to me,
very similar spaces. They speak of things that are invisible to traditional approaches.
This invisibility allows them to be disregarded, irrespective of their importance to
a nuanced and comprehensive picture. Spatial history is a way forward. Discursive
spaces are invisible, yet powerful. A spatial history approach in this thesis does not
close Mahuika’s gaps or fill Carter’s lacunae. It does, however, seek to expose and
acknowledge those spaces where possible.

My reframing of the history of the Waikato connects with other attempts to reframe
New Zealand history more generally. Giselle Byrnes, in the introduction to the New
Oxford History of New Zealand, makes the case for decentring “the nation” from New
Zealand histories.⁵ The book takes a thematic approach to explicitly avoid the pitfalls
of a linear and progressive chronology. The introductory chapter ‘Reframing New
Zealand History’ argues that this reconfiguration is essential as histories that emphasise
progressive nation building and “national identity” are complicit in ongoing cultural
colonisation. In this she follows Peter Gibbons:

Those histories which propose national identity/ nationhood/nationalism as the
normative narrative, which consider national identity to be a natural, even organic
growth rather than an ideological construction, and which conceal how national
identity is fabricated within the broader processes of colonization, are themselves

⁴ Paul Carter, The Road to Botany Bay: An Essay in Spatial History (London: Faber and Faber,

⁵ Giselle Byrnes, ed., The New Oxford History of New Zealand (South Melbourne, Vic: Oxford
University Press Australia & New Zealand, 2009).
colonizing texts, not ‘representations’ of the past but practices with real and continuing consequences.  

Tony Ballantyne agrees that ‘reframing colonialism’ is urgently desirable. He argues that ‘the need to revisit ... the “spatial imagination” of historical writing is particularly vital within the specific context of British imperial and post-colonial history’. This is because of the two problematic models that are typically employed to produce histories that are either Britain-focused or centred on often teleological birth of a nation narratives involving former colonies. Ballantyne’s work has reimagined colonisation in New Zealand in both transnational and sub-national local frames. My own reframing of the Waikato in this thesis bypasses the ‘nation’ by contextualising local action (and representations) in a wider framework of European attitudes and ideologies.

This thesis represents my response to calls to re-frame this aspect of New Zealand’s history. I investigate the colonisation of the Waikato through a close reading of landscape images, both maps and photographs. I examine the particular circumstances and discursive contexts of the creation of these images in order to foreground a methodological approach which highlights the complexity and potential of these kinds of sources. The historical account that emerges is shown to be nuanced and disorderly. The spaces of the Waikato and its history are freshly recounted as a result.

---


7 Ballantyne uses this heading to frame the first section of his collection of essays *Webs of Empire: Locating New Zealand’s Colonial Past* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2014).


9 These approaches are exemplified in *Webs of Empire: Locating New Zealand’s Colonial Past*. See, in particular, Chapter 1 ‘Race and the Webs of Empire’ for the former, and Chapter 13 ‘Thinking Local’ for the latter.
Locating the Waikato

The Waikato is a fundamental subject of this investigation, but there is by no means universal agreement as to where and what the Waikato is. From a Māori perspective, Waikato was (and is) a river, a people and a region, although the limits of each of these labels have always been fluid and flexible. For example, there are multiple narratives explaining the origin of the name Waikato which express particular local meanings and identities. These narratives have in common that Waikato first referred to the river, but probably not as much of it as is now the case, perhaps only the section below the confluence with the Waipā at Ngāruawāhia. Wāi, Māori for water, is a common part of New Zealand river names. Kāto can refer to the flow of water, particularly the tides. An influential explanation traces the origin of the name Waikato back as far as the arrival of the Tainui waka off the river mouth where those on board noticed the strong pull (kāto) of the river (wāi) current in the sea.10

The river played, and continues to play, an important role in the identity of many Māori people, mainly of Tainui descent. A well known Waikato tribal pepeha (saying) expresses this link:

Ko Waikato te awa  
Ko Taupiri te Maunga  
Ko Te Wherohero te tangata  
Waikato taniwharau  
He piko he taniwha, he piko he taniwha

Waikato the river  
Taupiri the mountain

Te Wherowhero the man
Waikato of a hundred taniwha
At every bend a taniwha\textsuperscript{11}

People of Ngāti Maniapoto and Ngāti Hauā, for example, sometimes refer to the Waikato river in their pēpeha as well, although the mountains and named ancestors might be different depending on the relationships being emphasised. These tribes are sometimes included when referring to Waikato more generally, although the Waikato tribe, or tribal confederation, more commonly describes a group that includes Ngāti Mahuta, Ngāti Māhanga, Ngāti Tamainupō, Ngāti Wairere, Ngāti Te Ata, Ngāti Te Wehi, Ngāti Tīpā and others. Waikato, the region, is sometimes restricted to the tribal lands of this group, more or less as described by this pepeha:

\textit{Ko Mōkau ki runga}
\textit{Ko Tāmaki ki raro}
\textit{Ko Mangatoatao ki waenganui.}
\textit{Pare Hauraki, Pare Waikato}
\textit{Te Kaokaoroa-o-Pātete.}

Mōkau is above
Tāmaki is below
Mangatoatao is between.
The boundaries of Hauraki, the boundaries of Waikato
To the place called ‘the long armpit of Pātete’.

Using this as a guide, ‘Pare Waikato’ can be described as approximating the area bounded by the west coast from Kāwhia to Manukau and including the Middle and Lower Waikato Basins. However, the geological and conceptual boundaries of Waikato do not always coincide. They contract or expand to suit particular purposes or contexts. Furthermore, simple translations do little justice to the importance

\textsuperscript{11} Taniwha are a kind of monstrous being, normally found in water, which can provide protection or danger depending on how they are treated. It is also a complimentary way of referring to the power of a chief and so, in this saying, describes the strength of the Waikato region where many powerful chiefs resided (Sydney Mead and Neil Grove, \textit{Ngā Pēpeha a ngā Tīpuna : The Sayings of the Ancestors} (Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2001), p. 421).
and complexity of Māori relationships with the Waikato which resist classification according to Pākehā categories. When Pākehā began to conceive of the Waikato, they were influenced, but not constrained, by Māori understandings of the name.

Pākehā Waikato has fixed boundaries for some purposes and a rather looser definition for others, and this has changed over time. Developing perceptions of the Waikato are traced through successive stages of the thesis. In brief, however, the earliest Pākehā to encounter what is now the Waikato were oblivious to this name or possible shapes. Waikato itself began to take hold in Pākehā consciousness with the emergence and growth of Auckland from the early 1840s. The potential for the Waikato to become a successful farming hinterland for what was then the capital was first realised by Waikato Māori, such as Ngāti Apakura at Rangiaowhia under the initial guidance of the CMS missionary John Morgan. While this settlement, among others, provided much needed food for the Auckland market, this arrangement was seen as most unsatisfactory by colonists for whom making a living by farming was often a key driving force for their emigration in the first place. Economic jealousy was heightened by racial antagonism in those who felt that Pākehā reliance on Māori, and the consequent enrichment of some Māori tribes, was quite the wrong way around.

So the Waikato came to be viewed with covetous eyes. As pressure to obtain Māori land for Pākehā settlement grew in the Waikato and elsewhere, one prominent response among Māori was the establishment of the Kingitanga, whose first king was the ageing Waikato chief Tē Wherowhero. For Māori, though by no means all of them, this innovation focused their eyes on the Waikato as a source of mana as they sought to deal with the corrosive effects of Pākehā incursions to their economic and political, as well as cultural, independence. For Pākehā, including successive governors Gore Browne and Grey, the Kingitanga represented a disrespectful and illegitimate
challenge to the sovereignty the British Crown had ostensibly obtained through the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840. Waikato Māori began increasingly to be seen as rebels and the Waikato as a bastion of rebellion.

The invasion by the British army in 1863-64 resulted, for Pākehā, in the near combination of the crippling of the Kīngitanga threat and the opening up of millions of Waikato acres to the potential of large-scale farming. Victory on the battlefield was reinforced by the confiscation of a huge and almost contiguous swathe of fertile land, much of which was granted to former soldiers as part-payment for their contribution to the victory. Maps of the confiscated territory gave firmer shape to Pākehā perceptions of the Waikato as a region, and this was further developed when, in 1876, New Zealand’s provincial system was abolished, leaving local administration in the hands of county and borough councils. The Waikato name was bestowed on a county, but one that comprised only a small part of the greater Waikato. Over time, Waikato County, now called Waikato District, has grown to include what was once Raglan County and what was part of Franklin County. In 1989, a major reform to New Zealand’s local government introduced a network of Regional Councils, including the Waikato Regional Council (formerly Environment Waikato). This latest official incarnation of Pākehā Waikato is also the largest. Based on river systems and watersheds, the boundaries of this organisation include the King Country and Lake Taupō to the south, as well as the Coromandel Peninsula in the north-east. Another layer of modern Waikato meaning consists of the Waikato District Health Board boundaries which correspond to the Regional boundaries in the north but are unique in the south. Perhaps a more influential, and certainly a longer established identity involves the area controlled by the Waikato Rugby Union, a different set of parameters again.
Māori perceptions of Waikato are also evolving, sometimes as a result of having
to create organisational structures to deal with the government concerning on-
going grievances arising out of the confiscations. The Tainui Māori Trust Board was
established to administer the proceeds of the first attempt at redress recommended
by the Sim Commission in 1926 and actioned in 1949, regardless of the fact that
not all Tainui tribes suffered directly from confiscation. The Tainui name was
retained, however, to denote the latest incarnation of the umbrella organisation to
control the assets and monetary compensation paid out as a result of the Deed of
Settlement with the Crown in 1995. Waikato-Tainui Te Kauhanganui Incorporated
serves as trustee for the ‘64,500 members affiliating to 68 marae from 33 hapū’
who benefit from this settlement. This name, and the spread of the associated marae,
indicate the inter-connectedness of the tribes and hapū, as well as, to an extent, the
dispersal, perseverance and/or return of Waikato people following the upheaval of
the mid-late nineteenth century to the present. In combination with these kinship
ties, an enduring connection for most Waikato Māori is the ongoing importance of
the Kingitanga whose rituals and institutions provide visible and sustained means
and symbols of collective identity. My intention here is not to offer a new or more
definitive meaning of Waikato, either in terms of its geographical extent or its
function as a container for the identities of its inhabitants. All of these different
perceptions and definitions have important roles in the understanding of Waikato as
contested space.

12 The name Tainui refers to one of the great ancestral waka (canoes) that brought Māori to New
Zealand. All Māori who identify as Waikato are descended from those on board Tainui waka,
but not all Tainui descendents are Waikato. According to the Waikato-Tainui website, the four
main subdivisions of Tainui are Waikato, Ngāti Maniapoto, Hauraki and Ngāti Raukawa.

Locating myself

This study contributes to the construction of historical and spatial knowledges, yet it is also a personal quest underwritten by two aspects of my own experience. First, most of my life has been lived in this region and, in one sense, I know it well. This intimate knowledge is undermined, however, by the ordinariness and normality of contemporary Waikato for me. The undertaking of a spatial history of Waikato involves my own re-acquaintance with Waikato places in more reflective and conscious ways, enriching my personal knowledge of and relationship with this region. My interest in Waikato history has been gradually acquired. When I was born, and for the next few years, my family lived on the outskirts of Te Awamutu, and our home was in Frontier Road. Following the British Army invasion of the Waikato in 1863 and victory at Ōrākau in April 1864, the Māori King, Tāwhiao, and many of his people were forced to flee into the territory of Ngāti Maniapoto south of the Pūniu River. This area subsequently became known, to Pākehā, as the King Country, and the aukati, or frontier, between Kīngitanga territory and the confiscated lands to the north remained a hotly contested place for at least the next twenty years. As a small child a century later, I was, naturally enough, oblivious to the resonance of the names Frontier Road and King Country. It was not until I was already teaching history some twenty years later that the significance of these labels started to dawn on me. Another thirty years has passed and ideas about the place of place in history and of Waikato in New Zealand history are crystalising. Part of this project is a personal journey to find some common ground between places I have learned about by reading, studying and teaching and places which share identical map co-ordinates, but with which I have a different relationship through living and travelling across the region.
Second, my other personal connection to the Waikato and its history, is as a history teacher. My students have been, to a greater or lesser extent, locals like me but Waikato people, places and events have a limited role in the general New Zealand history texts. The ‘Land Wars’ of the 1860s, and their immediate consequences, were often the only direct references to the Waikato in the general histories, except perhaps for a cursory description of how resourceful pioneering settlers overcame hardship to transform bush and swamp into some of the most productive dairy farms in the world over the course of the following century. A desire to connect my students of New Zealand history to local places, spaces and action was undermined by this sudden arrival, and then disappearance of the Waikato in the 1860s, before a usually even briefer mention in the 1960s. Therefore, a key aim of this thesis is to throw a spotlight more closely on the Waikato in order to make Waikato stories more accessible to students of New Zealand history.

Many of the images reproduced in this thesis first came to my attention as a result of seeking out learning or assessment opportunities for my students. But my students also taught me some important lessons about photographs in particular. Emphasising visual evidence has always been typical of my role as a History teacher and this approach has proved a fruitful and enjoyable means of encouraging my students to engage with the experiences of people in the past. In my teaching practice, I admit that I was often guilty of the kind of practice that I criticise in this thesis – I often used images to illustrate a particular point or theme without paying attention to the actual circumstances of their creation. However, it became increasingly obvious to me, at least partly through the insights of my students, that to treat historical photographs in this way is sometimes to suppress the actual historical information that they may contain. This seemed particularly true of the few images that seemed
Fig 0.1 Scene in the bush showing a thatched hut, three people, and a washing line
Photograph taken by William Temple [ca 1860s]
Ref: 1/, Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington, New Zealand
https://natlib.govt.nz/records/22718238

Fig 0.2 Two men sowing seeds amongst tree stumps
Photographer: Northwood Brothers. Date: 1900s-1930s
Ref: 1/1-006250-G, Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington
https://natlib.govt.nz/records/22329785
to be commonly reproduced in textbooks to illustrate aspects of the settler incursion into the Waikato.

The image reproduced above, Fig 0.1, which is analysed in greater detail in Chapter 5, is a good example of this point. My students also revealed to me the power of their own perceptions to shape their understanding of images. Responses to the above image, Fig 0.2, were also particularly instructive. Influenced by the historian James Belich’s analysis of the ‘Progress Industry’ in the development of Pākehā New Zealand, I would attempt to frame this photograph within the context of the taming of ‘savage’ native bush and its replacement with ‘civilised’ farmland. The emphasis was placed on work – the work of the highly labour intensive and time-consuming clearance of the forest, a small amount of which can clearly be seen here, and the work that remained to be done to create the lush, green pastureland that my students were so familiar with. I still hold that the intention of the photographer was very likely the creation of a positive record of progress. But my students often resisted this interpretation, fixated as they were with the environmental destruction that was evident to them as the subject of this scene. For them, this image was overwhelmingly negative.

In addition, the following image, Fig 0.3, that was discussed in my classroom in the context of gender relations, often led to humorous debates about the nature of photography and historical evidence (and the nature of gender relations). On one occasion the photograph was published with a caption suggesting that the image contradicted the drunken single male stereotype of ‘the crude, beer-swilling “bush bachelor”’ and, instead, showed ‘these Scandinavian picnickers were going about their Sunday afternoon festivities with a high degree of ritual and formality’. On

---

the contrary, in the TVNZ series *Frontier of Dreams*,\(^\text{15}\) this photograph has also been used as evidence of the very alcohol-fuelled, male-dominated culture refuted above. It was an enlightening, if somewhat alarming, revelation that a single photograph could be used by respected historians as evidence for diametrically opposed arguments in this way. It revealed to me the flexible nature of photographic images and the power of captions to frame the understanding of pictorial content for the viewer. My students tended to side with the latter interpretation, citing the ratio of beer bottles to picnickers and suggesting that if this was a ‘before’ photo, then an ‘after’ one might be needed before making a final determination. I wondered whether, bearing in mind the technological constraints which required a careful set up and execution of photographs at that time, the ‘ritual formality’ could be more to do with

---

with the occasion of the photograph than that of the picnic. I found (and still find) it unsatisfactory that the historical occasion and the actual circumstances of the creation of this image have been ignored in favour of superficial assumptions about its meaning.

This thesis is therefore, for me, at least partly, an exercise in reflexivity. In considering space as a subject of enquiry, my own position is necessarily spatialised. The point from which I view the spaces of Waikato’s colonial history influences the knowledge that is constructed as a result. According to the British geographer Gillian Rose, reflexivity is a ‘strategy for situating knowledges [and] a means of avoiding the false neutrality and universality of so much academic knowledge.’ Positioning myself in this way highlights not only the partial nature of my perspective, but of all perspectives. ‘Position’, ‘situated’, ‘perspective’ and viewpoint are all visual metaphors which have a particular resonance for the analysis of the images under consideration in this thesis. I argue that the ways of seeing of the photographers and cartographers, and their contemporaries, are discernible to the ways of seeing of present-day analysts, then my own perspectives are as much in the frame as those of the subjects and objects of my study. As Rose puts it, ‘siting is intimately involved in sighting.’

In acknowledging my positionality here, I am merely making visible what is sometimes hidden in historical enquiry. Subjectivity is a controversial issue among some historians. The American historian Susan Crane writes that while historians can never be entirely objective, ‘they nonetheless value the sustained effort.’ In other words, historians usually seek to be invisible and, if they cannot eliminate subjectivity

17 Rose, p. 308.
in their work, they aim to minimise it. Crane claims that 'historical subjectivity generally has been rendered obscure as part of the attempt to be objective.'

Articulating my position is not straightforward, however. I have noted that I was born and have lived most of my life in the Waikato, and that I have many years experience of teaching New Zealand history in the region. In some ways, this makes me a local—in the sense that I identify with the places and spaces of the Waikato in ways that I cannot elsewhere. But I disagree with the New Zealand historian Michael King who claimed that his Pākehā credentials entitled him to indigenous status. To me, this makes no sense due to the fact that, as Lydia Wevers writes, “Pakeha” is a term that has meaning only in relation to Māori.’ In other words, to me, embracing the term Pākehā, a label bestowed by Māori on newcomers who stayed, is an acknowledgement of Māori indigeneity. My position as a Pākehā historian, then, requires me to write Pākehā history which is ‘neither disingenuous nor romanticised.’ This history does not speak for Māori but it is written with the consequences of colonisation for Māori, as well as Pākehā, in mind.

Charting the course of the thesis

This focus on the images as a starting point is married to a spatial history approach to researching and writing this thesis. The theoretical and methodological underpinnings of this are the subject of Chapter 1. Prioritising changes across space, while not ignoring change over time, allows for the de-emphasis of the kind of linear chronology that has supported narratives of colonisation in New Zealand

19 Crane, p. 434.
22 Wevers, p. 3.
and elsewhere. Spatial history provides an opportunity to explore the uneven, contradictory and contingent experiences of those involved in or affected by the historical events and actions under investigation here. Physical geographical space is the ostensible subject of landscape photographs and maps such as those featured in this thesis. Not only that, however, intangible discursive and imaginary spaces are also represented in the images and in their interplay with the contexts of their production and consumption. The meanings that were intended by their creators were not necessarily shared by their contemporary audience, and over time additional messages and meanings have been overlaid through their uses in collections, archives and publications.

Decoding these meanings is an often far from exact business and the resulting analyses can be tenuous, even speculative. It is acknowledged that the alternative readings offered in this thesis are affected by this uncertainty to a greater or lesser extent. However, I argue that this approach does not suffer in comparison with many of the more confident but mistaken, or at least misleading, meanings that have typically been ascribed to these images in the past. Furthermore, while at times speculative, these interpretations are supported by a strong and growing scholarship around concepts of landscape and space, as well as the connections between pictorial representations of space and the development of identities and power relationships. Maps and photographs have been implicated as powerful tools of imperialism and colonisation and I argue that this power to shape perceptions, as well as to record them, continues to the present and therefore has great implications for this study. By presenting alternative interpretations which acknowledge the ambiguities and ambivalence inherent in the images, their contents and contexts, the possibility emerges for complementary and intersecting narratives which provide for a richer
and more complete understanding of the history under scrutiny here. This thesis falls short, however, of providing the kind of multi-threaded and holistically satisfying history that I envisage as not only possible but urgently desirable. The history I am writing here is necessarily Pākehā-centric—to my knowledge, few maps and no photographs were made by Māori in the Waikato or elsewhere in the nineteenth century. The source material I am using, therefore, is imbued with Pākehā cultural priorities and technological practice. Māori are sometimes represented in these images but they were never in control of the mechanisms or agendas behind their creation. That is not to say that the resultant images were (are) not important to Māori people. But the kind of informed and nuanced evaluation of Māori perspectives that would add so significantly to this topic is not only outside the scope of this thesis but beyond my capabilities as a researcher and writer.

The main body of the thesis is, as noted above, organised in three main thematic parts: ‘Reconnaissance’, ‘Invasion’ and ‘Occupation’. These were not three distinctly chronological phases, particularly as the Waikato as a whole is concerned. Some areas were still being reconnoitred while others were already occupied, while even in a particular locality, the three phases overlapped significantly. Structurally, each of the three parts contains an introduction and a pair of chapters. The introductions provide a rationale for, and explanation of, the section labels, and a contextual framework for the analysis of the images that follows in the chapters. Each chapter considers separate, but closely related, aspects of the themes.

Part A, *Reconnaissance*, deals with the ways the Waikato was imaged and imagined by Pākehā while the economic and political control of the region was still largely in the hands of its indigenous owners. In this section, the images are almost all maps due to the fact that it was only near the end of this phase, around 1860, that
photography came to the region. The maps are often speculative and based on limited knowledge as Pākehā ‘explored’ and ‘discovered’ for themselves places that were already well known to tangata whenua. The Waikato was perceived, classified and imaged in ways that make it clear that the purpose of these maps was as a means of reconnaissance for further incursion. Chapter 2 Measuring and Measuring Up traces the beginnings of the production of the Waikato as an imaginary Pākehā construct. This arguably began with Cook’s visit to the Waikou where he projected and predicted colonisation of the unknown (to him) interior. Pākehā values and perspectives began to be projected onto Waikato spaces. The interior being relatively inaccessible, early maps were often detailed representations of the fringes but had little to say about places further from the coast. Harbour entrances were sounded and hazards noted as, going beyond a simple recording of geographical fact, charts were produced to facilitate repeated and ongoing voyages. From a European point of view, the earliest imaginings of the Waikato were undertaken from the decks of ships, and, in fact, this kind of reconnaissance continued until the Waikato harbours were among the last sections of the New Zealand coastline to be officially charted by the British Admiralty’s Hydrographic Office surveyors in the mid-1850s. Chapter 3 A Catalogue for Colonisation investigates the intentions of Pākehā as they mapped out what they saw as the potential of the region. These blueprints of a progressive future measured, quantified and valued according to Pākehā priorities and can be seen as a prelude to invasion. The fact the Waikato was located in the hinterland of the (then) capital Auckland presented both a threat and an opportunity. The agricultural potential of the region was always an implicit or explicit reason for the covetous gaze cast by Pākehā in the direction of the Waikato during this time. The earliest infiltrations of this phase of reconnaissance were undertaken by some of the first
Pākehā to set foot on Waikato soil. Early ‘scientific’ incursions included journeys by Dieffenbach and Hochstetter, who both travelled extensively in the region and who both left important accounts of the prospects for Pākehā development they found. Hochstetter’s expedition was responsible for the production of maps of the Waikato’s geological structures, including the location of coal seams that he had specifically been sent to investigate. It was also the occasion for probably the first photographs taken in the Waikato by Bruno Hamel.

Part B, *Invasion*, is concerned not just with the British military invasion in 1863 but also the ways in which Pākehā projected themselves physically and discursively into the Waikato by non-military means. Well before the first shots were fired in the Waikato Campaign of the ‘Land Wars’, Pākehā imagined themselves in control of the Waikato and the end of the battles did not signal that the invasion was complete. Maps and photographs contain evidence of these pre- and post-military invasions. Chapter 4 *Space Invaders* focuses on the preparations and rationalisations for war in the early 1860s. The photographs of William Temple, a British army Assistant Surgeon involved in the construction of the Great South Road from Drury to Pōkenō, capture preparations for the literal invasion to come. At the same time, the road building and associated activities that were portrayed, illustrated the march of civilisation according to a Pākehā perspective. The discursive invasion of Waikato’s figurative spaces was captured as bush was cleared and the roadway was formed and/or improved, setting a course for the future Pākehā control of Waikato’s meanings and functions. Maps, such as those created by Charles Heaphy, Chief Surveyor, soldier and, like Temple, a winner of the Victoria Cross during the battles to come, marked out friend and foe, justifying the military invasion by annotating and colouring the Waikato as rebel territory. Other maps, such as river charts to aid the navigation
of the invaders’ boats, had more precise military value. In Chapter 5 *Extending the Invasion*, photographs by surveyor and engineer Daniel Manders Beere exemplify ways in which contested space was claimed as under control by Pākehā invaders through strategies like framing, which imposed Pākehā pictorial conventions and landscape ideologies onto Waikato localities. Early Waikato cadastral maps claimed to organise land ownership and use according to European norms well before, in many cases, anything like this was evident on the ground. They also demonstrate how European strategies of naming, including the appropriation of Māori names, were used to project authority onto contested space.

Part C, *Occupation*, examines ways in which Pākehā tried to make themselves local in the Waikato. Images that purport to show settlers and settlement are shown to reveal an often very unsettled existence in reality. Caught as they were between metropolitan and indigenous first worlds, ‘settlers’ struggled for legitimacy and identity. Indigenous people and environments did not give up their primacy easily, even after the military battles were over. There was always the prospect of a Māori ‘outbreak’ and economic ruin to remind the occupiers that, in many respects, they were not welcome to stay. In Chapter 6 *Settlement and Unsettlement*, the unsettled frontier is explored through its representation on maps which continued to express hopes and plans for the future as much as the lived and experienced realities on the ground. This theme is continued by maps used to promote land sales to prospective ‘settlers’. Prosperous farming communities were promoted without ever necessarily coming to fruition, at least not in the manner intended or expected by those responsible for the maps. More Daniel Beere photographs seem to illustrate settlers succeeding in their new environment, but, scratching a little beneath the surface reveals evidence of a less linear and inexorable progress than has often been described.
Chapter 7 *White Space?* examines two kinds of images which are part of a large collection of photographs taken by Raglan shopkeepers the Gilmour brothers which reveal an ambivalent attitude to progress. Made with the prospect of distribution as postcards, some of these images invoke pastoral scenes reminiscent of British romantic landscape painters. Others depict strange, even ‘grotesque’ land forms and natural features. In common, however, both of these photographic styles make claims of control over the historical and geographical spaces of the Waikato. This is also true of the official maps of counties and other administrative areas analysed in this chapter.

**A note on language**

While this thesis is written in English I have consciously used some Māori words where relevant. This includes the widespread use of the controversial term Pākeka to denote non-Māori. I use the term for precisely the same reason that I believe it is unpopular with some New Zealanders who prefer to be categorised as New Zealand European or simply New Zealander. This reason is that Pākehā frames non-Māori New Zealanders from a Māori perspective. In most cases, I use Pākehā to mean those of European origin or descent. At times, European might be a more logical or more appropriate label, but Pākehā has the advantage of reminding the reader of the distinction being emphasised between tangata whenua (the original Māori inhabitants of the land) and European invaders and occupiers.

It is becoming increasingly common to use Māori words in New Zealand English and I acknowledge this normalisation by avoiding italicisation (which would indicate a foreign word) and by adding macrons where appropriate. Macrons are diacritics
over vowels, such as the ā in Māori, which indicate increased stress or added vowel length, and they resolve a long-standing problem of representing accurate Māori pronunciation in writing. Sometimes in the past, double vowels have been used, but more often the distinction has been ignored. The advent of Māori keyboard settings on modern computers has solved the problem of rendering macrons, although my limited expertise in Te Reo Māori means that I cannot be assured of comprehensive accuracy in this regard. In names, titles and quotations drawn from other sources, I have followed the spelling of the original.

Many of the Māori words used in this thesis will be familiar to New Zealand readers but a glossary is also provided (see p. 377)

**Viewing the images**

Unfortunately, the thesis format does not readily accommodate large images such as the original versions of some of the maps I have used here. Readers will note that many of the maps, as they are reproduced in the thesis, are difficult to read and many interesting and important features may be illegible. This may also be true, though to a lesser extent, of the photographs. I have added a link in the caption of the images to an online version where one is available. In the pdf version of the thesis, the symbol in the captions is a live hyperlink. In most cases this will provide a larger, higher resolution and/or clearer image, and, sometimes, more contextual information as well. The text URLs provided have sometimes been shortened through tinyurl.com in order to avoid the excessive length of some of the original web addresses—some run to more than four hundred characters.

*Note: not all of the links work in all pdf readers.*
CHAPTER 1

Frames and Lenses

*Establishing the theoretical and methodological considerations of the thesis*

This chapter sets out the theoretical and methodological underpinnings of the thesis. Drawing on an inter-disciplinary scholarship to provide a rationale and a mechanism for using primary visual evidence, I outline the purpose of this thesis to reframe the history of the colonisation of the Waikato. The theories and methods deployed here are interconnected and yet their use is still somewhat controversial. Theoretical justification of methods for analysing and utilising historical images is necessary in the light of a relatively limited acceptance of the validity of this kind of historical evidence. Furthermore, a fundamental position of this thesis, that histories are multiple and contingent, and therefore responsive to different frames and lenses, is not universally supported in the community of professional historians.

In this thesis, frames and lenses are both methods and metaphors. Frames enclose or otherwise delineate or position space. They include and exclude. Lenses can reduce or magnify, focus and blur. They collect and arrange light according to the specific nature and organisation of their glass elements. Lenses, like gazes, are also ways of seeing that are directional and acquisitive. Picture frames and camera lenses provide literal boundaries in the creation and display of images. Specific frames are applied to particular photographs and maps such as those featured in this thesis. Lenses determine the actual content and composition of photographs. I contend that, less consciously, photographers and cartographers in the Waikato were
influenced by discursive frames of reference and ideological lenses which drove their decisions about what to portray and how, and that these are discoverable through a close analysis of the images and the contexts of their creation. Quite consciously, I have chosen to view the images, and the actions of the image-makers and their contemporaries, within a framework that emphasises colonisation, and through a lens that acknowledges the discursive and ideological power of colonial images to act as records and rationalisations of such activity. In other words, I am viewing the real and metaphorical frames and lenses which were employed to create the images that form the basis of this thesis through my own acknowledged frames and lenses in order to generate a new understanding of the colonisation of the Waikato.

A colonisation lens focuses our attention on the power dynamics of the assertions of political, economic and cultural control by Pākehā over the land and its people. This does not mean replacing one limiting narrative with another. On the contrary, a colonisation lens allows for a reading of events and actions that is more complex, dynamic and ambiguous. It also problematises the idea of colonisation itself. As Felicity Barnes warns, terms like ‘colonial’, if used uncritically to ‘effortlessly span the 60 or so years from 1840 to the end of the nineteenth century, cloaking a myriad of cultural changes’,¹ can impose as limiting a framework as the ‘nation’. But I argue here that colonisation, unlike ‘the nation’, is not a destination but a complex and dynamic combination of events and relationships that varied greatly in their nature and impacts. This thesis, in its content, recognises the shifting emphases of colonisation during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in three broad phases, and, in its approach, acknowledges the persistence of colonising practices into the present.

Spaces and Spatial History

The overarching strategy for accomplishing this is spatial history. The practice of spatial history borrows from geographers’ understanding of the concept(s) of space, and is therefore inherently interdisciplinary. Spaces are actual geographical locations where human activity can be observed and patterns identified. But there are also less tangible discursive spaces that can be seen as sets of relations and identities, and which serve as the cultural contexts of that human activity. Much of the literature that underpins my use of the term and the concept(s) of space employs these connotations more or less interchangeably. Spatial history, then, is a historical study located in a particular place, but that also seeks to situate and understand human historical activity within ideological and other contextual spaces. The spatial history that I undertake here is specifically employed to examine the extent to which the role of visual representation of physical space was the product and instrument of the ideologies and identities that fuelled the Pākehā colonisation of Waikato spaces, both physical and discursive.

Spatial history is a term probably coined by Paul Carter. His book *The Road to Botany Bay*, first published in 1987, carries the subtitle ‘An Essay in Spatial History’ and the concept and approach form the basis of his analysis of the creation of Australia in the 18th and 19th centuries.² For Carter, the key difference between his spatial history strategy and traditional historical practice is that, by focusing on spatial events, decisions and intentions, he can avoid the teleological and deterministic pitfalls of conventional historical narratives. His chief criticism of what he calls imperial history is that it reduces space to a stage on which historical evidence is selected, and historical action is shaped, by the historian into a progressive narrative

---

in order to emphasise cause and effect and the emergence of order from chaos. As he
writes in *The Road to Botany Bay*,

the governor erects a tent here rather than there; the soldier blazes a trail in that
direction rather than this: but, rather than focus on the *intentional world of*
historical individuals, the world of active, spatial choices, empirical history of
this kind has as its focus facts which, in a sense, come after the event.³

Furthermore, according to Carter, the 'primary object [of this empirical/imperial
history] is not to understand or to interpret: it is to legitimate.'⁴ Spatial history, on
the other hand, is 'like a journey, exploratory.'⁵ Historical actions and events can
be viewed, not as steps in an inevitable path from how it was to how it became,
but as contingent, intentional and speculative. For me, by adopting this approach,
it is not only possible, but also essential, to reframe the history of colonisation
in the Waikato to focus on actual occasions, events and locations. I am aware
that the complete decoupling of history from narrative is impossible, and in my
view undesirable, and that my alternative here is not a fully formed replacement
of traditional approaches. The most important change allowed by this approach
is a more deliberate focus on intentions of historical agents, and the specific
circumstances of historical events and actions without being constrained by the need
to cohere to a chronological narrative. Spatial history’s more inclusive and multi-
faceted frames can accommodate the events that seem aberrant to the traditional
story, or that do not fall neatly into the traditional frame of the Waikato’s colonial
history.

Carter argues that spatial history begins 'in the act of naming.'⁶ Here, he
closely scrutinises the role of the newly arrived Europeans in appropriating space
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by transforming it symbolically into ‘place’ through naming. For Carter, the act of naming was a rhetorical strategy of would-be settlers for ‘bringing into being a place by announcing their intention to do so: from that time on … [it] was a point of reference; it had become an intentional object; a place had been linguistically settled.’  

Giselle Byrnes has elaborated on this process in the New Zealand context in her work on surveyors and mapping. Following Carter, Byrnes claims that Pākehā ‘colonised the land through language, literally inscribing it with new meanings and ways of seeing’.  

Berg and Kearns have also argued that ‘naming is a form of norming.’ The act of naming (renaming) can be seen as a discursive strategy to normalise the presence of the colonists as it seeks to deny a prior indigenous presence.

I draw on this now well-established literature throughout the thesis with an emphasis on Waikato naming and names, including Waikato itself. To the strategies of naming and norming, as instruments of claiming I would add framing. As noted above, framing is a means of controlling the scope and context of a view, in both literal and figurative senses. I have also already outlined my own strategies for framing this study through language. In this thesis I critique the ways that Pākehā visitors and colonists framed the land, and themselves within it to assert superiority, dominance and control.

Landscapes are both lenses and frames. Pākehā valued certain landscapes and land uses, and their sense of cultural—at times racial—superiority led them to assert these values in exotic places like the Waikato. There is now a considerable interdisciplinary literature from geography, art history, literary studies and also, to some extent,
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history that connects landscapes, and representations of landscapes, to the practices of Europeans in imposing control over people and place around the world. Simon Ryan has argued that control over landscapes was achieved ‘by actively constructing the scene through pre-existent descriptive paradigms.’ One such paradigm is the ‘picturesque’. The picturesque is an idealised way of seeing and recording landscapes according to conventions developed by William Gilpin in the late eighteenth century. According to Ryan, ‘[f]raming landscape, and labelling it picturesque, combats its threatening vastness and unfamiliarity and demonstrates the triumphant portability of visual taste.’ Ryan also argues that ‘the imperial endeavour encourages the construction of space as a universal, measurable and divisible entity, for this is a self-legitimising view of the world’. The picturesque, therefore, both influences and is reinforced by European colonial activity. Its comfortingly familiar frame permits the taming of exotic landscapes, and the assumption that it is universal discourages colonists from investigating or acknowledging alternative constructions, like those of the indigenous natives for example. But ideals of landscape, like the ‘picturesque’, are not universal. Nor can landscapes be truly natural, as they do not exist in nature. As Byrnes has pointed out, ‘a landscape is a cultural construction; it is a particular perspective on or of the land’. Moreover, according to Baker and Biger, ‘any landscape is likely to contain all manner of ideological representations so that description of its appearance must also be logically “thickened” into an interpretation of its meaning’. The usurpation of landscape is not merely a metaphor for colonisation, however, but

11 Simon Ryan, p. 60.
12 Simon Ryan, p. 4.
13 Byrnes, p. 11.
an active ally in the imposition of control on the ground. W. J. T. Mitchell argues that landscape should be considered a verb as much as a noun, and as a process rather than an object.\(^\text{15}\) Furthermore, James Ryan asserts that ‘the very idea of Empire depended in part on an idea of landscape, as both controlled space and the means of representing control’.\(^\text{16}\) I argue that the ideas and practices of colonisation in the Waikato are reflected in, and reflected by, the ways that Waikato landscapes are represented, including in those maps and photographs I critique in this thesis.

Reinforcing and amplifying the link with historical geography, this thesis illuminates and examines the discursive spaces of the colonists’ geographical imagination—sometimes imaginary or imaginative geographies—which is a label that has been coined to describe the identities and attitudes that reflect and shape people’s experience of place. The term is a salient reminder of the subjectivity of this experience and can be likened to the kinds of cultural filters, or headspace, through which experience is interpreted. According to Steven Hoelscher, the term imaginative geographies was first used by Edward Said who argued that the perceptions that European colonial powers had of themselves as superior and advanced (civilised), and the ‘Others’ as inferior and primitive (savage), underpinned colonialis\(^\text{17}\)t attitudes and justified colonialis\(^\text{17}\)t actions. Hoelscher also points out that ‘imaginative geographies are based, to a very large degree, on the circulation of textual and visual materials that give substance and meaning to such images’. Imagination is a particularly visual experience, both etymologically and conceptually connected to ‘image’. This thesis draws on these ideas to argue that imaginative geographies represented and reinforced
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through images were not merely important in the conceptual construction of colonial space, but they provided powerful encouragement to the realisation of more tangible colonial goals. Colonists imagined themselves in control and set about making this a reality.

In adopting a spatial history approach, and as a result emphasising space, I do not deny the importance of time. Traditionally, the discipline of history has been seen to describe change over time. But while Carter would reject chronology as a kind of narrative straitjacket, others, Philip Ethington, for example, go further still and abandon time itself. According to this interpretation of spatial history, ‘the past cannot exist in time: only in space.’ But as Doreen Massey points out, ‘space is not static, nor time spaceless,’ adding that ‘spatiality and temporality are different from each other but neither can be conceptualized as the absence of the other.’ And time is important in history – historical action is contextualised by what came before and after. However, spatial history offers the opportunity to explore, in greater depth and detail, contextualising features that were important at the same time. Rather than abandoning time, time itself becomes a subject of historical investigation.

This is what Stuart Elden means when he argues that we should ‘historicize space and spatialize history.’ Accordingly, the spatial history approach adopted here seeks to ‘recognize how space, place and location are crucial determining factors’ in understanding particular historical contexts. The constraint that Felicity Barnes calls ‘time’s totalizing frameworks’ are directly in the frame.

21 Elden, p. 18.
22 Barnes, p. 139.
This thesis addresses multiple elements and aspects of spatiality in undertaking a spatial history of colonisation in the Waikato. I have already noted the space, or gap, between traditional Pākehā and Māori understandings of and attitudes to New Zealand’s histories. As well as trying to identify and illuminate that space in the hope that it may be bridged, the physical and discursive spaces of the Waikato come under the spotlight. The Waikato’s physical geography, its land and landscapes, is the subject of the images selected for analysis. The title of this thesis, ‘Imaging and Imagining the Waikato’, was expressly chosen to highlight the role of visual representation in recording and promoting of the ideals and actions of colonialism in this region. While the expectations, intentions and actions of Pākehā associated with the colonisation of the Waikato can be shown to be fuelled by scientific, mercantile and religious motivations and are closely linked to culturally constructed and assertive ideals of landscape, I argue that what brought these things together, lending impetus and momentum to the process, was a collective geographic imagination that placed the invaders at the centre and in control.

Towards Decolonising Pākehā History

I am not Māori and this thesis makes no claim to speak for Māori. Instead, as a Pākehā author, I seek a way forward to revise narratives of colonisation in the Waikato. I actively engage with Māori calls, like that of Nēpia Mahuika already mentioned, to close the gaps between Māori and Pākehā approaches to our shared past. In doing so I walk tightrope and risk opprobrium from all sides. Pākehā seeking a comfortable rationalisation of modern identity as locals will be disappointed. My approach is purposefully as unsettling to Pākehā readers as it is to myself as I write
it. On the other hand, Māori may criticise another decentring of Māori from the historical action to which they are inextricably linked. This is a legitimate criticism, but this thesis deliberately frames Pākehā as colonisers in a first step towards decolonising Pākehā history. If I have little specific to say about Māori that is because I am acutely aware that I am ill-equipped to do that justice. I take note of Joe Pere’s warning that ‘those who trespass [into Māori history] risk joining the ranks of the “historical imperialists” of the nineteenth century’.  

Even from a Pākehā perspective, it is widely acknowledged that indigenous peoples, including Māori, suffered greatly from the oppressive consequences of European colonisation, and it is becoming more common to appreciate that this oppression continues today. History is implicated in this process of ongoing colonisation when the actions and attitudes of the colonisers are minimised, omitted or explained away. In Ani Mikaere’s words, ‘to euphemise the impact of colonisation on Māori is to fundamentally disrespect the memory of those who suffered as a result of resources wrongly taken, of language denied, of spirituality suppressed’. This thesis puts such actions and attitudes front and centre in order to frame Pākehā colonisation as oppressive from a Pākehā point of view. In doing this I acknowledge a number of pitfalls that I will not entirely avoid. Is this a case of the colonial oppressor appropriating the space of decolonisation? Colonisation is, after all, about power. I am writing from a position of power derived from the fruits of colonisation. Am I usurping the rightful occupation of the colonised to the decolonisation space? That is not my intention, but I can hardly claim, like some apologists for nineteenth century
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Note: the ¨ symbol, as in ‘Māori’, was an early attempt to emulate macrons on a computer. I have retained the original usage.
colonists, that I am ignorant and therefore blameless. My aim here is not to usurp power but to diminish it by making it visible.

In proposing the decolonisation of Pākehā history, I draw on a growing body of writing by Māori academics, as Māori and other indigenous writers are the leading experts in this field. As long ago as 1999, Linda Tuhiwai Smith wrote *Decolonizing Methodologies* in which she outlines strategies for indigenous researchers to assist them in overcoming the problem that, in her words, ‘the term “research” is inextricably linked to European imperialism and colonialism’. In fact, she goes so far as to label ‘research’ as ‘probably one of the dirtiest words in the indigenous world’s vocabulary’. By this she means that Western ‘research’ into indigenous matters has, from an indigenous point of view, inevitably led to negative outcomes for indigenous peoples. A power imbalance in the relationship between researcher and subjects has often been compounded by the oppressive uses to which the ‘research’ findings have been put. Smith is critical of the way that history has typically been written from the perspective of the coloniser and that indigenous views have been negated. She claims that history ‘is the story of the powerful and how they became powerful, and then how they use their power to keep them in positions in which they can continue to dominate others’. She argues that ‘reclaiming history is a critical and essential aspect of decolonization’. I suggest that reframing history through a spatial history approach could be a useful strategy towards this end. Smith’s critique of Western history, while emerging from a different tradition, overlaps considerably with that of
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Paul Carter outlined above. Among the problems highlighted by Smith are concerns that history claims to be a coherent, universal narrative, tied to a single chronology and predicated on development.\(^30\) This thesis rejects these problematic features of traditional historical narratives and, instead, proposes a more multi-threaded and less orderly version.

It is perhaps necessary to point out that this thesis does not aspire to be postcolonial, even as I am influenced by others who have assumed this label. Postcolonialism, at first glance, may appear to be an apt designation for the kind of approach I am taking here. As Giselle Byrnes writes, ‘a post-colonial reading aims to unsettle and challenge the authority of colonialism and highlight its ambivalence and diversity’.\(^31\) And Robert Young describes the advantages of a postcolonial approach to history:

> Before postcolonialism, for example, there were plenty of histories of colonialism. But such histories rarely considered the ways in which colonialism was experienced, or analysed, by those who suffered its effects.\(^32\)

But Leonie Pihama asserts that ‘the use of the notion of ‘post-colonial’ in this country [New Zealand] not only centres Pākehā definitions but is also disturbing in its denial of the voices of Māori’.\(^33\) Nēpia Mahuika notes that postcolonialism has been a highly useful way of thinking about the problems within colonial encounter, while on the other it has been critiqued for its failure to accentuate the obvious continuation of colonialism within our contemporary context.\(^34\)

\(^30\) Smith, pp. 31–32.
\(^31\) Byrnes, p. 13.
This last point about ‘our contemporary context’ is important. The ‘post’ in postcolonialism has always had the unhelpful connotation of something coming after. This means that readers may assume that a postcolonial analysis concerns a world after colonisation has finished. Peter Gibbons quotes the Australian poet Bobbi Sykes’s poem ‘Post-Colonial Fictions’: ‘Have I missed something? … Have they gone?’

In that same article that has been so influential to my thinking, Gibbons warns that ‘perhaps historical writings dealing with cultural matters that do not take postcolonial perspectives and problematise the presence of Pakeha run the risk of being considered as parts of the colonizing process’. Decolonisation must precede postcolonialism, but, as Miranda Johnson points out, in settler societies like New Zealand, there is ‘no event of decolonization’. Decolonisation must, therefore, involve numerous persistent strategies and actions. The decolonisation of history must occur in the present and I employ spatial history in my attempt to contribute to the achievement of that goal.

A possible further step, signalled here but not achieved in this thesis, is a kaupapa Māori approach to Pākehā history. According to Linda Tuhiwai Smith, kaupapa Māori research ‘is a counter-hegemonic approach to Western forms of research and, as such, currently exists on the margins’. In this it is similar in its goal to postcolonialism. Yet, kaupapa Māori is an authentic Māori perspective and set of practices that is not (yet?) available to me as a Pākehā historian. It would involve a far greater understanding of te reo (Māori language) and tikanga (behaviours and practices based on Māori customs and ethical frameworks) than I currently possess.


36 Gibbons, p. 15.
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It would, more importantly, involve acceptance by Māori communities based on relationships developed over time. By focusing on reframing Pākehā history, I have avoided relying on Māori sources to a great extent, partly for reasons of practicality, and partly because I am, frankly, daunted by the responsibility. Such excuses will not be tenable in the future.

**Analysing visual images – methods for excavation and deconstruction**

A spatial history approach seeks to identify the discursive spaces that inform and inhabit historical action. The following section outlines the specific methods that I employ to contextualise and extract meaning from the photographs and maps included in the body of the thesis. These methods are not necessarily confined to spatial history, but they are compatible with the spatial history goal of contextualising historical action through the revealing of the discursive practices and systems in which they are embedded. In this section, the methods used to analyse both photographs and maps and the theoretical underpinnings of these methods are set out.

This thesis shows that photographs can be productively scrutinised as legitimate sources of historical information. This has not always been obvious to historians who are used to working with written documents, but it is becoming more commonly accepted. According to Peter Burke, historians have tended to use images to ‘illustrate conclusions the author has already reached by other means’.  

In other words, the images themselves are not used as sources of information, but as

embellishments for information gleaned from other sources. The American historian Martha Sandweiss claims that ‘[a]ll too often, historians regard “picture research” as secondary to their real purpose, and visual images as inherently inferior to literary ones.’\textsuperscript{40} Sandweiss goes on, however, to argue that photographs can be rich sources of information for historians and that they ‘deserve and reward the careful sort of historical attention more often lavished on literary texts.’\textsuperscript{41} Another American historian, Jennifer Tucker, has pointed out that ‘photographs are neither more nor less transparent than other documentary sources.’ Tucker argues that, in working with photographs, historians have their eyes opened to the ‘potential and limits of all historical sources’.\textsuperscript{42} Furthermore, as the New Zealand historian Bronwyn Dalley, among others, has pointed out, photographic images offer the historian types of information that other sources do not, at least not with such immediacy. For Dalley, this was particularly the ‘quotidian and the small, taken-for-granted details’ of daily life that often go unnoticed and unmentioned in other media but that appear as ‘chance residues’ in historical photographs.\textsuperscript{43} Dalley is also awake to the fluidity of photographic meanings, highlighting the potential conflict between the intentions of the photographer and those of the historian with a different story to tell. The context of an image’s reproduction and the association of a particular caption can alter its meaning(s) considerably. Dalley’s work has proved influential in raising the profile and promoting the possibilities of using visual sources in New Zealand historical study. But, to me it also raises some important questions. To what extent


\textsuperscript{41} Sandweiss, p. 7.


Are these ‘residues’ down to ‘chance’? And what happens when the historian uses the photograph as a starting point, rather than as an illustration for a story already formed? Are the intentions of the photographers and subjects retrievable? Do some meanings have primacy?

These questions have been touched on by other New Zealand authors, at least to some extent. Dalley herself, in her book *Living in the 20th Century* which features more than 350 photographs drawn from New Zealand’s National Archives, tells two connected stories in which stories of New Zealand’s social histories of the twentieth century are told side by side - one in the main text, and another, complementary one in the photographs and captions. Many of those images are attributed to government departments rather than individual photographers, posing intriguing questions about the photographic decisions involved in their execution. Anthony Dreaver’s *An Eye for Country* is a tightly focused account of aspects of the life of Leslie Adkin, a farmer, family man, and scientist, which is accompanied by a generous selection of the subject’s own photographic archive. The photographs are not simply an adjunct to the text but, as Adkin’s photography was such an important part of his life and legacy, the photographs and the occasions they represent form an important part of the story being told. Felicity Barnes has contextualised the photographs of amateur photographer Harry Moult within the framing conventions British pictorialist practice. Barnes suggests that Moult’s engagement with this pictorialist aesthetic can be connected to re-colonising impulses which drew colony (New Zealand) and metropolis (Britain) closer together. She explains that ‘the new relationship of
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colony and metropolis – close and complementary, not distant and different – is both captured in and constructed by Moults photographs. Christine Whybrew has written extensively about the commercial imperative that informed the photographic work of the Burton Brothers, the most famous photographic firm of New Zealands colonial era. While they were based in Dunedin, they travelled throughout the country and to the Pacific. In the 1880s, Alfred Burton travelled through the King Country recording many images of Māori at home and several Waikato views are also attributed to him at this time. Those Waikato photographs, in context of Whybrews analysis, form an interesting complement to the other Waikato images presented here.

My own approach in this thesis leans heavily on methodological approaches outlined by Julia Adeney Thomas, whose article The Evidence of Sight focuses on this duality of photographs as both reservoirs of information about the past, and also as objects that can generate meaning in the present. Thomas argues that our relationship with the past through photographs is both visceral and discursive and that, as the evidence of sight is both sensuous and cognitive, it appears to promise complete satisfaction, but it delivers instead two different, often incommensurate, types of perception. Thomas draws on the work of Michel Foucault and the neuroscience of sight to suggest that, in analysing images, historians employ distinctly different approaches, which she calls recognition and excavation. According to Thomas, recognition is a pre-discursive and pre-cognitive act of identifying a

48 see also Whybrew, Christine, Reading Photographs: Burton Brothers and the Photographic Narrative, Journal of New Zealand Studies, 12 (2011), 77–89
49 Julia Adeney Thomas, The Evidence of Sight, History and Theory, 48.4 (2009), 151–68.
50 Thomas, pp. 151-152.
likeness, whereas excavation recognises and seeks to understand and explicate the contextual embeddedness of an image and its production. Recognition is an act of substitution whereas excavation is an act of reconstruction. Similarly, Sandweiss argues that ‘[p]hotographs are primary source documents that can be encountered both in history and through history.’ Photographs embedded in history become tools for ‘understanding larger issues …, about the role of photographs as purveyors of information and creators of myth’, whereas in reading photographs through history, she argues, ‘we must also become more aware of how our own knowledge and imagination shapes our reading of the picture as we encounter it in the here and now.’\textsuperscript{51} These approaches are not necessarily exclusive alternatives, but examining and illuminating the tension between them can provide some interesting and useful knowledge.

I emphasise excavation as a methodological approach in this thesis. The alternative, recognition, can, at times, be put to legitimate uses but it has significant limitations. The historian’s use of images to illustrate their conclusions already reached relies on recognition. The reader/viewer must be able to imagine a connection between their own experience and that of the subject(s) in order for them to be convinced of the image’s relevance. This assumes a direct connection between the viewer’s modern reality and that of the subject of the image in historical time. While this may provoke an empathic bond that engages the viewer, the actual connection may be tenuous or illusory. An understanding of an historical context based on recognition may therefore be powerful but superficial. Instead, in excavating an image, my aim is to ‘uncover the network of connotations, practices, and relations of power—in short, the entire discursive system—through which it emerged as an object’\textsuperscript{52}.

\textsuperscript{51} Sandweiss, p. 9.
\textsuperscript{52} Thomas, p. 153.
This is not straight-forward as ‘discursive systems’ are not, in themselves, visible in the actual photographs. As a consequence, the techniques of excavation involve the retrieval of the social/cultural world in which the images were created and distributed. The photograph is seen as a discursive fragment of this social/cultural world that derives meaning from being reconnected to its discursive context. Thomas has worked with, and written about, mainly, images from post-war Japan where she has sought to understand how those pictures may have been received and understood then. In her favour, she has access to a range of publications in which the images were published and critiqued. Particular photographs were widely circulated and commented on as vigorous debates raged about the nature and purpose of photography generally, and the meaning and status of certain images in particular. The fact that Thomas can point to examples of how these images were received gives her a significant head start over my own analysis of images from the previous century. Technologies that allowed for the publication and distribution of photographs in newspapers and magazines were not available when many of the images that are the subject of this thesis were created. Even when, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, the mass-production of postcards allowed for a much wider distribution of images, there is no way of knowing, at this distance, how many copies of any particular photograph were re-produced, by whom they were viewed or how they were received. In other words, in this thesis, a discussion of the discourse of photography and photographic representation involving the very photographs I am studying will not be possible, at least not while discussing their possible original meanings. Other discursive systems and practices will play a vital role in contextualising these images, however. For example, an examination of ‘military photography’ or ‘commercial postcard photography’ may offer contextual insights for those relevant images.
The key overarching discursive framework within which I analyse these images is colonisation. The methods for identifying the effects of the selected images on colonial relations and actions are problematic. I am using as a starting point the premise that colonisation was (is) not a discrete process of migration and displacement that can be defined simply in terms of economic resources and political power. These aspects are important, but they are accompanied by less tangible, but equally intrusive, acts of cultural colonisation. Colonists not only gained control over the physical spaces, but also the discursive spaces of meanings and identities. In New Zealand, Māori conceptions of themselves as tangata whenua, their relationships with other tangata and their whenua, were not destroyed, but they were marginalised and eventually engulfed by the weight of Pākehā perceptions and priorities. A key question here is, can these discursive colonialist features be identified, revealed and explicated through the study of colonial photographs? My answer is a qualified yes. One methodological strategy that can be useful is to treat the images as texts. Here, as has been acknowledged above, I draw on the work of Peter Gibbons. Gibbons has written of the power of the written word in extending colonial control in New Zealand. He has described writing and printing as ‘sharp instrument[s] of colonization’. While Gibbons mainly refers to written texts, he also acknowledges the importance of images in the discursive production of New Zealand by colonists and the consequent marginalisation and alienation of Māori. Production and, especially reproduction, technologies meant images like photographs were far less widely distributed than written texts could be. However, I have already suggested that photographs may be more powerful – sharper – instruments of colonisation than the written word. The apparent reality of photographs, as well as the scientific reputation

of both photographs and maps, has tended to give these forms an authority that
can be enjoyed. They may not have been as ubiquitous, but they may
have carried more weight.

Chris Hilliard has pointed out some limits of Gibbons’s approach to ‘cultural
colonisation’. He argues that ‘as a tool for analyzing (rather than merely labelling)
Pakeha practices it would not take us far.’ Hilliard implies that while texts may
describe colonisation, they may not be implicated in the actual work of colonisation.
While it is true that, for example, military invasions are more powerful than
discursive ones in real terms, I argue, and I show throughout the thesis, that cultural
factors like maps and photographs acted as records as well as validation of the more
coercive actions. In this sense they cannot be separated. As Patrick Wolfe writes, ‘the
opposition between the discursive and the practical – including such variants as the
ideal versus the material, the cultural versus the instrumental and so on – is a false
one. Representations dialectically inform the understandings that permeate practical
activity and vice versa.’ As Felicity Barnes argues, the role of cultural phenomena
such as images of landscapes is ‘as an auxiliary engine to activities (and thus times
and spaces) already considered colonising.’ Elsewhere, Gibbons has argued that
cultural colonisation took the form of cultural appropriation, which he defines as
‘the unauthorised utilisation of elements of the signifying systems of the indigenous
people by a settler society through incorporation of these elements into the signifying
systems of the settler society.’ Gibbons quotes Hartmut Lutz who argues, in the
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context of North American colonisation, that, while the treatment of land and people as raw materials according to the colonisers’ interests is ‘most obvious in terms of geographical dispossession, … appropriation of non-material aspects of Native cultures has long been overlooked, or dismissed as being inconsequential, or being of the past.’ There is not a direct connection between representation and reality. As Doreen Massey warns, ‘a map of a geography is no more that geography—or space—than a painting of a pipe is a pipe.’ But the colonising power of cultural articles like landscape images lies, not in their resemblance to the physical space depicted, but their appropriation of the discursive power to organise and represent that space. The capacity of such images to inform and sustain more direct colonising practices continues into the present and it would be impossible to attempt a ‘decolonising’ history without emphasising that point.

Despite this, we cannot assume that colonial texts are directly complicit in the actual work of cultural colonisation if we cannot identify the mechanisms by which this happened. Tony Ballantyne warns of the ‘fuzziness that often characterizes work on colonial knowledge production and reproduction, work that frequently identifies writing or literacy (or statistical thought or map-making for that matter) as practices that automatically consolidated colonial hegemony and eroded Maori culture’. According to Ballantyne, it is not simply enough to draw attention to the ways that colonial texts illustrate or represent the attitudes of the colonists. What is needed is a greater emphasis on ‘the spatial/social location and institutional frameworks from
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which the text was produced’. This thesis responds to this challenge by focusing on the circumstances of the production of the images that are selected for analysis. While this does not provide hard evidence of the actual transmission of ideas or attitudes, it allows for the images to be located in particular spatial and social contexts, which can then be used to provide meaning not explicitly available from just the image itself. Where possible, these contexts also include the inclusion of multiple images from the same photographer in order to highlight recurring themes and concerns.

There are two further points that need to be clarified here. Firstly, the analyses of the production of these images, while never completely certain, are not as speculative as their meanings on reception by contemporary viewers. Photographs can be interpreted in different ways and it is likely that the intentions of the photographers would have been confounded at times. While acknowledging the importance of avoiding a simplistic Māori/Pākehā binary, and noting that these images were made by Pākehā and generally intended for a Pākehā viewership, there is likely to have been a significant difference between the interpretations of colonisers and tangata whenua when it comes to their content and form. Secondly, it is also acknowledged that images such as these change meaning over time. New meanings are overlaid on old and sometimes it is difficult to peel away these laminations. Having said that, it is much clearer how the limited remaining archive can and has been used to continue the work of cultural colonisation into the present. Photographs have been used to illustrate and reinforce narratives of New Zealand’s history in illustrated history books and other media formats. The existence of certain images, and types of images, and the dearth of certain others, has led to an intensification of a Pākehā-centered New
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Zealand history at a time when other voices are struggling to be heard. The uncritical use and casual captioning of nineteenth century images has left Pākehā clearly in control of the frame, if sometimes by default.

Suggesting a way forward, Ballantyne has identified ‘four modes of writing where he sees a strong connection between writing and the process of colonization’. Some of these inter-connected modes, perhaps all of them, are directly applicable to the analysis of images of colonisation in the nineteenth century as visual texts as well. I will therefore seek to draw attention to the ways that the images presented exemplify these modes in order to make their connection to processes of colonisation more visible and explicit. The four modes are: imperial potentiality; colonial promotion, or ‘boosterism’; ethnographic assessment; and improvement writing. ‘Imperial potentiality’, according to Ballantyne, framed land and resources within ‘an imagined imperial future’. Many of the images reproduced for analysis here will be seen to be directly associated with this very ideology, particularly in the Reconnaissance and Invasion sections. Boosterism was, as we shall see, mainly associated with Occupation, as was improvement writing. Only ethnographic assessment is not directly relevant to the focus of this thesis. While Māori are important subjects in this work, they are seldom the overt subjects of the images I am reading as texts. I am aware that, for Māori, the people and the land may not be distinct categories. Moreover, much of the writing about colonial landscapes echoed that of colonial ethnography in its terminology and tone—the savage/civilised dichotomy did not just refer to people. Perhaps an adjusted mode of geographical assessment might be useful here, although the distinction between geographical and ethnographic may not always be possible. This mode is relevant throughout sections covered by the thesis.
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In examining the work of photographs as agents of colonisation, I am also influenced by the work of art historians such as Joan Schwartz, Eleanor Hight and Gary Sampson, and geographers such as James Ryan. These scholars have drawn attention to the connections between the emerging technologies of photography, and the ideologies and practices of imperialism in the nineteenth century. According to Schwartz, photographs were ‘employed as visual truth to forge, validate, confirm, shape and perpetuate ideas of place, space, time, self and the Other’. 65 Western standards and frameworks were imposed on exotic locations by photographers of empire, and the resulting images were consumed in the metropolis in ways that allowed ‘armchair travellers’ to imagine themselves as participants. Ryan argues that ‘photographic practices and aesthetics … express and articulate ideologies of imperialism’ 66 and that photographs are ‘expressions of the knowledge and power that shaped the reality of Empire’. 67 Hight and Sampson contend that photographs ‘can be seen as substantiating imperialist rhetoric that essentialized both people and places; while they perpetuated the myths of other races and their environments.’ 68 These writers argue that a large part of the power of photographs to persuade as well as to show comes from their reputation, especially in the mid-nineteenth century, for scientific realism.

There was an assumption that, because of the constraints of photographic technology, photographers could only record and portray objective reality. Schwartz quotes an 1860 journal: ‘The photograph, however, cannot deceive; in nothing can

it extenuate; there is no power in this marvellous machine either to add or to take from: we know that what we see must be TRUE." The combination of the ‘realistic’ impression of photographic representation and the power of images to shape viewers’ perceptions created a doubly potent effect. But, when photographs are read merely as faithful and unmediated facsimiles of the real world, the subjective contingency of the photographic moment is completely obscured. Each photographic image is actually the product of numerous decisions by the photographer – What to photograph? When? From what angle? How will the image be posed/composed? And so on. In the nineteenth century, photographic practice was a time-consuming, and by more modern standards, laborious process. In other words, the images will be analyzed here, are not candid snaps, but carefully constructed and arranged. Using the interdisciplinary example of these scholars, I will be aiming to identify and illuminate these decisions where possible. By demonstrating how the Waikato was consciously framed and represented by colonial photographers, I deliberately connect the practices and occasions of photography to the process of cultural colonisation.

Maps and photographs are distinctly different media, and the differences are interesting and informative. Maps are more obviously representations and their ‘man-made’ element is much more self-evident and, while they also have a reputation for scientific accuracy, they are not ‘realistic’ in the way that photographs are. They also usually depict a ‘bird’s eye view’ of the landscape and they more explicitly define and delineate the lie of the land. Maps do, however, share with photographs a power to normalise particular styles of representation and to operate as value-laden champions of particular ideologies. In this thesis, I mostly focus on their similarities as examples
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of how Europeans conceptualised and represented the Waikato. And, while maps and photographs are considered separately within each section, by consciously arranging them in the same conceptual space, I hope to be able to transfer, and perhaps transform, their meaning(s) and significance.

In examining the role of maps and cartography in the practices and processes of colonisation in the Waikato, I draw from a relatively well-established literature, certainly when compared with that on photography. Maps, and the practice of cartography, have a better-recognised connection to colonisation than photographs do. This is no doubt, at least partly, due to the fact that some cartographic decisions are more obvious than photographic ones. Maps are never comprehensive – they can never show a life-sized version of reality that records and displays everything as it is. Depending on its purpose, a map will highlight certain information, while other details that are deemed less relevant will be downplayed or omitted. The decisions of the mapmaker, or whoever commissioned the map, are readily evident in this interplay between what is included and what is not. However, sometimes maps designed for one purpose are used for another, and the repetition of certain features can mask the subjectivity of mapmaking, leading to assumptions of normalcy and even reality. When I showed my nephew, who was then five years old, a version of a world map oriented with the southern hemisphere on top, he declared: ‘That’s not my world’, and rushed to show me the map on his bedroom wall with the north and south more familiarly arranged.

It is not only small children who are enculturated in this way. The power of maps to transmit ideologies and to shape perceptions has been articulated by a number of scholars since at least the 1980s. For example, American geographer J. B. Harley’s ‘deconstruction’ of maps and cartographic practices, not only provides
insights into the mechanisms of how imperial mapmakers framed colonial space, but also offers some broad methodological tools for decoding maps that I will be employing. Deconstruction, one such tool, is related to excavation. Both methods seek to contextualise the image under analysis, recognising that a superficial reading can leave a great deal of potential information unnoticed. In other words, and importantly for this thesis and my approach, both rely on the possibility of a close and critical reading as texts in order to expose their ideological content and discursive power. Deconstruction, most closely associated with the work of Jacques Derrida, denies a direct and constant link between language and meaning. The American geographer J.B. Harley has applied this idea to maps in his stated desire to ‘break the assumed link between reality and representation which [had] dominated cartographic thinking’. Following Harley’s example, rather than succumbing to an uncritical belief in the scientific accuracy of maps, I ‘read between the lines of the map … and through its tropes to discover the silences and contradictions that challenge the apparent honesty of the image.’ Harley recognised the discursive power of maps and the ability of cartographers to define, as well as to describe, space. Culturally constructed and culturally encoded, maps are agents of power that are directly implicated in the imposition of imperial norms and ideologies on colonial spaces.

The selective and subjective decisions of the cartographer reveal as much about his—this was a male dominated activity—cultural priorities as about the landscape. The process of defining and inscribing space ‘replicates not just the “environment” in some abstract sense but equally the territorial imperatives of a particular political system.’ Harley goes further to claim that ‘[a]s much as guns and warships, maps
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have been the weapons of imperialism.’73 The Irish geographer David Livingston concurs, stating that ‘[t]hroughout its history, geography has frequently cast itself as the aide-de-camp to militarism and imperialism. Maps, it was long known, were as vital implements of war mongering as gunnery’.74 In other words, mapping can be seen as a real strategy of colonisation, as discursive and actual spaces were controlled through cartographic means. Furthermore, according to the British historian Jeremy Black, ‘[i]f power is about space, spaces were created through the exercise of power. Cartography could be seen as central to this process.’75 Black acknowledges the power of maps to record as well as to promote imperialist practices. He writes that ‘whatever the nature of indigenous spatiality, it was subordinated to imperial cartography. The energy of the latter was expressed not only in the drawing of boundaries and the tensions these reflected or created, but also in the contribution of cartography to the creation of myths that sustained imperialism.’76

Other models of the role of cartography in the colonial project that I will be drawing on are American-based British geographer and cartographic historian Matthew Edney’s Mapping an Empire77 and, particularly, New Zealand historian Giselle Byrnes’s Boundary Markers.78 Edney’s work concerns how the British mapped ‘their India’. Edney explains: ‘I say “their India” because they did not map the “real” India.’79 Edney shows how mapping and colonisation are closely linked as the

---
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collection and recording (and then representation) of knowledge were used to impose control. He claims that ‘imperialism and mapmaking intersect in the most basic manner. Both are fundamentally concerned with territory and knowledge.’\(^{80}\) Byrnes focuses on the role of surveyors who measured and mapped New Zealand spaces in order to make the land available to European sensibilities as well as settlement. She argues that surveyors ‘did not simply “colonise” the land in a physical sense — rather, they possessed it through various conceptual, textual, and visual strategies.’\(^{81}\) These strategies can also be identified and elucidated through a deconstructive reading of the Waikato maps analysed here.

The Spaces in and of the Visual Archive

This investigation of Waikato spaces interprets images that are freely and widely accessible. It does not seek to revisit the Waikato’s colonial past by revealing new or obscure maps or photographs whose unique or noteworthy features lead to the questioning of orthodoxy. On the contrary, I have selected accessible images that are, in some cases, already very well known in order to subject them to the different kind of scrutiny proposed here. The photographs have been sourced from the Alexander Turnbull Library and the Auckland City Libraries, while, in addition to these two sites, the maps have also been gathered from the University of Waikato Library’s map collection. In selecting the images that have been reproduced and analyzed here, the main criterion is that the provenance must be known. There are hundreds of interesting photographs, for example, in archives that are completely devoid of contextual information. In the context of this thesis, such images would provide for superficial, or even speculative, analysis and have hence been disregarded.

---
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The photographs selected are generally samples from larger collections and several images by the same photographer are examined together. In some cases, very little is known about the actual circumstances of the photographic event that led to the creation of an individual image. However, by examining and comparing multiple images for their content, style and spatial features, I argue that some more confident assertions can be made about their meaning, individually and collectively. The maps generally display more contextual information on the images themselves—often a date and mapmaker’s name are available along with the title and other labels, although it is not always clear who instigated the production of a particular map and/or how much input the cartographer named on the map had in the collection of data that informed its creation. Examples of different map styles have been selected to highlight the various ways that Pākehā described the spaces and places of the Waikato. Hydrographic charts, cadastral maps and thematic maps, for example, are all, in their own ways, revealing of the attitudes and intentions of the colonisers and, like the photographs, they can be read together as well as separately.

In accessing these various archives, I acknowledge here that I have made a selection from an existing selection. Each image is a representation, each collection represents these images and I am placing a further burden of representation on them. While Dalley has noted the ‘chance residues’ that can be detected in historical photographs, it is also the images themselves that are, to some extent, available to us in the present by chance. From the singular occasion of a photographic event, and the imperfect processes and fragile result, to its retention and possibly its collection in an album, to its inclusion in a modern archive as a photographic print or negative,
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there are numerous possibilities for an image other than its continued existence and availability. At each step, decisions have been made to keep and not reject particular images, and the surviving archive is no doubt a small remnant, or chance residue, of the original oeuvre. Another fraction of the remnant is being made more widely accessible through digitisation and publishing on internet sites.

Libraries, museums and other archival institutions are facing new sets of issues bearing in mind the significant money and time costs in scanning the often very large numbers of images in their collections. New selection decisions are being made based on new priorities, perhaps of the institution, perhaps of individual archivists, that continue to shape the availability and accessibility of images to researchers. This leaves unanswerable questions about the representativeness of archives, or of ‘the Archive’. According to Ann Laura Stoler, the ‘Archive’, with a capital A, is not necessarily a ‘material site not a set of documents [but, rather, a] metaphor for any corpus of selective forgettings and collections’. The forgettings may be as important as the rememberings, but, of course, they are unavailable to our scrutiny. What remains, and is accessible, may assume an exaggerated degree of importance. The absent possibilities cannot support or refute what remains, and these gaps or spaces in the archive must be acknowledged.

Forgetting and chance are not the only reasons for gaps in the Archive. One vital void in New Zealand’s nineteenth century visual archive is the relative dearth of Māori images. There remain numerous pictures of Māori made by Pākehā but few Māori maps and, as far as I can tell, no Māori photographs. The extant Māori maps seem mainly to be trying to delineate tribal territories and doing so
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in a distinctly Pākehā form apparently for a Pākehā audience. A well-known early
example is Tuki’s Map, created by a young Māori man, Tuki Tahua, who, along with
another man Ngahuruhuru or Te Hurukokoti, was kidnapped from northern New
Zealand and taken to Port Jackson (Sydney) by ‘the crew of the Daedalus, whose
impatient captain was acting on [Governor of New South Wales and Norfolk Island
Philip] King’s suggestion that a New Zealander might be persuaded to … teach
the convicts the art of flax dressing.” Rather than return the men to their homes,
King took them to Norfolk Island, where, eventually, they were persuaded to share
some information about their world. Unfortunately for King, this did not include
much about flax dressing as this task was usually carried out by women. Tuki was,
however, more forthcoming with the map that he drew to represent his home.
Binney rightly suggests that Tuki ‘drew a land which was, in one map, both actual
and mythological,’ but it is also clear that, at least in terms of the engraving cited
by Binney, this view was filtered through Pākehā perceptions. This is most obvious
from the inclusion of the representation of a ship with the annotation ‘Here Tooge
and Hoodoo left the Britannia’, which event occurred on their return to Muriwhenua
in November 1793, some months after the original map was made. The engraving is
dated 1798.

Photography appears to be something that happened to Māori rather than
something they participated in. There is a certain irony that photographic images
that may be interpreted as disrespectful stereotypes, or even racist ethnographic
caricatures, are now possibly more likely to be viewed as treasured images of revered
ancestors by the descendants of their Māori subjects. The reason Māori did not leave
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photographic or cartographic traces of the nineteenth century was not because they lacked visual images or visual imagery. The fact that historic images of Māori and their meanings are difficult to access now, is partly due to the effects of colonisation in suppressing or dismissing them then. Their continuing absence in archives accessible to Anglophone historians reinforces their invisibility.

Nor is this the only absence. As Tony Ballantyne has pointed out, ‘[o]nly some “voices” are recorded in colonial archives and those voices are frequently unreliable.’86 These voices are unreliable in the sense that particular kinds of documents created for particular purposes and from particular perspectives dominate the archival space to the exclusion of others. As Catharine Coleborne points out, these omissions were sometimes deliberate editorial decisions.87 There is, therefore, as earlier mentioned but re-emphasised here, a real danger that, in choosing to study maps and photographs, and by so doing explicitly excluding Māori sources, I have fallen into the trap of re-inscribing the kind of Pākehā-centric history I am trying to avoid. But these maps and photographs are not used in the service of a narrative of Pākehā triumph and progress. In some ways, however, a spatial history approach to examining images as discursive constructions implicated in the processes of cultural colonisation will not overcome the absence of Māori sources.

Thus the spaces in the archive can be seen alongside the space of the archive itself as another site of colonisation. The selection decisions by collectors and archivists that have constructed the Archive mean that ‘certain stories are privileged and others

marginalized. Ann Laura Stoler has emphasised the active process of archiving, and Terry Cook has argued that modern archivists should look past their traditional role as ‘custodians’ in order to focus on ‘archive’ as a verb rather than a noun. In identifying and emphasising the contingent and constructed nature of archives and of ‘the Archive’, it may be possible to limit, if not eliminate, their discursive power. The electronic nature of the archives that I am primarily accessing can both help and hinder this process. On the one hand, the ready access to multiple archives can help to widen the contextual framework of the individual images. On the other hand, however, as Schwartz and Cook have argued, ‘the electronically augmented power of archives to provide access to the record also amplifies archives’ traditional power to mediate access to the record.’ Image repositories such as libraries typically have many more images than they can digitise and display electronically. Therefore the approach that I am taking to using readily-available images cannot by its nature be comprehensive. A detailed survey of the space of the Archive of New Zealand’s historical images would be a welcome achievement, but is beyond the scope of this study.

The Images of the Thesis

This thesis contains twenty-one maps and twenty-five photographs. I selected them initially because they feature Waikato landscapes and their provenance in terms of creator and date of creation are known, although some of this information is not
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known with absolute precision. This genealogy of the images is the vital starting point for the investigation of the circumstances of each image’s creation. I use the term genealogy here as a metaphor to place the image at the centre of a web of relationships which, as much as the image itself, is the subject of this thesis. The genealogy of the maps and photographs includes a mix of ideologies, identities and technologies that influenced a particular individual to create a specific image at a certain time. It reinforces the contention that these images and others like them are not produced or consumed in a cultural vacuum. It also has the advantage of implying that this web of connections remains important to a modern understanding of each image. My investigation of these images is, therefore, metaphorically akin to genealogical research. Orphans and only children without paperwork provide for short and unfulfilling searches, whereas large and well-documented families enable a richer and more fruitful inquiry. Similarly, images that are now isolated and shorn from their contextual genealogy are only available as ciphers to our faculty of recognition. There were a number of potentially interesting images that were rejected from this study because their genealogical trail went cold too quickly. To give one example, the University of Waikato library catalogue lists 160 Waikato photographs whose date can be placed (sometimes speculatively) between 1800 and 1914. Of these, 121 are listed as photographer unknown. Many of the remaining thirty nine are isolated fragments of potentially more extensive original collections but, for my purposes, they were unusable.

There were a number of images which were not selected, but could have been according to these criteria. This is particularly true of the maps where a number of very similar versions exist of particular map types. For example, as mentioned in chapter 7, all of Waikato’s counties (and all of New Zealand’s) were organised
according to the same criteria and designated in the same manner. Sometimes, as in the case of my selection of Raglan county in this case, it came down to the clarity and legibility of the examples available. Any index map of a Waikato county would have served the purpose of the thesis, but the location and trajectory of the narrative would have been altered. In terms of the photographs, there are other examples of military photographs than the William Temple archive featured here. This is true even in the Urquhart Album from which the Temple images are drawn, although many of photographs in the album are unattributed. This album also features photographs by a better-known artist and photographer John Kinder, but there were two reasons for excluding them from this study. While the Kinder images feature military scenes, Kinder was not a ‘military photographer’ and his photography would be better contextualised alongside his painting. The military images in the Kinder archive are few and the Waikato ones fewer. This reduces their representativeness. Furthermore, Kinder has already been the subject of a number of analyses such as those by Michael Dunn. John Nicol Crombie, whose work also appears in the Urquhart Album, was better known as an Auckland studio portraitist and so Temple’s images represent ‘military photography’ far better. Similarly, as pointed out above, Christine Whybrew has analysed the extensive Burton Brothers archive, which includes some Waikato images from the 1880s, in the context of the commercial enterprise of the Burton Brothers’ studio. In the light of Whybrew’s work, the Burton Brothers’ Waikato
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images, which might otherwise have fit my criteria for inclusion in this study were nonetheless excluded from consideration.

This study is only directly concerned with maps and photographs and not other kinds of images such as surveyors’ sketches or paintings. This is because contemporary Waikato maps and photographs are much more numerous and therefore more reliably susceptible to the kinds of analysis I employ here. Furthermore, Giselle Byrnes’s work on surveyors is an important forerunner to this thesis and renders the re-examination of such Waikato images as there are of this kind less urgent. Similarly, such paintings as Alfred Sharp’s such as ‘View of Taupiri village and plain from the top of Little Taupiri Hill. Sunset’ and ‘Lake Waikare and Waikato River in flood, from Rangiriri Pah’ (both 1876) are also complementary to this study but Sharpe’s work has been critiqued by Roger Blackley.95

The key point about image selection is that, while the number of images is not comprehensive, those chosen are representative of the main varieties of maps and photographs available. It is noted, and in fact an essential point of this thesis, that had I focused on other images, the Burton Brothers photographs for example, the narrative trajectory could have emerged quite differently. The following is a brief overview of the images used in the thesis and some introductory contextual information. This is considerably developed in the chapters to follow.

The Photographs

Chapter 3 A Catalogue for Colonisation includes seven photographs (Figs 3.5-3.11) taken by Bruno Hamel on the Hochstetter expedition into the Waikato in 1859.

These images comprise approximately one quarter of the thirty-two photographic prints, of which ten feature Waikato scenes, collected in an album now housed in the Auckland City Libraries’ Sir George Grey Special Collections. Digitised versions of the images from the album can be found on the Auckland City Libraries website heritage images collection. As is shown in Chapter 3, the Hamel images were created within the context of the geological investigation of the central North Island and their subject matter reflects the interests of the geologist Hochstetter, as well as highlighting the islands of Pākehā, especially missionary, occupation that they encountered on their journey.

In Chapter 4 *Space Invaders* images from another album are featured. Figs 4.1-4.4 and Figs 4.7-4.8 are photographs taken by William Temple, a British Army officer, in the context of the construction of the Great South Road from Drury to the Waikato in the early 1860s. Another officer, Charles Urquhart, compiled the album and it contains images by other photographers as well as Temple. The Urquhart album contains seventy items of which twenty-one can be safely attributed to Temple. The album itself is housed in the Alexander Turnbull Library in Wellington and approximately thirty of the images have been digitised and are available through the National Library website.

Three photographs featured in Chapter 5 *Extending the Invasion* were taken by Daniel Manders Beere who was a surveyor and engineer involved with road, bridge and railway construction in the opening up of the Waikato to Pākehā occupation in the years following the Land Wars of the 1860s. Figs 5.4-5.6 are three of six such images taken by Beere near Whangamarino in 1866 that are now housed in the Alexander Turnbull Library and available through their online portal at natlib.govt.nz. Two further William Temple photographs, Figs 5.7 and 5.8, are used to illustrate
the misleading ways that historical images of the Waikato have been used more recently by historians. These Temple images are part of the same collection as those featured in Chapter 4.

Photographs by Daniel Beere also feature in Chapter 6 Settlement and Unsettlement, but Figs 6.5-6.7 were taken twenty years after the Whangamarino pictures mentioned above. This is a series of three images featuring the same family and farm at Tauwhare near the confiscation boundary, probably taken in 1886. Recently before this time, Beere had been involved in the construction of the Thames-Waikato Railway. Like the Beere photographs of the previous chapter, these images are at the Alexander Turnbull Library and can be accessed online.

Six photographs in two groups by the Gilmour Brothers form the photographic basis of Chapter 7 White Space?. The first group (Figs 7.1-7.3) comprises rural landscapes from the Te Mata area near Raglan and the second (Figs 7.6-7.8) features more natural or ‘wilderness’ images. All of the images can be dated around 1910. The considerable number (almost 2,000) of Gilmour Brothers images housed in the Alexander Turnbull Library came into that institution via the William Archer Price collection of postcard negatives, and the booming postcard trade of that time seems to have been a key reason for their creation.

The Maps

In Chapter 2 Measuring and Measuring Up seven maps are featured. Figs 2.1 and 2.2 are those by Tasman in 1642 and Cook in 1769 which form the earliest European attempts to represent New Zealand, including the Waikato, cartographically. Figs 2.3 and 2.4 are coastal charts drawn by Captain Thomas Wing in the 1830s to facilitate safe access to the Waikato’s west coast harbours for Pākehā shipping. These maps are
located in the Sir George Grey Special Collections at the Auckland City Libraries.

Figs 2.5, 2.6 and 2.7 can be seen as updates to the Wing charts. They were the result of the official Admiralty survey of the whole of New Zealand’s coastline between 1848 and 1856. The Whāingaroa and Kāwhia maps included here are dated 1854. Fig 2.7, the larger scale and longer coastal view, is dated 1857.

Chapter 3 A Catalogue for Colonisation features four maps, two (Figs 4.1 and 4.2) by the British cartographer John Arrowsmith, and two (Figs 4.1 and 4.2) by the German cartographer August Petermann from material compiled by Hochstetter on his geological survey. The Arrowsmith maps, dated from the early 1840s, attempt to show a large area—Fig 4.1 covers all of New Zealand—in as much detail as possible, although it is clear that there are many errors, gaps and distortions. The Petermann maps, created some twenty years later, are based on the official Admiralty surveys by Stokes and Drury and are richly illustrated with geological formations and features identified by Hochstetter. Fig 4.1 is located in the Alexander Turnbull Library and the other three are part of the Sir George Grey Special Collections at Auckland City Libraries.

In Chapter 4 Space Invaders two maps drawn by Chief Surveyor Charles Heaphy are featured. Both date from the early 1860s and are associated with the British military invasion in which Heaphy took part as a soldier. The earlier map, Fig 4.5, predates the invasion of the Waikato but appears to attempt to justify such an action. Fig 4.6 was made during the Waikato campaign and depicts strategically important information about the course and navigability of the Waikato River. Both maps are housed in the Auckland City Libraries’ collection. Another seven maps drawn from official government papers, both in New Zealand and the United Kingdom, exemplify the often chaotic and contradictory implementation of the confiscation
legislation that coincided with the fighting in the Land Wars in the Waikato. These maps were all sourced from the University of Waikato Map Library.

Chapter 5 *Extending the Invasion* features two maps from the Auckland Libraries collection (Figs 5.2 and 5.3) and one from the University of Waikato Map Library (Fig 5.1). The latter is associated with an attempt in 1864 to impose Pākehā control over the Māori King’s headquarters at Ngāruawāhia even before the outcome of the Land Wars was finally confirmed. The short-lived attempt to impose the name ‘Queenstown’ is also illustrated on the map. The other two maps both reflect the imposition of Pākehā ideals of land organisation, use and value on territory recently acquired through military means. In all three maps, the application of cadastral grids and names by the colonisers is a feature, with Fig 5.2 being specifically associated with the sale of land to prospective settlers at Pōkeno.

In Chapter 6 *Settlement and Unsettlement* four maps are featured. Figs 6.1 and 6.2, both made in the 1870s, focus their attention on a Waikato region that is still contested despite the British military victory of the previous decade. These maps, both from the Waikato University Map Library and retrievable online through the University of Waikato Library website, contain an idiosyncratic mix of symbols of progress and its unsettling obstacles. Figs 6.3 and 6.4 were both created to advertise the sale of land at Tauwhare. The former is dated 1880 and the latter 1882 although the content is very similar. Although neatly and precisely measured and drawn, neither map represents the reality on the ground as it turned out, and they can be seen as good examples of why not to take historical sources at face value. Fig 6.3 is located in the University of Waikato Map Library whereas Fig 6.4 is part of the Sir George Grey Collection at the Auckland City Libraries.
Chapter 7 *White Space?* features two maps titled ‘Index Map of Raglan County’ both published by the New Zealand Department of Lands and Survey. The first of these, Fig 7.7, is dated 1905 whereas Fig 7.8 is dated 1916. These maps, which show the southern part of the county, are part of an on-going series of cadastral maps that connect Waikato landscapes to the rest of New Zealand by defining and organising space according to consistent criteria and labels. They also, together, reveal continuity and change over time. Fig 7.7 is from Auckland City Libraries and Fig 7.8 is from the University of Waikato Map Library. Fig 7.9 is a detail from Fig 7.8 indicating the location of the scene depicted in Fig 7.1. Figs 7.10-7.12 show Waikato County organised into different administrative entities. Fig 7.12, in particular, is used to illustrate the dangers of taking maps at face value.

**Conclusion**

Frames and lenses serve as both metaphors and methods in this thesis. Both frames and lenses invoke real, as well as theoretical and ideological perspectives. They suggest that making images, as well as interpreting them, both contemporarily and in the present, involves making decisions that are informed by invisible but important cultural factors. I argue that the discursive contexts of these images, then and now, are inseparable from the images themselves.

The images in this thesis also drive the narrative, acting as they do as the anchor points for the histories that are elaborated here. The spaces of and in the images are illuminated through excavation and deconstruction to contribute to a spatial history of the Waikato. These spaces seldom encompass the whole region and some, particularly the photos, depict a very small part. The contextual space that links them all, however, is colonisation.
Therefore, in this thesis I am choosing to interpret these images and their historical circumstances through a colonisation lens. The colonisation lens is allied to a spatial history approach which allows for a more complex consideration of the actions and events represented by the maps and photographs under examination in this thesis. Using a colonisation lens, Pākehā colonising strategies, including naming, claiming, norming and framing, are identified and explicated. The power of these images to support, as well as to perpetuate, cultural colonisation is revealed in the process. In so-doing, I signal a possible pathway to the decolonisation of New Zealand’s history.
PART A

Reconnaissance
Reconnaissance: an introduction

This introductory frame to the section ‘Reconnaissance’ sets the context for the evaluation of the images that are the focus of Chapters 2 and 3. Maps and charts produced by the earliest European visitors to New Zealand and the Waikato framed the land according to European priorities and practices, ignoring or overriding the pre-existing indigenous knowledge that was comprehensive and long held. With the benefit of hindsight, and from a Māori point of view, the label ‘Reconnaissance’ is easily justified. I argue that, even at that time and from a European perspective, it is an equally appropriate characterisation.

The European arrival at the fringes of the Waikato was part of a far-reaching (in all respects) process of expansion into the non-European world during what has been called the ‘Age of Exploration’ or the ‘Age of Discovery’. I argue here that the terms ‘exploration’ and ‘discovery’ are unsuitable labels for the activities of the first Europeans in these waters and that ‘reconnaissance’ is a more apt characterisation. ‘Reconnaissance’ carries a connotation that the knowledge that was being gained by the European ‘explorers’ was preliminary to a further incursion and I argue that this was precisely the intent in this case. Men such as Tasman, Cook and du Fresne, who all visited New Zealand, and many others who ventured into the Pacific operated within a framework that made it clear to them and others that their voyages were to
be the vanguard of a more sustained and systematic incursion. While ‘reconnaissance’
carries a military association, it is not used here strictly in this narrow way.
Notwithstanding the actual military links with many of the exploratory expeditions
— Cook was, after all, a Royal Navy captain — the later invasions that were made
possible by these voyages of reconnaissance were not only conducted with warships
and gunpowder. They were also commercial, religious and, of greatest importance to
this thesis, cultural invasions. As Europeans sought to gain knowledge of the world
through their own eyes and experiences, they also projected themselves physically and
psychologically onto the spaces of the ‘new’ world. They understood and incorporated
that which was hitherto unknown to them by seeking to control and exploit it.

In applying ‘reconnaissance’ I am, therefore, rejecting the label ‘exploration’. This
is despite its use by Peter Gibbons in the framework that inspired the structure of
this thesis. Furthermore, it is possible to justify the terms ‘exploration’ and ‘discovery’
from a European perspective — they knew, or at least knew of, the ‘Old World’,
but the exploration of what was unknown to them led to ‘discoveries’ in the ‘New
World’. Moreover, during the period from the earliest voyages of Portuguese and
Spanish ships in the fifteenth century, Europeans did find some of the earth’s land
mass that had never been seen by humans before. More often, however, what was
discovered was already known by local inhabitants. As far as they were concerned,
being ‘discovered’ by Europeans turned out to be a mixed blessing. The European
expansionary impulse was fuelled by seemingly contradictory motivations, among
which were the pursuit of trading opportunities, a genuine and benign desire for
new knowledge of the world, less benign urges for conquest and plunder and an
evangelising zeal to provide salvation to heathens, if necessary by force. However,
at least by the time that New Zealand reemerged onto Europe’s radar in the mid to
late eighteenth century, these motives were all connected within the framework of European enlightenment thinking which gave Europeans the confidence to expect to be able to know the world through experience and to control it due to their place, as they saw it, at the pinnacle of human civilisation. In practice, the fruits of the benign motives acted in support of the less benign — exploration and discovery were often precursors to invasion. Even if Europeans normally saw conflict with the peoples of the ‘new’ world as regrettable, they did not shy away from implementing their world view by whatever means necessary. The seeming inevitability of the necessity of using force to exploit resources and/or impose civilisation meant that few were under any illusions that the ‘explorers’ were actually on a mission of reconnaissance. My use of the designation ‘reconnaissance’ is not without precedent. J.H. Parry, as early as 1963, wrote a book entitled *The Age of Reconnaissance* (subtitle: Discovery, exploration and settlement 1450-1650) in which he links the discovery of new lands to the discovery of new forms of knowledge and new ways of knowing that characterised the Enlightenment. Parry notes the ‘technical attitude to knowledge [and] an extreme readiness to apply science in immediately practical ways’ as features that distinguished European civilisation from all others. He adds: ‘the unprecedented power which it produced eventually led Europe from Reconnaissance to worldwide conquest’.


The scope of these books, in terms both of their geographical reach and timeframes, is far greater than my intention here. However, the forces that drove Europeans across the surface of the planet that are described in these works eventually brought Europeans to the Waikato. The voyage of Abel Tasman from Batavia in 1642 is generally acknowledged to be the first European visit to New Zealand which was then ignored by Europe for nearly 130 years. The intervening years before Cook’s first arrival in 1769 had seen some important changes in European geopolitics. The Dutch had become less concerned with the possibilities of the Pacific while, especially the South Pacific, became another setting for Anglo-French rivalry. Tasman’s fleeting and ill-fated visit raised the tantalising possibility of the fabled Great Southern Land but that expedition stopped well short of the scope of that of Cook for a variety of reasons. One of these reasons was that Cook’s Europe had become a significantly different place to that of Tasman and his contemporaries. Enlightenment thinking and practices were in the process of transforming virtually every aspect of European life. While ‘the Enlightenment’ is not easy to define briefly, it was a period of European history in which thinking came to be characterised by an increasing confidence in the ability of the rational human mind to uncover and understand the mysteries of the natural world. The rise of science with its reliance on scientific methods and a belief that the world was accessible to this kind of scrutiny was one important consequence of this. Voyages of discovery, like that undertaken by Cook, were important contributors and beneficiaries of such ways of thinking and the explorers were important sources of information about the natural world beyond Europe. The botanist Joseph Banks, who was a key member of the Endeavour expedition, was a direct link between exploration and natural science. However, less obviously, Cook himself played an important role due to his mastery
of the techniques of navigation. His contribution to the scientific measurement and charting of coastlines, added to the safety and reliability of journeys of exploration, including his own. It also aided the perception that the world was susceptible to be described and explained by the systematic application of careful and precise measurement. Cook had proved himself to be the ideal candidate to lead the expedition that brought him to New Zealand and the Waikato in 1769 by developing and demonstrating his skills charting coastlines in Newfoundland during the previous decade. Nicholas Thomas describes Cook’s achievements there as ‘produc[ing] a new kind of accurate knowledge that suddenly showed up his predecessors’ efforts for their amateurishness.’3 The explicit scientific purpose behind the Endeavour expedition is well known. The observation of the transit of Venus at Tahiti, and that of Mercury at what became known as Mercury Bay on the east coast of New Zealand’s North Island, were important contributions to contemporary astronomical knowledge. In addition, the work of botanists Banks and Solander in collecting and describing hundreds of previously unrecorded and uncategorised (by Europeans) botanical specimens was seen as significantly expanding the known natural world. What is less well known, however, is that the voyages of Cook and his contemporaries in the Pacific were in themselves significant scientific accomplishments. As Bernard Smith has commented, ‘… the Pacific, although the last great ocean to be explored by Europeans, was, curiously enough, the first large region beyond Europe that modern scientific method came fully to grips with.’4

Cook’s reconnaissance of New Zealand was carried on in the context of Enlightenment science. Enlightenment science gave Cook and his contemporaries the

curiosity and confidence to ‘discover’ the Pacific in the mid-late eighteenth century
but it also gave them a frame of reference to understand their discoveries. According
to Bernard Cohn, to the ‘educated Englishman of the late eighteenth and nineteenth
centuries, the world ... was divinely created, knowable in an empirical fashion, and
constitutive of the sciences through which would be revealed the laws of Nature
that governed the world and all that was in it.’5 The belief that they were capable
of objective observation and empirical collection of information was a relatively
recent idea and one that seemed to be confirmed by the experiences of the explorers
themselves. Anne Salmond explains that ‘the cosmos ... was framed in standard grids
and measured, processes made visible in the instruments, tables, charts, and logs of
the explorers. At the same time, those aspects of the world that resisted measurement
– for instance, plants, animals and people – were brought under other kinds of
standardised description (particularly the languages of taxonomy).’6 Botanical
specimens, though completely new to Europe, could be classified according to
Linnaean categories, and islands of all sizes and locations could be measured, charted
and positioned on maps with increasing accuracy enabling repeat visits. They were
simply able to add these new items and places, no matter how exotic, to an expanding
knowledge of the world by assimilating them into their existing patterns of knowing
and understanding. According to Matthew Edney, ‘observed facts were considered to
be as concrete and as representative as physical specimens.’7 The same strategies were
applied to the peoples of the world that the Europeans met for the first time and, here
too, the same Enlightenment impulses that encouraged the voyages of exploration

5 Bernard S. Cohn, *Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India* (Princeton
6 Anne Salmond, *Between Worlds: Early Exchanges Between Maori and Europeans, 1773-1815*
7 Matthew H. Edney, *Mapping an Empire - The Geographical Construction of British India, 1765-
influenced the understanding of what was discovered. Assumptions that Europe was the pinnacle of human civilisation, the result of a progressive elevation from more simple and savage beginnings, seemed to Europeans to be confirmed by their contacts with peoples they saw as less advanced. There were real differences in the respective technologies at the disposal of the locals and the visitors particularly with regards to the use of metals of which the Pacific peoples had none. These disparities led the Europeans to assume that these people were less advanced in other respects as well — that what they saw was evidence to confirm their developing ideas of progress and human hierarchies. These assumptions persisted in the face of evidence that the peoples of the Pacific were in many other ways a match for their European visitors. In this case, as in many others, enlightened Europeans found their rational and objective methods of empirical observation to be less rational than rationalising and that objective was more useful as a noun than an adjective. The result of this was a vindication of European expansionary strategies and the underpinning of a sense of responsibility to bring civilisation to the non-European world. This ‘White Man’s Burden’ bestowed on Europeans ‘the right and duty to show the rest of the world the way forward’. This means that the exploratory expeditions of Cook and the others were not simply voyages of discovery but can be seen as reconnaissance operations for the civilising missions that would inevitably follow.

It is, perhaps, ironic that these civilising missions often involved Christian missionaries taking salvation out to the world’s heathens and savages when one of the strongest drivers of the Enlightenment expansion was a more secular outlook in Europe itself. The new rationalist ‘scientific’ approach superseded superstition and
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mere belief as underpinning explanations of the world and this explains to some extent the antipathy and disdain of Europeans towards indigenous religious and other knowledge, and, by extension, the indigenes themselves. Europeans saw their ‘enlightenment’ as a pinnacle in the development of human society so far and this contrasted with their distant and even their more recent past. It was not a great leap to see non-Europeans, who the Europeans compared unfavourably with themselves, as resembling their own ancestors in that they represented an earlier stage of human development. This had a number of important implications for the relationships that developed between the explorers and the locals. Firstly, following a chain of inductive reasoning, if these indigenes were on the same human path as Europeans but just not as far along it, then it would not only be possible to help them advance but this would be a good thing for them. Not only that, but this idea gave Europeans a sense of destiny that, as the most advanced humans, it was their duty to help non-Europeans progress to a higher stage of civilisation. The success or failure of this enterprise could then be measured in how closely the ‘savages’ came to resemble Europeans, not simply in their use of material technology, but also in their social habits and political and economic institutions. In this sense, Europeans were not just pulled into the Pacific by the mysteries of the unknown but were pushed by their own sense of themselves as Europeans. The experiences of the explorers drawn by the pull seemed, to them, to confirm the justification for the push.

Despite its influential position, this way of thinking about non-Europeans was not universally accepted by Europeans. A prominent alternative strand of thinking about the peoples of the ‘new’ world incorporated romantic concepts of the ‘noble savage’. Holding to the view that mankind was in descent rather than following a progressive path of improvement, ‘Romantics’ saw the simplicity of ‘natural man’ as
a superior state of being compared with civilised Europeans who had been corrupted by civil society. Conceptions of the ‘noble savage’ are most strongly connected with French philosopher Jean Jacques Rousseau although he himself never used the term. He referred instead to humans in their natural state, or in a state of nature, which he described as ‘isolated, timid, peaceful, mute and without the foresight to worry about what the future will bring’\(^9\), which contrasts with Hobbes’ more famous ‘solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short’. While Rousseau is often cast as a counter-Enlightenment thinker, he agrees that the capacity for reason is what sets humans apart from the rest of the animal world and that it is reason that makes civilisation possible. These conflicting ideas were most important in the philosophical debates among Europe’s educated elite but they did have their impacts in the conduct of Pacific exploration in the late eighteenth century. Whether the explorers saw the Pacific peoples as noble savages or as simply uncivilised, their European preconceptions framed their observations and influenced their interactions with the locals. It did create some ambivalence among some as to the morality of invading the Pacific world and thereby undermining its natural state, but this was often done so with a sense of regret about the inevitability of such an impact rather than used as a reason to avoid the problems that were perceived. The noble savage became collateral damage in the quest for civilisation in the Pacific.

Enlightenment mapping was not confined to charting coastlines in the quest for more accurate and detailed knowledge of the world. The land itself was also beginning to be more carefully examined. Of course minerals and other resources had been extracted from the ground for centuries but new attempts were being made to systematically investigate the composition and contents of the rocks and soil

and to record and represent these on a map. Following William Smith’s ‘map that
changed the world’ which was developed through the early years of the nineteenth
century and published in 1815, the possibility of mapping in three dimensions
arose. Rather than merely describing the surface features and edge shapes of the land,
Smith’s map showed the composition of what was below the surface and the extent
and relationships of different zones. Entitled *A Delineation of The Strata of England
and Wales with part of Scotland; exhibiting the Collieries and Mines; the Marshes and
Fen Lands originally Overflowed by the Sea; and the Varieties of Soil according to the
Variations in the Sub Strata; Illustrated by the Most Descriptive Names*, Smith’s map
was revolutionary yet, as Simon Winchester points out, ‘in many ways a classic
representation of the ambitions of its day’.\(^{10}\) By this Winchester means that the
goals that drove Smith were typical of the age where empirical observation of data
was the starting point for a wider investigation and the development of reasoned
conclusions — in other words the genesis of the modern scientific method. But the
map’s name also clearly reveals that the science was not as objective as the purists
would have liked. Smith’s focus on coal mines and fens may be explained as reflecting
key economic interests of the day, and may have been a necessary device to gain the
attention of important people to the strange map of an unknown map maker. But it
also demonstrates the challenges of transcending pre-existing mindsets for scientists
and others. Evidence that was available to the senses of researchers did not speak
for itself — it still had to be evaluated and contextualised. It is too simplistic to say
that Enlightenment scientists found what they were looking for rather than what
was actually there, but, at times, they were influenced in their analyses by aspects
of their thinking that were ignored or unacknowledged. Eurocentric concerns and

priorities featured on European maps (naturally enough) although the assumptions of objective neutrality and an overarching universality of meaning led Europeans to impose these interpretations on lands with distinctively different meanings in other parts of the world. A confidence that Europeans had unlocked the secrets of geography and geology led them to have had few qualms about incorporating new lands into their existing frame of reference. As Anne Salmond points out, ‘whatever their initial expectations may have been ... the scientists on board the Endeavour, and Cook himself, carefully observed Maori ... and tried systematically to describe them and their ways of life.’11 This ‘system’ was a set of criteria and categories that posited Europeans as ‘normal’ and could be used to rate others like Māori against this norm.

The maps and photographs that feature in the following chapters are contextualised by the discursive frameworks that have been outlined here. The charts of coastlines and harbours that gave shape to a European understanding of local landforms, and the geological survey maps constructed by the first scientific land-based expeditions, served to frame the Waikato in terms of European understanding. Furthermore, by gathering and translating this information into comprehensible and useful forms, the tools and record of the advance guard of European reconnaissance were produced.
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11 Salmond, *Between Worlds*, p. 24
CHAPTER 2

Measuring and Measuring Up

Pākehā visitors gaze at the Waikato from the decks of ships

This chapter traces the development of Pākehā constructions of the Waikato as the fringes of the land were measured and charted in preparation for the widespread and prolonged invasion to follow. I argue that the Pākehā gaze that was directed at the Waikato was acquisitive as much as inquisitive and that ‘explorers’ actively undertook reconnaissance missions with the expectation that further European incursion would follow. From the first glimpses by Tasman’s expedition through to the completion of the detailed survey under the auspices of the British admiralty’s hydrographic office in the mid-late 1850s, the Waikato’s coastal periphery was scrutinised and charted in increasing detail. This chapter shows how the observations and measurements that were made from the decks of the ships Endeavour, Fanny, Pandora, as well as others, all served the purpose of reframing the Waikato according to Pākehā perceptions and priorities in order to expedite Pākehā exploitation and control of real and imagined spaces. The first Pākehā framers of Waikato spaces were completely oblivious to the actual Waikato. The region was incidental to the greater task of finding the fabled Terra Australis Incognita, the great southern continent that was assumed to exist to balance northern and southern hemispheres. Dutch seafarer Abel Tasman’s map fragment tantalised the possibility that the Waikato was at the western extremity of an enormous land mass, before James Cook circumscribed that
Fig 2.1 Staete Landt sailed to and discovered by the ships Heemskerck and Zeehaen under the command of the honourable Abel Tasman in the year 1642 the 13 December.
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possibility by circumnavigating what became known as New Zealand more than one hundred years later. Much had changed in Europe between these landmark visits and by the late eighteenth century, the British were in a better position to follow up Cook’s reconnaissance than the Dutch had been a century earlier. The New Zealand coastline, including the Waikato, was charted with increasing precision. This continued even after the assumption of British imperial control following the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840.

**First impressions and Appraisals**

Probably the first Waikato geographical feature to enter the consciousness of Pākehā was Karioi. Karioi is a mountain that rises above the southern headland at the entrance of Whāingaroa, also now known as Raglan Harbour, and it was presumably this feature that was deemed worthy of inclusion on the partial map constructed as a result of Tasman’s voyage in 1642 (Fig 2.1). The only inland feature represented on this record of passage of the *Zeehaen* and the *Heemskerck* was described in Tasman’s journal on 28 December as a ‘high mountain … in 38° South Latitude’.

It is not clear why Karioi merited this inclusion but Tasman did not linger in its presence. ‘It fell a calm’, he continued in his journal, ‘but when there came a light breeze from the north-north-east we tacked to the north-west.’ Tasman projected Karioi onto the western fringe of a great southern continent where it remained for more than a century. On 10 January 1770, Cook and his party aboard the *Endeavour* travelled southwards along the same stretch of coast in the process of demonstrating New Zealand’s insular nature and debunking Tasman’s Terra Australis. Cook’s journal
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records the uneventful course of this passage, including the prosaic naming of three features that later appeared on his famous chart (Fig 2.2) – Woody Head, Albatross Point and Gannet Island.

These descriptions marked the beginnings of the framing of the physical Waikato in Pākehā terms and, although separated by almost a century and a half, the actions and responses of Tasman and Cook were remarkably similar. For example, neither Tasman nor Cook saw Kāwhia, Aotea or Whāingaroa harbours, and finding nothing of more than passing interest, neither lingered for long before continuing his journey. French explorer Marion du Fresne saw nothing worthy of note on his way up the coast in March 1772. No doubt the rough prevailing sea conditions were an effective disincentive to get too close to shore in order to carry out a more detailed inspection. Cook and du Fresne’s late eighteenth-century world was a quite different place to that of Tasman in the mid-seventeenth century and yet they were constrained by similar viewpoint — from the deck of a sailing ship rather more at the mercy of the elements than any of them would have wished. Access for ships to safe anchorages was of paramount importance to the safe completion of these kinds of voyages. As both Cook and du Fresne found out, these were more readily found on the North Island’s east coast. Each independently ‘discovered’ the Bay of Islands (named Port Marion by du Fresne). Tasman and Cook found shelter at the northern tip of Tē Wai Pounamu (later to be called the South Island). These sheltered harbours encouraged longer stays and complex interactions with indigenous locals. However, early Pākehā appraisals of Waikato’s west coast from the sea seemed unpromising or, at best, inconclusive. As they gazed upon Karioi, the maunga offered the possibility of a returned gaze which may have been similarly ambivalent in its evaluation of the newcomers.
Fig 2.2 Chart of New Zealand
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Despite Tasman’s glimpse of Karioi in the west, the Pākehā construction of the Waikato arguably began in the East with Cook’s visit to the Waihou where he predicted colonisation of the unknown (to him) interior. In contrast to their hasty passage down Waikato’s west coast, Cook’s party had lingered for five days in late November 1769 at what he called the Firth of Thames. Cook ambitiously bestowed the name Thames on the Waihou river, its width and flow ‘bearing some resemblance to that River in England.’

That the English Thames is the site of the port of London, and therefore one of the most important waterways in the world at that time, is an indication of the potential Cook saw in this region. It also gives an insight into the familiarising frame of reference he applied to these strange places. Both Cook and Banks described the extensive kahikatea forests in glowing terms. Neither was interested in the intrinsic natural beauty of the trees and the interdependent ecosystems of the vast forests. The first inclination, on the contrary, was to assess the new found timber resource: Banks described ‘the finest timber my Eyes ever beheld … every tree as streight as a pine and of immense size’ and which ‘would make the finest Plank in the world.’

As well as commandeering the right to exploit this ‘Noble timber,’ Banks was projecting a more invasive appropriation. He described the ‘Thames’ as ‘the properest place we have yet seen for establishing a Colony.’

In addition to timber for ‘building defences, houses or Vessels’, the region would, in Banks’s opinion, ‘furnish plenty of fish, and the soil make ample returns of any European Vegetable sown in it.’ Banks’ personal experience of the drainage
of the fens in his Lincolnshire home led him to consider that the swamps of the Hauraki could ‘doubtless Easily be draind’ in order to transform its ‘strangeness into “home”’. Cook agreed that ‘Should it ever become an object of settleing this Country the best place for the first fixing of a Colony would be either in the River Thames or the Bay of Islands.’ Neither man hesitated to claim the destiny of the lands they saw before them in their own hands. As such they were not merely exploring and ‘discovering’—they were appraising and drawing up an inventory in the vanguard of invasion.

Nor did there seem to be any qualms about the prospective dispossession of the indigenous locals. It was clear that opposition was expected: Banks wrote of locations that would be ‘a safe and sure retreat in case of an attack from the natives,’ while Cook played down the difficulties of overcoming such resistance as, according to him, Māori ‘seem to be too much divided among themselves to unite in opposing’ Pākehā incursion. Some important assumptions are demonstrated here—Pākehā not only had the right but also the means to appropriate ‘discovered’ lands and their resources. These were not extreme views on the European spectrum. In fact Cook has a reputation for his measured and moderate dealings with non-European peoples. The discourse of exploration carried within it the rationale for global expansion and domination by Europeans. Counter discourses seem to have been ignored or discounted even when disastrous consequences ensued. Individual failures did
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10 ‘Banks’s Descriptions of Places, New Zealand, Page 195’
not necessarily dent European confidence as a powerful momentum sustained the colonising impulse. And even ‘moderate’ Europeans like Cook had no doubts about the validity of his mission in the front line of Pākehā expansion in the Pacific or its seemingly inevitable outcomes.

No doubt Cook and Banks believed they were fulfilling the Admiralty’s instructions that new lands be ‘observed with accuracy’. Before arriving in the Pacific, Cook had already become one of the leading exponents of the developing practices of surveying, measuring and recording coastal features and navigational information on maritime charts. The reputation that Cook acquired in North America was instrumental in his appointment to the captaincy of the Endeavour. This new knowledge was vitally important to the extension of safe European shipping routes and Cook’s Pacific journeys and his subsequently published surveys opened up the region to more general Pākehā advance. Cook’s New Zealand map (see Fig 2.2) which was created from the observations and measurements taken from the deck of the Endeavour in 1769-70, is famously accurate. In fact, according to New Zealand’s Ministry for Culture and Heritage, ‘few countries had been charted so well so early after their discovery by Europeans.’ But Cook’s map actually records very little of what was really there. Indigenous New Zealanders already knew where they were and they did not require Pākehā enlightenment. While Māori had (and have) culturally distinctive ways of viewing, valuing and organising land, it is also clear that they were also knowledgeable about the shape of the islands of New Zealand in ways that Pākehā then and now would recognise. Te Ika a Maui (Maui’s Fish) is

12 Park, p. 28
13 It also has two well-known errors - Banks peninsula was shown as an island, while Stewart Island was shown attached to the mainland.
the traditional name for what is now commonly known as the North Island and the island’s shape is reminiscent of a stingray.

It is evident that Māori had a clear sense of the spatial relationships of the island and it also suggests that Māori had a cultural practice that allowed them to imagine the land from a bird’s eye perspective. While Māori did not draw charts and maps as the Pākehā then understood them, they did share a sense of spatial awareness. Māori maps were configured in different ways and used different media, yet they also clearly combined the dual functions of travel directories and plans of the markers of spatial relationships and identities. Names were overlaid with other names which serve different purposes and reflect different narratives of belonging. These names often refer to the travels or other actions of ancestors and are important markers, as well as stated connections and claims to the land. By the time Cook arrived in New Zealand, every major and minor geographical feature was named, often more than once, and was included in the complex conceptual understanding by Māori of the specific and the general of Aotearoa. Cook and the other early cartographers were completely ignorant of this however, and they acted on the assumption that they were creating knowledge. This was more than simple oversight or understandable ignorance of what, to them, were alien cultural concepts. Cook was disparaging of Māori knowledge, suggesting that he was ‘inclinable to think that they know’d no more of this land than what came within the limets of their sight.’ On the contrary, he was confident that his own charts would ‘best point out the figure and extent of these Islands’. While he acknowledged some areas of varying degrees of certainty, where circumstances allowed he was confident that ‘the oppertunities I had and the

16 ‘Cook’s Descriptions of Places, New Zealand, Page 49’
methods I made use on to obtain these requesites were such as could hardly admit of an error.17 Ironically, the example given by Cook to demonstrate his superiority was where the Māori, of what he called Queen Charlotte Sound, had told him that Te Wai Pounamu consisted of two islands ‘one of which, at least we [...] were to have saild round in a few days.’ However, as this had not been ‘verify [ed] by our own observations,’ he was dismissive, despite the fact that what he postulated was part of the mainland was in fact Rakiura, also now called Stewart Island, and it was his ‘own observations’ that were in fact unreliable.

Cook was demonstrating (stereo)typical attitudes of the European ‘Enlightenment’ when he gave priority to the evidence of his own eyes. This period of European thinking and practice encouraged a view that the world’s secrets were available for discovery through close observation. The kind of voyages undertaken by Cook and his contemporaries were designed, at least in part, to pursue intellectual goals. As the historian Dorinda Outram asserts, ‘exploration in order to gain new knowledge was a characteristic of the Enlightenment.’18 While there has been (and still is) considerable debate about exactly what the Enlightenment means, it is generally associated with the rise of ‘rational’ thought and empirical science and the decline of the reliance on forms of knowledge based on ‘revelation’ and superstition. Perhaps best symbolised by the revolutionary and increasingly influential taxonomy of Swedish botanist Carl Linnaeus, whose disciple Daniel Solander was on the Endeavour,19 the world needed to be re-investigated and its elements classified so that relationships among and between natural and human phenomena could be illuminated. There

17 ‘Cook’s Descriptions of Places, New Zealand, Page 49’
19 The Endeavour’s complement of around 100 men included five officers, eleven scientists and their servants. See Adrienne L. Kaeppler, ‘Captain Cook’s Three Voyages of Enlightenment’, in James Cook and the Exploration of the Pacific (London: Thames and Hudson, 2009), p. 18
was certainly a burgeoning of collecting and cataloguing of natural and cultural ‘specimens’ and the efforts of Banks and the others in this regard was in many ways as important as Cook’s charting of the physical geography. Julien Crozet, second in command on the tragic voyage led by the French explorer Marion du Fresne, had no doubts about the value of the work of Cook and his scientific companions. They had, he observed in his journal, ‘drawn from this splendid but laborious voyage all that it was possible to do for the advancement of human knowledge.’\footnote{Julien Marie Crozet, \textit{Crozet’s Voyage to Tasmania, New Zealand, the Ladrone Islands, and the Philippines in the Years 1771-1772}, Facsim. ed (Christchurch [N.Z.]: Kiwi Publishers, 1999), p. 69} Crozet also registered his disappointment that their own venture was not boosted by such scientific support which ‘would have made our voyage infinitely more useful.’\footnote{Crozet, p. 69} While this may have represented, for Europeans, the pinnacle of scientific achievement, this new rationality helped to blind explorers like Cook and scientists like Banks to the real importance of the artifacts and specimens they collected, and the peoples and practices they documented. In fact, the belief that species could and should be classified later gave a pseudo-scientific support to theories of racial hierarchy that Europeans used promote their own superiority over non-Europeans including Māori.

Furthermore, Enlightenment thinking fueled a confidence in European ‘civilisation’ that was ranged in support of the denigration, dispossession and, sometimes, death of peoples seen as inferior. The knowledge systems of indigenous peoples, like their actual knowledge of their own worlds, were deemed irrelevant by Europeans who often saw this knowledge as based on mythology and/or superstition and who had recently begun to reject their own reliance on such ‘irrationality’.

Therefore, rather than journeys of discovery, expeditions like that of Cook can be seen as voyages of reconnaissance which helped to cement for Europeans an
image of themselves as masters of, not only their own world, but also the planet as a whole. This gave them virtually unlimited power, in their minds, to control and exploit places inhabited by peoples whose technologies and cultural practices they considered backward. The information collected was understood and simultaneously misunderstood through European eyes.

The European perception of Pacific peoples as innocent and childlike, yet at the same time unpredictably treacherous and violent, was another example of how the Pākehā misread the cultural transactions that took place. These seemingly contradictory attitudes both served to justify Pākehā sense of entitlement to control of the region, its resources and people. The Pacific also provided an arena for the debates about whether mankind was on an upward journey of progressive achievement—and therefore the backward Pacific peoples could possibly be assisted in their advancement by Europeans—and the romantic view that ‘uncivilised’ peoples lived a purer and happier life than Europeans who had been corrupted by civilisation—which meant that European intrusion into the Pacific and the engagement of the locals with the people and technologies of Europe was likely to degrade the utopian world of the ‘noble savage.’ Neither of these views reflected an effort to understand Pacific societies on their own terms as Pākehā used the Pacific as a ‘projection of space for their own concerns.’

Cook’s contemporaries, or near contemporaries, may have drawn on Enlightenment thinking to famously write of ‘Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness’ and ‘Liberté, Égalité et Fraternité’ but these principles were seldom considered applicable to non-Europeans. The Enlightenment opened up wide-ranging debates about the nature of humanity and the place of humans in the world. It was not universally agreed just who was human.

22 Outram, p. 55
or what the observable differences in outward appearance or cultural practices meant for the species. What these debates and discourses had in common, though, was that they were all Eurocentric in their conception and application.

Māori saw Cook’s arrival and subsequent travels around Aotearoa from a very different perspective. As Paul Tapsell points out, the presence of the Tahitian priestly navigator, Tupaea (Tupaia), on board the Endeavour greatly assisted in the relatively smooth relations between tangata whenua (locals) and tauiwi (strangers). Tupaea’s Polynesian ancestry and language enabled him to act as ‘ambassador, interpreter and negotiator’ and Cook and his companions and crew were afforded respect under Tupaea’s ‘rangatiratanga (chiefly mantle)’. According to Tapsell, Tupaea’s mana was enhanced by his connection to the ancient homeland of Rangiatea–Tawhiti (Ra’iatea–Tahiti) and the fact that he spoke ‘the ancient dialect of the priestly schooled Maori elite.’ But this is likely to have gone both ways, as Tupaea’s arrival was tangible evidence of the validity of the spiritual and ancestral connections to the Pacific that informed so much of Māori culture and identities long after physical contact with Polynesian homelands had been lost. While Pākehā may like to think that Cook brought modernity to New Zealand, for Māori the arrival of Tupaea is likely to have reinforced their relationship with their traditional world. Furthermore, during early exchanges at Anaura, Māori preference was shown for Tahitian cloth over European trade items.

Cook’s reputation, as well as that of Banks and their other companions, is partly based on the quality and value of gifts bestowed on them by supposedly wide-eyed
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and awe-struck natives. But if, as seems likely in New Zealand, these gifts were actually given to Tupaea, or to the others because of their association with Tupaea, the indigenous reception of Cook and company can be read quite differently. The more hagiographic accounts of Cook’s accomplishments have been revised by recent scholars but the general perception of Cook in the European, especially English-speaking, world is overwhelmingly positive. For the indigenous peoples of the Pacific, however, his arrival ‘marks the beginning of cataclysmic social, political and economic change’. In Australia, too, Captain Cook is regarded ambivalently as ‘the forefather of British occupation [and] the originator of their [Indigenous Australians’] dispossession.’ The Royal Society’s the Earl of Morton offered the following ‘hints’ to Cook:

They are the natural, and in the strictest sense of the word, the legal possessors of the several Regions they inhabit. … Therefore should they in a hostile manner oppose a landing, and kill some men in the attempt, even this would hardly justify firing among them, ‘till every other gentle method had been tried.

Perhaps considering the equivocal nature of the assurances of ownership and safety from attack, this is not surprising.

**Drawn in**

The early reconnaissance of Tasman and Cook had ignored the Waikato’s western harbours – Whāingaroa, Aotea and Kāwhia. During the early years of the nineteenth century, however, as the region entered the consciousness of Pākehā, particular those with mercantile interests who aimed to exploit a potential dynamic between New Zealand supply and Australian, as well as wider international, demand, these harbours
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were measured and charted with increasing precision. The trader John Rodolphus Kent was the first Pākehā ship’s captain to enter a number of New Zealand’s harbours, certainly Waitematā and Hokianga, and probably Kāwhia. Kent visited Kāwhia in the *Elizabeth Henrietta* in 1824, before establishing his base of operations there in 1828. Ruth Ross declared that ‘[n]o ship’s captain better knew the New Zealand coasts in the 1820s and early 1830s, or was better known on those coasts, than John Rodolphus Kent.’ Presumably the title of ‘ship’s captain’ excluded the numerous Māori who could have disputed that claim. Kent, known to Māori as Amukete, visited New Zealand waters many times from his base in New South Wales and he surveyed, charted and sketched a number of important coastal features, including harbour entrances, in both the South and North Islands. According to Brian Hooker, ‘Kent was the most competent marine surveyor of the period apart from those attached to official British and French expeditions.’ Perhaps surprisingly, no such views of Kāwhia or the other Waikato west coast harbours remain in existence. It is possible, however, that they were not widely circulated at the time due to the economically sensitive information such documents would have contained. According to John Ross, ‘[g]reat secrecy surrounded the trade possibilities at Kawhia, and no
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32 Kent is sometimes referred to in texts as Amos Kent, closer to his Māori name Amukete (or Hamu-Kete)

details appeared in the press as to the destination of the ships involved. Business rivalry over access to supplies of commodities such as timber, flax, pork and potatoes was one potential reason for this secrecy. In particular, flax was widely sought after as its strong fibres were useful in rope-making.

The exploitation of such trade depended not only on reliable knowledge of safe passages and anchorages, but also on a constructive and, perhaps, exclusive, relationship with Māori trading partners. Kent himself was an early adopter of the model whereby New South Wales trading companies would establish trading stations in New Zealand, permanently occupied by Pākehā intermediaries who could expedite this trade. Kent, having left the employ of the New South Wales government, established such a base at Koutu in the Hokianga in 1827, before turning his attention to Kāwhia in 1828. These trading stations could be seen as beach heads as reconnaissance began to give rise to invasion. Along with mission stations, they were among the earliest permanent, or semi-permanent, Pākehā settlements in New Zealand. But these incursions were far from unwelcome and, while in the long term missionary and mercantile contacts wrought significant impacts on Māori, at the time of their establishment, their existence brought considerable advantages to their Māori hosts. In fact, tribes competed for access to Pākehā and their trade goods—in the 1820s especially guns. Kent’s Kāwhia trade with Waikato Māori was mutually lucrative with ‘2500 tons of flax … exchanged for 5000 muskets in four years.’

This access to Pākehā weapons allowed Waikato tribes to successfully negotiate the period of the ‘Musket Wars’, and the enhancement of Te Wherowhero’s reputation during this period was one of the key reasons behind his election as first Māori King.

34 John O’C. Ross, ‘Captain Kent: His Last Years’, p. 28
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in 1858. Before Kent’s arrival, this outcome was not at all assured, Waikato having suffered a major reverse with heavy casualties at Mātakitaki on the Waipā in 1822. A Ngāpuhi taua led by Hongi Hika who had muskets, defeated Te Wherowhero’s forces who did not. The outcome of the battle demonstrated to Te Wherowhero the urgent need for access to these weapons that had changed the nature of inter-tribal warfare and threatened the existence of those who lacked them. The peace negotiations that followed Mātakitaki seem to have provided just such an opportunity for Waikato Māori. According to Smith, quoting Te Wheoro, a chief, Puaha, visited Ngāpuhi in early 1824 and ‘[w]hen he returned he brought back with him “Hamu-kete,” a Pakeha; they came back in the latter’s vessel to Kawhia, to Heahea, at the entrance.’

It is likely, therefore, that, rather than seeing Kent’s incursion into Kawhia as reconnaissance or invasion, it was Waikato locals who enticed him from Hokianga for their own purposes. This sense of Māori agency is reinforced by the subsequent arrival of more Pākehā, brought by Kent from Sydney, including John Cowell, who were provided with wives and settled in different parts of the harbour. ‘They would be appropriated by these various chiefs’, Smith continues, ‘in order that they might, through them, obtain arms, etc., and with whom to barter their flax.’ Kent was ‘appropriated’ by Te Wherowhero himself who showed the extent of Kent’s value to the tribe by arranging for the marriage of firstly his niece, and then his daughter, Tiria, to Kent.

From 1834 Kent went to live as a Pākehā Māori at Te Wherowhero’s pa at Kaitotehe near Taupiri. So, while no visible traces of Kent’s surveying and charting
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exploits in the Waikato remain, he was clearly responsible in large measure for
penetrating the Waikato for the purposes of establishing trade. His legacy is
ambiguous, however. While his example opened the door to later incursions, Kent
himself was integrated into Māori life and became part of the tribal whakapapa
(genealogy) of Waikato. He had more freedom of movement and action than some
‘pet Pākehā’ but he seems to have allied himself closely with his Māori hosts and
identified their interests with his own. In this way, Kent represents an important
counter-current to the main themes of this thesis. He and the other Pākehā Māori
were integrated into Māori life and, while they may have influenced their hosts in
some respects, the burden of cultural compromise fell on them.

Plotting for access

While Kent may or may not have charted the West Coast harbours, the earliest
survey charts of Kāwhia and Whāingaroa which are known to exist were made
in 1836 by Captain Thomas Wing, described by John Ross as a ‘competent and
industrious surveyor’39. Wing had been commissioned by the British Admiralty
to survey New Zealand harbours in order to gather information to allow for more
extensive access to New Zealand for Pākehā. During this period Wing was also
responsible for surveys of Kaipara, Manukau, Tauranga and Ahuriri (Napier)
Harbours as well as other South Island locations. Brian Byrne goes further to claim
that Wing was ‘not only one of early New Zealand’s most esteemed master mariners’
but ‘without doubt one of the most significant non-naval contributors to New

39 John O’C. Ross, This Stern Coast (Wellington: Reed, 1969), p. 111.
Zealand’s early cartographic history. In other words, Thomas Wing was one of the most important agents of Pākehā reconnaissance in Aotearoa.

The information represented on Wing’s charts focuses on landmarks and water depth to aid navigation through tricky entrances and narrow channels. The Kāwhia survey, Fig 2.3, was carried out from Wing’s ship *Fanny* which, according to information on the map itself, arrived on 12 January 1836. A note on the map suggests that it was based on an earlier version by Captain Wright with soundings added by Wing. A number of aids and dangers to shipping are identified while three cultural features are also depicted. Two of these are Wesleyan mission stations – that of Rev. William Woon on the northern shores labelled ‘Papa Kawia’ on the map, and that of Rev. John Whiteley to the south. Not acknowledged on the map is the fact that by the time Wing arrived in January 1836, Woon and his family had already left for a new station at Orua on the Manukau Harbour. Wing certainly knew as much as he had collected Woon himself and conveyed him to Orua aboard the *Fanny* a year earlier. Furthermore, a few months after the map was made, the Whiteley family also left due to a territorial dispute with the Anglican Church Missionary Society which saw the Wesleyans’ west coast stations abandoned for a time. Whiteley returned to Kāwhia in 1839.

Wing’s sole reference to the tangata whenua is a collection of buildings and other items labelled ‘Native Village’ which is shown below ‘Albatross Point’, outside and to the south of the harbour entrance. There appear to be three whare (houses), a pātaka (raised storehouse), two people, a pig, a waka (canoe) and something I cannot
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41 Possibly Captain John Wright, who was at one time captain of the CMS schooner Active?
**Fig 2.3** A chart of Kawhia Harbour, drawn by Captain Thomas Wing, 1836.
Sir George Grey Special Collections, Auckland Libraries, NZ Map 4612
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identify in front of the seated people. This detail suggests an attempt at accuracy and the similarly detailed depiction of the cluster of buildings at Whiteley’s mission station bears this out. But it’s hard to imagine that this one village was the only Māori presence in and around the harbour that was visible or otherwise accessible to Wing as he sketched this map. Perhaps the reason that this village was singled out was for its location as a landmark which could direct ships to a sheltered anchorage. An anchor symbol has been placed in front of the village in a small bay where the sea floor is marked ‘sand’, and where the water depths have been extensively sounded and noted. Such an anchorage would no doubt have been useful when weather or sea state conditions, especially from the south, prevented safe access to the harbour for the time being. Four other anchorages are noted within the harbour, two just inside the entrance and one each beside Whiteley’s and Woon’s mission stations. The channels leading to the respective mission stations are labelled ‘Channel to Kawia’ (to Woon’s) and ‘Channel to Wai Hinage’ (to Whiteley’s). Kawia is consistently spelled ‘Kawia’ by Wing and ‘Wai Hinage’ is likely to be an attempt at Wai Harakeke which was the early site of Whiteley’s station before it was moved to Ahuahu (now Te Waitere, a transliteration of Whiteley). From all of this it is clear that the destinations that Wing was making accessible were the mission stations. Other aspects of the harbour were not deemed important or relevant to the purpose of this map.

Wing’s Whāingaroa map (Fig 2.4) is similarly focused on safe access to the harbour and features the location of a Wesleyan mission station, that of Rev James Wallis. Also in common with the Kawia map, this mission location was quickly outdated – the same injunction to vacate the West Coast in favour of the Church Missionary Society affected Wallis as well and he was forced to relocate to Northland. As with Whiteley further south, he returned in 1839, but he established a new site
Fig 2.4 Whaingaroa Harbour, drawn by Captain Thomas Wing, 1836.
Sir George Grey Special Collections, Auckland Libraries, NZ Map 4605
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at Nihinihi on the other side of the harbour. For some reason, only the entrance to the harbour is shown in detail. Both maps contain written instructions to guide vessels through the narrow entrance channels, avoiding the treacherous sand bars that provide hazards at all the harbours along this stretch of coast. The ‘heavy breakers’ noted on the Whāingaroa map continue to threaten marine access to the harbour as well as generating ‘the longest, most accessible and consistent left-hand break in the world.’

World renowned surfing location Manu Bay is located between South Head and Woody Head, approximately where ‘Native Village’ is marked on Wing’s chart. This reference is the only indication of a Māori presence in a region known to have been well populated. For example, in January 1836, when this map was made, James Wallis could expect 400-500 in attendance at his Sunday services. The only Pākehā known to be in the district at the time were the Wallis family so the rest were local Māori, including Te Awaitaia, the Ngāti Mahanga chief who had been baptised and took the name Wiremu Neera (William Naylor). Yet the people of the land are virtually invisible to Wing’s gaze, or at least to his pen and ink. Perhaps Wing had been drawn into the quickly escalating dispute between the Anglican CMS and the Wesleyan WMS over territorial jurisdiction and the focus on the Wesleyan mission stations was a claim of occupation. That is, of course, if it was Wing who was entirely responsible for these maps. The Kāwhia map, as mentioned above, includes a partial acknowledgement to an earlier sketch by Captain Wright. Furthermore, both of these maps, and the Kaipara one contemporaneously created, have the attribution ‘Drawn by Capt. Thos. Wing’ (the Kāwhia map has the word Capt. in brackets) but this is
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written in black ink whereas the rest of the map is brown. The handwriting style of these labels is also different which suggests they may have been added by someone else, perhaps at a later date.

So these charts, created at the behest of the Admiralty in Britain, were clearly designed to facilitate access to the west coast harbours of the Waikato. Their projection into Waikato space was also a prediction of a burgeoning Pākehā presence. The geographical obstacles to further incursion were tamed, or at least minimised by close descriptions of the hazards and detailed instructions for their avoidance. The role of the Admiralty in this reconnaissance, particularly as it came before the nominal transfer of sovereignty to the British Crown by means of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840, suggests an expectation that a more comprehensive British involvement in New Zealand would be a natural consequence of the initial forays that had already been made. In this, Wing can been seen in a direct line from Cook in the British reconnaissance of New Zealand.

**Deeper penetrations**

So far this chapter has argued that these initial missions of reconnaissance measured and framed New Zealand locations in the Waikato and elsewhere, in support of an expected invasion, though not necessarily a military one. The following charts proved directly useful to the military invasion that ensued as well. A comprehensive survey of New Zealand’s coastline was carried out by Captain John Lort Stokes and his team on the H.M.S.V. *Acheron* and completed by Captain Byron Drury on the H.M.S. *Pandora* between 1848 and 1856. Waikato’s west coast harbours were charted during
the second phase of this survey between 23 January and 11 March 1854.\footnote{Byrne, p. 133.} In the book that accompanied the publication of these charts, *The New Zealand Pilot*, both the purpose of the surveys and the debt to Cook are made explicit:

> With these materials, aided by the labours of the illustrious navigator Cook, (whose sagacious remarks on the coasts of New Zealand, recorded in his published voyages, may even at the present day be consulted with advantage,) there is no doubt that the intelligent seaman, if in possession of the Admiralty Charts, may visit every part of the group in safety and security.\footnote{G. H. Richards and F. J. Evans, *The New Zealand Pilot. From Surveys Made in H.M. Ships Acheron and Pandora.* (London: The Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, 1856), p. 4.}

According to Brian Byrne, 'the *Pandora* and *Acheron* surveys, together with their harvest of charts which are still held in high esteem by hydrographers, cartographers and mariners, form a major part of New Zealand’s early hydrographic and cartographic history; and in their time they played a significant role in the successful settlement of Pākehā in New Zealand and its subsequent economic development.'\footnote{Byrne, inside front jacket.}

In other words, these expeditions and the resulting maps and charts were effective tools in the colonisation of New Zealand including the Waikato.

The *Pandora* charts and those created by Wing show similar priorities, although the *Pandora* charts are far more detailed. The Kāwhia chart, \textbf{Fig 2.5}, follows the tidal channels further inland but also contains a reference to the Wesleyan mission at Ahu-ahu. A few Māori settlements are depicted, including Po-wiwi (Pouewe). The Whāingaroa chart, \textbf{Fig 2.6}, ventures into the interior far further than was managed by Wing. The later location of Wallis’ mission at Nihinihi is noted along with a settlement called Hoie Village on the northern side. As with the other charts in this series, great detail is offered concerning the water depths and tidal flows throughout the whole extent of the harbour and into the tributary streams and rivers.
Fig 2.5 Kawhia Harbour, surveyed by Comr. B. Drury, P. Oke Secd. Mast. and H. Ellis, Mast. Assis. R.N. 1854
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But the situation in New Zealand had changed greatly in the intervening twenty years since Wing’s surveys. By the time the *Pandora* survey was completed in 1854, the British had nominally assumed control over all New Zealand. But the cession of kawanatanga in the Treaty of Waitangi was a bone of contention between many Māori and the Crown due to different interpretations of the nature and amount of actual power the British could expect to wield. Waikato was still effectively under the control of its traditional chiefs, and the leading chief, Te Wherowhero had refused to sign the treaty when it was offered to him in 1840 at Manukau. A movement to appoint a Māori king was already underway that would lead to Te Wherowhero’s accession in 1858. These events and their implications, including the outbreak of war between the Kingitanga in Waikato and the invading British Army in 1863, are covered in much more detail in Chapter 4. One effective strategy used by the British forces during the conflict was the deployment of gunboats on the Waikato River. The *Avon* and the *Pioneer* were particularly important to the outcome of the battle at Meremere. The *Koheroa* and the *Rangiriri* were subsequently added to the fleet at General Cameron’s disposal. These gunboats all entered the Waikato through Waikato Heads at the mouth of the Waikato River, which had been charted as part of the *Pandora* survey in 1854. The Waikato River chart was published as an inset, along with Aotea Harbour and New Plymouth, on Sheet VI of the New Zealand North Island series ‘Manukau Harbour to Cape Egmont’. The version reproduced here in Fig 2.7, includes a note that it was published by the Hydrographic Office of the Admiralty 12th Nov. 1857. Corrections Nov. 1861. Also noted is that it was sold by J D Potter Agent for the Admiralty Charts and the purchase price was 3 shillings. No doubt the intelligence obtained by Stokes’ reconnaissance was worth much more than that to Cameron and his troops.
Fig 2.6 Whaingaroa Harbour, surveyed by B. Drury, P. Oke, H. Ellis, 1854
Sir George Grey Special Collections, Auckland Libraries, NZ Map 3910
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The *Pandora* survey confirmed and also exemplified a particular problem of Waikato’s west coast harbours from a colonisation point of view. Their inaccessibility to larger ships made them very impractical as the scale of Pākehā incursion grew. The survey itself was hampered by this fact—one of the *Pandora*’s officers, Phillip Oke, carried out the survey aboard the chartered schooner *Anne* as the sand bars, particularly at Whāingaroa, prevented the *Pandora* from entering. The establishment of Auckland as the colonial capital diverted trade northwards from the Waikato, with much of the produce from agricultural settlements like Rangiaowhia being transported up the Waipā and Waikato Rivers and over the portage at Waiuku into the Manukau Harbour, thus avoiding the Tasman Sea altogether. This trade was mainly in the hands of Māori and so Pākehā shipping was less important to the Waikato than it was elsewhere. Perhaps this realisation was already evident when the priorities for the Acheron and then the Pandora surveys were being set. The Waikato coast was among the very last of New Zealand’s coastlines to be closely charted.

Smaller ships continued to ply these harbours, however, particularly Whāingaroa, as Pākehā occupation grew. It was vitally important for the safe incursion of Pākehā into New Zealand that the kind of information collected and published in these charts was made available. But while the main and stated purpose of this enterprise was to facilitate navigation, and for Pākehā ship’s captains this was no doubt the primary usefulness of the charts, there was clearly a marked difference between the Great Survey of New Zealand and the concurrent Grand Survey of the British Isles. The methods used to collect and represent information were similar but it would be difficult to imagine a scenario in the United Kingdom where a surveyor would need to remark, as Drury did while at Kaipara, ‘it was difficult to make the natives
Fig 2.7 Manukau Harbour to Cape Egmont, surveyed by B. Drury and the officers of H.M.S. Pandora. From New Plymouth to the Southward by Captn. J. L. Stokes and the officers of H.M.S. Acheron 1857
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understand our mission.\textsuperscript{48} The reported good relations between Drury and Māori locals throughout his expedition suggests that its full implications were not conveyed. I do not know how Waikato Māori responded to the activities of these surveyors and cartographers but the impacts of their work to measure and frame the Waikato coastlines were far-reaching.

**Conclusion**

The maps and charts reproduced here are empirical records of Pākehā reconnaissance of the Waikato between the 1640s and the 1850s. The circumstances of their creation involved the inspection and appraisal of the Waikato coastline with a view to offering stimulus and support for Pākehā colonising invasion. Impediments as well as helpful features were catalogued as the Waikato began to be framed from a Pākehā perspective. From a New Zealand-wide point of view, the Waikato’s west coast, which is the main focus of these maps as far as this thesis is concerned, was seldom an official priority. For the earliest Pākehā visitors the North Island’s west coast was quickly skirted in search of safer anchorages elsewhere, while Whāingaroa, Aotea and Kāwhia harbours were among the last sections of the whole coast to be thoroughly surveyed by the British Admiralty. No doubt this was at least partly due to the barriers imposed by the physical geography of sand bars and prevailing sea states which acted as deterrents to close inspection. The view from the decks of ships may not have looked that promising to those seeking colonial destinations. The exception was at Hauraki where Cook and Banks gazed towards the Waikato (although they were unaware of it) and dreamed of colonisation aided by great timber plantations, fertile soils and impotent natives. The map makers described and defined the shape

\textsuperscript{48} Byrne, p. 119.
of the Waikato’s edges in a European vernacular as they and their sponsors assumed control over the real and discursive spaces they imagined and imaged. Individuals who were invited in, such as the merchant who became a Pākehā/Māori Kent (Amukete), were an important counter current to reconnaissance although those who were willing to integrate in this way were few. For other Pākehā, if the Waikato did not immediately present its best potential for colonisation, this did not last long. The following chapter examines the developing nature of Pākehā reconnaissance as the Waikato was subjected to first-hand scientific scrutiny.
CHAPTER 3

A Catalogue for Colonisation

Pākehā scouts reconnoitre the Waikato at first hand

During the period starting from the late 1830s, the Waikato was again subjected to a Pākehā scientific gaze, but, unlike Cook and Banks, this scrutiny was increasingly at first hand as expeditions entered the Waikato and walked over the land. This kind of activity was couched in terms of exploration and discovery, and often still is, despite the fact that Māori guides were often used to lead ‘explorers’ on well known (to the locals) tracks to ‘discover’ well known (to the locals) features. This first hand reconnaissance resulted in a catalogue of Pākehā knowledge of the Waikato’s potentials and possibilities, as its specific land forms and landscapes were defined and recorded. The earlier maps and charts of the coastline were used to help frame the Waikato for these visitors as they attempted to reconfigure it in their own terms. These reconnaissance missions were not objective scientific enquiries, but expeditions where phenomena were classified and evaluated according to their familiarity to Pākehā, and/or their potential usefulness as resources for the colonisation that would inevitably follow. Scientists such as Dieffenbach and Hochstetter left no doubt that they believed themselves to be in the vanguard of a colonial invasion. Their descriptions resembled inventories and projected Pākehā control. Dieffenbach wrote:

I have entered, on several occasions, upon questions intimately connected with the capabilities of the country as a home for Europeans. In a time pregnant with the universal desire to search for employment, and to open new fields for exertion, foreign and unoccupied countries, previous to colonization, should be
explored with a view of making ourselves acquainted with their soil and natural productions. Natural history and the affiliated sciences should, in that case, be merely the helpmates to noble enterprise; and even more than that—they should guide and lead it.¹

According to Hochstetter, in Waikato’s coal reserves lay a considerable store of fuel, which will be raised as soon as European settlements have commenced to extend over the beautiful lands on the lower Waikato, and steamers to navigate the river. It is a rich treasure reserved for generations to come; lying at the very threshold of the portal which leads into the interior of the North Island.²

For Dieffenbach’s ‘natural history and the affiliated sciences’ we can read Western epistemological and cultural frameworks which were posited as aspirational for Māori. The role of Pākehā would be to control and manage the transition to civilisation for both the people and their land. And the inevitability and permanency of colonisation were evoked by Hochstetter as he conjured up ‘European settlements’ for ‘generations to come’. That these scientists were so positive about colonisation can be simply explained. They were, after all, in the employ of colonial enterprises—in Dieffenbach’s case the New Zealand Company and Hochstetter had been engaged by the Auckland Provincial Government—so it is hardly surprising that each described and defined New Zealand landscapes in this way. Yet both scientists, despite some reservations, particularly on the part of Dieffenbach, seemed to enthusiastically embrace their task of cataloguing colonial potential.

This chapter outlines the ways that maps and photographs both aided and recorded Pākehā reconnaissance activity in the Waikato as attempts were made to incorporate this region into Pākehā controlled New Zealand after its nominal

acquisition by Britain in 1840. In particular, I argue that the expeditions mounted by Dieffenbach and Hochstetter were not merely scientific journeys of discovery but attempts to categorise, itemise and prioritise the Waikato with a view to facilitating what they saw as the inevitable future Pākehā control and exploitation of the region. I also argue that the dispossession and marginalisation of Māori were acknowledged as necessary and, in some ways, desirable consequences of this Pākehā invasion to come.

The Dieffenbach reconnaissance

The first European scientist to examine the Waikato directly was Ernst Dieffenbach. Dieffenbach’s written descriptions of the Waikato spaces and places encountered on his travels, contextualised by his extensive writing on Māori, are the focus of this section. He does not seem to have created maps himself, although he notes in his preface the ‘excellent map which Mr. John Arrowsmith has compiled with the aid of my notes and sketches [which] will amply illustrate’ his journey.³ It is not clear which map he was referring to although Arrowsmith was responsible for a number of published maps in this period. The map reproduced here (Fig 3.1) has a publication date of 1841, after Dieffenbach’s expedition through the Waikato and before his account was published. Fig 3.2 was published in 1842 and was, according to the map itself, ‘compiled from various surveys by John Arrowsmith’. While its publication date is later and its coastlines apparently updated and rendered in more detail, and despite a scale allowing for a more particular focus on the Waikato, this map is less detailed in its recording of Waikato features than Fig 3.1. Fig 3.1 was ‘Ordered by the House of Commons to be Printed’ and represents New Zealand with a mixture of great detail and large absences. The blank areas on the map did not indicate unoccupied

³ Dieffenbach, Travels in New Zealand, 1, p. iii.
Fig 3.1 Map of the colony of New Zealand, from official documents [cartographic material]

Map by John Arrowsmith.
Ref: 830a 1841. Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington, New Zealand
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or empty land but a lack of information available to the cartographer. Dieffenbach’s expedition was intended to fill some of these gaps and to act as a road map to the most suitable locations for Pākehā expansion.

Dieffenbach produced a detailed catalogue of the Waikato, as well as other New Zealand locations. While it can be seen that he was an observant traveller whose interest in what he saw was genuine, it is also clear that his nature and background led him to assume that colonisation would, and should, follow. He had arrived in New Zealand aboard the Tory in 1839 as naturalist to the New Zealand Company and travelled over much of the country in the next few years. His book Travels in New Zealand4 was published in two volumes in 1843. Dieffenbach’s background influenced his responses to what he saw in the Waikato between March and June 1841. A German-born Doctor of Medicine, Dieffenbach had ended up in London in the late 1830s having been forced out of his native Giessen, and then from Zurich, for his radical political activities. His radicalism permeates Travels in New Zealand, and his views on race and indigenous peoples, particularly Māori, were, according to Gerda Bell, ‘far ahead of his time’.5 Bell notes the influences of Rousseau and Herder in Dieffenbach’s belief that Europeans were not innately superior to other races and that the disastrous effects of European incursions into indigenous worlds were the fault of European attitudes and actions rather than any actual weakness of non-European peoples.6 In Volume II of Travels in New Zealand, which is devoted extensively to descriptions of Māori, Dieffenbach wrote that ‘a feeling of regret is, I believe, very generally excited amongst thinking men, when they observe how little


6 Bell, p. 138.
Fig 3.2 The harbour and city of Auckland, the capital of New Zealand with the districts of the rivers Kai para, Waitemata, Tamaki, Waihou or Thames, Mercury Bay, Kawia, Piako, Waipa, Waikato, Manakao, Tauranga, etc., compiled from various surveys by John Arrowsmith.
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benefit has resulted to barbarous tribes from their intercourse with the people of civilized nations.”

Yet, a closer analysis of Dieffenbach’s writing reveals that these no doubt genuinely held beliefs did not allow him to throw off a more typical Eurocentrism of the times. Even while deploring the effects of colonisation, he did not resile from colonisation itself. On the contrary, he clearly saw a European role in the preservation of native peoples such as Māori. While he may have believed that Māori were not innately inferior to Europeans, he clearly believed in the notion that Māori and other non-European peoples were behind in their development and that it was up to Europeans to guide these peoples to a more advanced stage of civilisation. Dieffenbach considered that, of the Polynesian peoples, Māori exhibited the ‘readiest disposition for assuming in a high degree that civilization which must be the link to connect them to the European colonists, and ultimately to amalgamate them.’ Thus, while he rated Māori highly, this estimation was based on what he saw was their ‘civilisability’ and he saw their future as being eventually assimilated by Europeans. He did not advocate treating Māori as cultural equals and, while he did respect (most) Māori cultural practices, he proposed a process for their gradual phasing out, to be replaced by European ones. The problems associated with colonisation in other places, including Australia, could be avoided, according to Dieffenbach, by careful planning and administration by Europeans and he expressed the typical paternalism of European humanitarians of the time when he suggested that Māori were ‘the national wards of England’. And, while he advocated a strong legal protection for Māori land rights, this did not extend to all Māori land. Dieffenbach considered that New

---

8 Dieffenbach, *Travels in New Zealand*, ii, p. 139.
Zealand was big enough for ‘the support of a large population in addition to its native inhabitants.’ He recommended allowing Māori to retain such land as he deemed necessary for their subsistence on a per population basis. To put this into effect, his plan required that ‘the approximate population of each tribe should be ascertained; that it should be explained to them that they are at liberty to choose any spot which they may prefer, and that the rest is either given to the individuals to whom they have sold it, if the claims of the latter are found consistent with justice, or that it will return to them, and that they may sell it to the government.’

For Dieffenbach there was no contradiction between recourse to a system ‘consistent with justice’ and a plan to strip the great bulk of Māori land from their ownership. Like many of his contemporaries, he was influenced by a paternalistic philosophy of race relations which suggested that Europeans could, and should, benefit indigenous peoples by guiding them, or even coercing, them to become ‘civilised’—in other words Europeanised—in the confident knowledge that any loss of their traditional (backward) culture would be amply compensated for by the acquisition of a (more advanced) European way of life. After all, this was precisely the same sentiment advanced in the instructions of the Secretary of State for the Colonies Lord Normanby to William Hobson for the negotiation of the Treaty of Waitangi, which coincided with Dieffenbach’s New Zealand excursion. Furthermore, while he was genuinely concerned with Māori welfare and cautionary about the ill-effects of colonisation on Māori, Dieffenbach was quite clear that it was Europeans who had the power to make the decisions about the future of New Zealand and of Māori. In

10 Dieffenbach, Travels in New Zealand, i, p. 4.
11 Dieffenbach, Travels in New Zealand, ii, pp. 148–49.
so doing, two of the ‘grand objects of colonisation’ could be fulfilled—

first, that of opening new markets for British manufactures; and secondly,
which is still more important, converting in the course of a few years an island
of savage tribes into an integral portion of Great Britain, emulous to resemble
its parent land in wealth, happiness, strength, knowledge, civilization, and
Christian virtues.\(^\text{13}\)

It is in this context, then, of Dieffenbach’s ambivalent and, to the modern reader
somewhat contradictory, attitudes to race and colonisation that his description
of his travels in the Waikato should be read. His claim in the preface of \textit{Travels in
New Zealand} that he had ‘no other pretensions in bringing these volumes before
the public, than that they contain unvarnished descriptions of the places I visited’\(^\text{14}\)
should therefore be approached with caution. Furthermore, his assertion that he had
‘been over much untrodden ground’ and that he was ‘the first to visit or describe
Mount Egmont, many places in the northern parts of the island, and some of the
picturesque and interesting lakes and thermal springs in the interior’\(^\text{15}\) cast him as a
more typically Eurocentric ‘explorer’ who saw no irony in having local guides lead
him to locations which he would be the ‘first’ to visit and describe. Thus from the
beginning, Dieffenbach asserted what he believed to be his cultural superiority. He
made it clear that he believed he was creating knowledge and that any indigenous
precedent or prior knowledge could be ignored as somehow inadequate for European
purposes.

Unusually for a traveller to the Waikato in this period, Dieffenbach saw very
little of the Waikato river and made no use of it as a transportation route. Perhaps
this was because charts of the coastline were far in advance of maps of the interior at
this point. He described the Waikato Heads and the opportunities and difficulties

\(^{13}\) Dieffenbach, \textit{Travels in New Zealand}, ii, pp. 175–76.
\(^{14}\) Dieffenbach, \textit{Travels in New Zealand}, i, p. iii.
\(^{15}\) Dieffenbach, \textit{Travels in New Zealand}, i, p. iii.
presented to (Pākehā) shipping by the sandbar protected entrance:

> The outlet of the Waikato does not form a bay, but is a narrow channel, where, at low water, only vessels of about thirty tons can enter. But inside the headlands the Waikato is stately stream, and when the tide has increased its depth it is navigable even for larger vessels for about a hundred miles, where it is joined by the river Waipa, which is navigable for boats sixty miles farther.’

Yet Dieffenbach’s party instead followed the pathways along the coast down as far as Kāwhia via Whāingaroa and Aotea. They then travelled overland to the Waipā valley and on via Ōtāwhao and Maungatautari southwards to Taupō and Tongariro. From there they visited the Rotorua region and returned to the Waikato at Matamata via Tauranga before heading to Thames and Auckland. In *Travels in New Zealand*, Dieffenbach describes in detail many of the events and places of this journey, pointing out features of geological formations as well as prevailing and potential land uses. For example, the district of the Waihou (rendered Waiho by Dieffenbach) and Piako rivers is described for its accessibility: ‘The Waiho about forty miles from its embouchure is still a considerable stream, which would admit small steamers; the Piako is navigable for boats,’ and for its agricultural potential: ‘The next day, in travelling down the valley, we passed many swamps, but a perfect drainage system might easily be effected. The soil was better, and here and there it was covered with grass.’

These accounts are completely consistent with Dieffenbach’s assumption that New Zealand would become a settlement colony, populated by industrious Pākehā farmers. His descriptions of his encounters with Māori also accord with his ambivalent attitude outlined above. He was particularly impressed with the civilising influence of the missionaries. He praised Robert Maunsell, an Anglican minister

---

16 Dieffenbach, *Travels in New Zealand*, 1, pp. 300–01.
and CMS Missionary at Maraetai (called Maraenui by Dieffenbach) at Waikato Heads, for his ‘true Christian disinterestedness’ and he considered that Māori who attended a meeting at the Mission that coincided with his visit were ‘fast progressing in civilization.’\footnote{Dieffenbach, \textit{Travels in New Zealand}, \textit{t}, p. 301.} At John Morgan’s mission station at Ōtāwhao, he witnessed a lesson conducted by a blind Māori catechist called Haramona (Solomon). Commenting on the pupils, he was ‘surprised and gratified to see what progress they had made in such a short time.’\footnote{Dieffenbach, \textit{Travels in New Zealand}, \textit{t}, p. 319.} However, he was also frustrated by what he saw as overly zealous interpretation of Christian teachings among some of the converts he met. Near Taupō, he complained that his hosts refused to feed them on a Sunday because they ‘had become missionaries of late, and had been told it was the greatest sin to kill a pig or to cook on Sunday.’ This problem was solved when a Māori member of their party went to a nearby ‘Heathen pa’ and ‘came back in the afternoon with a pig.’\footnote{Dieffenbach, \textit{Travels in New Zealand}, \textit{t}, pp. 326–27.} On another occasion, an initially warm reception deteriorated markedly when, having been provided with food, Dieffenbach’s party took shelter in a house that was, in fact, the church. In spite of all efforts to redeem themselves, they were treated very frostily thereafter, and Dieffenbach complained that

in spite of all possible caution and forbearance on my part, I have several times met with a bad reception, and always found the cause something connected with missionary, I will not say Christian, observances. The misunderstanding generally arose from some exaggerated idea of what was required of them by the missionaries, a fault very usual among new and zealous converts.\footnote{Dieffenbach, \textit{Travels in New Zealand}, \textit{t}, p. 372.}

Dieffenbach, like many of his contemporaries, was reluctant to acknowledge Māori agency in adapting Christianity to their own purposes. Deviance from what he considered orthodox Christian practice—despite there being far from universal
agreement as to what this constituted among European Christians—was seen as a failure of either the missionaries’ skill or of Māori understanding. Pākehā generally read Māori adoption of European cultural items or practices either as having a negative, corrosive impact on Māori culture, or as indicating an acknowledgement by Māori of the superiority of Europe and a desire by Māori to become like Europeans. Dieffenbach was convinced that Māori were eager to become Europeanised and it was partly this desire that led to his high regard for their ‘civilisibility’. He described Māori at Whāingaroa as ‘highly pleased to be in future subject to the English law,’ and he also suggested that Māori were ‘friends of the Europeans, and particularly of the English, and have become reconciled to their taking possession of the country.’ Historian James Belich writes that, along with pragmatic reasons and financial constraints, the policy followed by the early governors of subjecting Māori with a minimum of force was based on similar assumptions: ‘that the Maori were unusually intelligent (for blacks) and that intelligence translated into the desire to become British.’ Māori interest in and engagement with the things and ideas of Europe were misunderstood by well-meaning observers like Dieffenbach as an indication that Māori recognised the superiority of European ways and were willing, if not immediately able, to be amalgamated. Pākehā also assumed that their partial, if imperfect in Pākehā eyes, adoption of European cultural ideas and practices, including Christianity, was an intermediate step on the way to full ‘civilisation’, and that gentle and patient treatment of Māori would be sufficient to encourage and enable Māori to complete their transition.

23 Dieffenbach, Travels in New Zealand, i, p. 305.
24 Dieffenbach, Travels in New Zealand, ii, p. 141.
But Māori adapted Christianity, as they did with other European innovations, to make it more relevant to their own way of life. As Belich writes, ‘Christianity made by Maori into Maori religion was changed in the process.’

Māori at certain times and places, including some of those reported by Dieffenbach, saw great value in many aspects of European culture and they coveted some technologies including, but not limited to, iron tools and muskets. Pākehā-introduced foods like pork and potatoes transformed nutrition as well as living patterns among some iwi and hapū, and competition to acquire Pākehā and their innovations intensified tribal rivalries. Yet the values and perspectives that underpinned the use of these items for Pākehā were seldom transferred along with the items. Māori developed their traditional practices to accommodate the inclusion of the newly introduced items and ideas, and they adapted them to their customs rather than the other way around. In other words, they behaved like normal, confident, resourceful human communities and it seems strange that this should need to be pointed out. That Pākehā, including moderate and well-disposed examples such as Dieffenbach, should misread this in this way indicates how deeply seated the European sense of cultural superiority was.

One of the key aims of this thesis is not to criticise people like Dieffenbach for their moderation, but to expose and critique the attitudes and actions of Pākehā who cast themselves as in control of the destiny of themselves and others for good or ill. Indigenous peoples like Māori were bit-part actors expected to play support roles in the European story and they were rated on their enthusiasm and progress towards ‘civilisation’. Many Europeans took very seriously what they saw as their responsibilities as mentors and guides to child-like indigenes, but this should not be seen as the same thing as a genuine respect for Māori as Māori. And Māori co-

operation with Pākehā and an engagement with their ideas and institutions, including British law, should not be seen as acquiescence to British authority or submission to European culture. In European minds these were indivisible and it led people like Dieffenbach to misread their interactions with Māori.

To Dieffenbach’s credit, he did base his observations on first hand accounts and he does provide detailed descriptions and analyses in *Travels in New Zealand*. Nor did he deem all European influences positive. He ruefully regretted, for example, that Māori seemed to have departed from their own traditions of hospitality and had joined the money economy—particularly when he did not seem to be able to negotiate what he considered a reasonable price for services like ferry transport. He felt that ‘the effect of their contact with Europeans has been to render them covetous and extortionate’, and that ‘their knowledge of the value of time and money will remain for a long time imperfect.’ However, this sense of disappointment derives from the same ‘Māori are civilisable because they want to be like us’ sentiments expressed above. But it is also clear that Māori were expected to know their place and that entrepreneurial behaviour that placed Māori in a position of power over Pākehā would be seen in a negative light.

Dieffenbach’s scientific gaze elicited far more than ‘unvarnished descriptions’ and what he saw through what he assumed to be his objective eyes was, on the contrary, radically filtered through his expectations and prejudices. There was no doubt in Dieffenbach’s mind that his journey and his subsequent catalogue would inform the inevitable colonisation to come. Histories that characterise Dieffenbach as a scientific ‘explorer’ risk reinforcing the idea that he was discovering rather than constructing knowledge and perpetuating the myth of the neutrality of such knowledge.

The Hochstetter Catalogue

While Dieffenbach did not leave a comprehensive visual record of his expedition, the next scientist to venture into the Waikato was responsible for a far more extensive pictorial catalogue. When the ‘Father of New Zealand Geology’, Ferdinand von Hochstetter, surveyed the geology of the southern Auckland Province in 1859 at the behest of the Auckland Provincial Council, he brought the specific geology of the Waikato region into the realm of European scientific understanding. In general, he classified land forms and structures in terms of European experience and priorities, highlighting those aspects of most interest or use to them. In particular, he identified important resources—such as coal reserves in what he called the Lower Waikato Basin—for future exploitation. Following Dieffenbach who had visited almost two decades previously, Hochstetter’s ‘scientific gaze’ predicted and justified the subsequent invasion of the Waikato landscape.

Dr Ferdinand Hochstetter,28 an Austrian geologist, arrived in New Zealand in late December 1858, embarked on several journeys of exploration of the New Zealand interior over the next nine months. The subsequent public lectures and published articles and books served to establish Hochstetter’s name as the ‘Father of New Zealand Geology’.29 This paternity is no doubt disputed by Māori New Zealanders for whom the creation and nature of landscapes and landforms have a whakapapa (genealogy) that significantly precedes Hochstetter’s arrival on the scene. Regardless of this, Hochstetter’s maps provide some of the earliest pictorial representations of

---

28 Baptised Christian Gottlieb Ferdinand Hochstetter, he was known as Ferdinand. Following the award of a knighthood by the King of Württemberg in 1860 after his return home from New Zealand, he was known as von Hochstetter. (Johnston, M. R., and Sascha Nolden, Travels of Hochstetter and Haast in New Zealand, 1858-60 (Nelson, N.Z: Nikau Press, 2011), p. 15, p. 227.

Fig 3.3 The southern part of the Province of Auckland showing the routes and surveys by Ferdinand von Hochstetter, 1859 from the original drawings, sketches and measurements by Dr von Hochstetter and the admiralty surveys by Stokes and Drury, compiled by A. Peterman. Gotha, Justus Pertes, 1864
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Pākehā perceptions of land associated with actual spaces and places in the Waikato interior. Hochstetter’s expedition is also responsible for what are very likely the first Waikato photographs. And Hochstetter’s ‘scientific’ gaze was not accidental or incidental to his Waikato journey. On the contrary, his foray into the Waikato at the behest of the Auckland Provincial Council had a specific scientific purpose—the investigation of known and potential coal reserves—as well as the more general aim of a comprehensive geological survey of the region.

Following techniques pioneered by William Smith in his ‘map that changed the world’ published in 1814, Hochstetter’s surveys and sketches led to the production of maps delineating the strata and composition of rock formations of the southern part of Auckland province including the Waikato. Two such maps, Figs 3.3 and 3.4 are reproduced here. Fig 3.3 ‘The Southern Part of the Province of Auckland’ was published as part of Hochstetter and Petermann’s *Geological and Topographical Atlas of New Zealand*, first published in German in 1863, and then in English translation in 1864. This map describes the geological structure of the landscape of central North Island, including the Waikato. The Waikato was labelled according to natural geographical features such as Lower Waikato Basin and Middle Waikato Basin. Cultural features were not ignored and a number of settlements were designated ‘Pah, Settlement of the Natives’ or ‘Mission - Station’. The scientific investigation and its publication in this form combined to designate areas of interest to Pākehā. This ‘scientific gaze’ ordered and disciplined the landscape, prioritising and hierarchising it according to European values.

Fig 3.4 The harbours and bays of Aotea and Kawhia, topographically and geologically explored by Dr Ferdinand von Hochstetter 1859
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From a European perspective, the resulting maps portrayed the physical environment precisely and correctly. Waikato became, for them, accessible, useful and available. The Māori owners and occupants were confined to a limited number of ‘Pah’ sites and their relationship with their rohe (region) and whenua (land) was superseded. The stratigraphic composition of the whenua was examined, evaluated and recorded using a European classification model and mapped using different colours to show similarities and differences across the region. Twelve categories were identified on Petermann’s map based on Hochstetter’s assessment—for example, the pink shaded areas are identified as being ‘Clay-Slate, Grauwacke, Silicious and Jasperoid Slate’, being further categorised under the heading ‘I. Paleozoic’. For the Provincial authorities who sent Hochstetter in search of coal, the areas shaded light green (Laminated Clay with Braun Coal) and bright yellow (Plastic Clay and Sand, with Braun Coal) were probably of most interest. The coal was concentrated in two areas: firstly in the region south of the Manukau Harbour around Drury, which at that point was the southern end of the Great South Road and near the limit of substantive British control; and secondly in what Hochstetter called the Lower Waikato Basin which was beyond that limit.

In fact, the latter region was centred on Rangiriri which was to become the site of probably the most significant battle of the Waikato War in 1863, as the British military invasion of the Waikato was in full swing (see Chapter 4). Fig 3.4, the larger scale map of ‘The Harbours and Bays of Aotea and Kawhia’, has seven categories noted on the key, with none mentioning coal. Both maps were ‘compiled’ by August Petermann, an influential German cartographer best known for Petermann’s Geographische Mitteilungen, the geographic journal he founded. Petermann also created several atlases including the Geologisch-topographischer Atlas von Neu-Seeland.
published in 1863 and translated into English in 1864. Petermann has been described as being motivated by a ‘desire to fill up the gaps in our knowledge of the foreign parts of the world’ and it has been argued that Petermann ‘embod[ied] the transition from the old speculative to the new empirical method in geography’.32

This impulse to measure and define the world on European terms fuelled cartographic innovation and the maps themselves reinforced the belief that the world could be known in this way. The work of cartographers like Petermann and Arrowsmith did much to enhance the reputation of maps for scientific accuracy. A great deal of trouble was taken to collect and compile knowledge from first hand sources like Dieffenbach and Hochstetter and to set this out in a standardised form. Thus the world that was previously unknown (to Europeans) could be known by its translation into recognisable and familiar forms and frames. The Hochstetter/Petermann maps reproduced here can therefore be seen not only as practical and objective catalogues of landscape and geology but as assertions of control over the conceptual spaces of these ‘unknown’ lands. The subjectivity of this gaze was masked by the appeal to scientific accuracy which was assumed to be objective.

Furthermore, even in his own terms, Hochstetter’s scientific analysis of the Waikato was not purely for the aim of collecting esoteric knowledge. Rather it was an example of science in the promotion of commerce. Despite the fact that Europeans often downplayed the commercial aspect of the colonising imperative, control and exploitation of resources (including people) were important facets of the impulse that sent Europeans around the world during this period. Hochstetter’s instructions to describe and quantify coal reserves in the Auckland Province arose from a desire

to harness the most important energy source of this time. Coal was the fuel of the industrial revolution, and, in particular, high grade coal was a valuable resource. Steam technology which drove European (especially British) industry and transport relied heavily on coal. Factories, railway locomotives and steam ships were powered by coal-fired steam engines and coal was also vital to the mass production of the steel that was used to build these machines. It was also expensive to transport so a local supply of good quality coal would have been of great benefit to the colony.

Unfortunately—though perhaps not from a Māori point of view—although the Waikato was blessed with large deposits of relatively easily accessible coal, it was mostly brown (braun) coal or lignite which is inferior to higher grade bituminous or anthracitic coals. Brown coal is made in exactly the same way as other coals but has a higher moisture content and a lower heat value, usually due to lower temperatures and pressure during coalification where the age and depth of the deposit are often important.\(^33\) This was, and still is, a significant resource but the Auckland Provincial Council which commissioned Hochstetter’s expedition must have received the news that the local coal was not of better quality with a tinge of disappointment. Hochstetter himself wrote reassuringly of the potential uses and value of this coal, suggesting that unfavourable comparisons to English coal could be partly explained by prejudice and he added that, although unsuitable for marine fuel where space concerns dictated a higher energy value, New Zealand’s brown coals were ‘well adapted for manufacturing and domestic purposes.’\(^34\) He also acknowledged that coal ‘sometimes of a far inferior quality’\(^35\) was extensively used in parts of Germany and Austria for a variety of industrial and domestic purposes.

---

Hochstetter did not disguise his view that the value of this resource and the other benefits of the region would only be realised by their acquisition and control by Pākehā. For example, he suggested that the coalfield of the Lower Waikato Basin would ‘not begin to be of importance until the beautiful country on the banks of the Waikato, which, as yet, is in the possession of the natives, shall be passed into the hands of the enterprising European settlers.’ He clearly believed that this would inevitably happen and that the destiny of the country was in Pākehā hands.

Describing his view towards the south from the summit of Taupiri, he lamented: ‘How much more charming would the smiling fields of this beautiful country have appeared to us, could we have beheld it studded with European towns and villages!’ Elsewhere he ruefully suggested that ‘it would have been better for New Zealand if it had been colonized a thousand years ago [i.e. before the arrival of Polynesians], as there would then have been no cause for the discussion of the “Land Question.”’

Evidently Hochstetter was of the view that Māori were not particularly relevant or important to the realisation of the kind of future he envisaged, except as potential obstacles.

While acknowledging the numerical strength and power of the Waikato tribes, Hochstetter asserted that the future of the region was as ‘the granary of the North Island, — a real Eden for agriculture and the breeding of cattle, to which, in this respect, no other part of New Zealand might easily compare.’ In this he would be vindicated to some extent in the following century. His implication that this vision would lead to conflict with Waikato Māori was also borne out, and much more quickly.

---

36 Hochstetter, *New Zealand: Its Physical Geography, Geology and Natural History*, p. 81.
38 Hochstetter, *New Zealand: Its Physical Geography, Geology and Natural History*, p. 42.
Hochstetter's initial report on his reconnaissance was presented in a lecture to the Auckland Mechanics' Institute on 24 June 1859. The text of this lecture, and that accounting for his findings in Nelson Province, as well as detailed descriptions of the maps created by Petermann appeared in New Zealand (having been translated into English by Dr Carl Fischer) in 1864 under the title *The Geology of New Zealand: In Explanation of The Geographical and Topographical Atlas of New Zealand*. The maps themselves were published as *Geological and topographical atlas of New Zealand [map]: six maps of the provinces of Auckland and Nelson* by Ferdinand von Hochstetter and A. Petermann which also appeared in New Zealand in 1864. In 1867, Hochstetter published a further, more extensive volume, *New Zealand Its Physical Geography, Geology, and Natural History: With Special Reference to the Results of Government Expeditions in the Provinces of Auckland and Nelson*. Before their official publication, copies of six maps had been sent by Hochstetter to Fischer in July 1863.

The *Daily Southern Cross* reported that the map depicting Auckland district was ‘very minutely and beautifully executed, and there would appear to be not a single important feature of the country, that is not faithfully delineated.’ While the article acknowledges the value of the map for scientific purposes, its timing following the invasion of the Waikato by the British Army led its writer to suggest that more valuable was the fact that it gave ‘with the greatest precision, the position of every native settlement, river, mountain, and road.’ The article goes on to applaud the idea that the map would be forwarded to British commander General Cameron who would ‘doubtless appreciate its value.’  

Ironically, the features that led Hochstetter to postulate an important agricultural future for the Waikato were probably not so much the ‘objectively’, or scientifically, discerned and described geological and natural geographical features of the Waikato landscape, but the cultural developments that Māori had already made in the region. He was ambivalent about the agricultural settlement at Rangiaowhia, on the one hand mocking what he saw as the pretensions of the Kingitanga by calling the settlement a ‘metropolis, — if we may use the expression’\(^41\), while going on to acknowledge its ‘extensive corn-trade and horse-breeding.’\(^42\) In fact, he went on to sing the praises of the beautiful, richly cultivated country about Rangiaowhia [sic] and Otawhao [which] lay spread out before me like a map. I counted about ten small lakes and ponds scattered over the plain, and the church-steeples of these places were seen arising from among orchards and fields. Verily, I could hardly realize that I was here in the interior of New Zealand.\(^43\)

In some important ways that he did not imagine, he was actually far from the interior of New Zealand: instead, it was as though he was looking at New Zealand on a map from which the inconvenient or unfortunate elements had been expunged. His reverie enabled him to block out the troublesome reality of Māori economic development. Waikato Māori had been supplying the Pākehā settlement of Auckland with food from its beginnings in the early 1840s, much of it originating from specialised, large scale agricultural communities like Rangiaowhia.\(^44\) This intensified in the early 1850s as Māori agriculturists participated in a booming trade to supply Australian, and to a lesser extent American, goldfields. A number of Māori owned


\(^{43}\) Hochstetter, *New Zealand: Its Physical Geography, Geology and Natural History*, p. 318.

\(^{44}\) For a detailed description of Māori agriculture in this period, including the economics and politics of flour mills, see Hazel Petrie, *Chiefs of Industry: Māori Tribal Enterprise in Early Colonial New Zealand* (Auckland, N.Z.: Auckland University Press, 2006)
and operated flour mills were constructed on the Waikato and Waipā rivers as tribes sought to add value to and decrease the bulk of their produce for transport. By the time Hochstetter visited Rangiaowhia in 1859 and was in equal measures charmed and underwhelmed by what he saw, a collapse in the Australian prices for wheat and potatoes had severely undermined Māori agricultural enterprise in the Waikato and elsewhere. A depressed domestic market and high indebtedness as a result of capital purchases (such as the aforementioned flour mills) added to their difficulties. Despite this, Rangiaowhia remained a highly important local centre, a point not lost on either side in the war that followed. The Pāterangi Line was established to protect this strategic asset and, when Cameron skirted the defences at Pāterangi in February 1864, he rushed to Rangiaowhia to take it before the defenders could regroup.

Hochstetter’s catalogue became a powerful shaper of Pākehā perceptions of the Waikato. He is responsible for extending the meaning of Waikato by bestowing the names Lower Waikato Basin and Middle Waikato Basin on relatively flat river basins north and south respectively of Taupiri. These names were innovative in that they described in Pākehā terms what was, for Pākehā, new locations, yet in another sense they were mundane transfers of commonly understood meanings that were applied by Pākehā to similar features throughout the world. Lower and Upper parts of a river are those sections closest to the mouth and closest to the source respectively. The Middle reaches are in between Upper and Lower. A basin is a tract drained by a river and its tributaries. Using these definitions, it is clear that these labels make complete sense when describing the particular places identified. While the names Lower Waikato Basin and Middle Waikato Basin have not gained great currency outside specialised geographical texts, Hochstetter’s labels were an important example of the imposition of European concepts of geology and geography onto the Waikato. This was perfectly
consistent with European naming conventions and practices and it did bring the Waikato into the realm of Pākehā geographic understanding. It did so, however, in a way that did not mesh with Māori understandings of the regions and sub-regions so described and it also co-opted and to some extent colonised the name Waikato in the process. The region was defined by Hochstetter’s reconnaissance and subsequently by the use of this information by cartographer and lithographer, according to a European epistemological framework. The classification of the natural world had become an important aspect of European scientific practice which was one of the aspects of their culture that fuelled their sense of superiority over non-European peoples, including Māori. The consolidation of these knowledges through their permanent publication on maps added a reciprocal sense of scientific validity and power of the catalogue. The power of photographic representations was also seen for the first time in the Waikato in the work of Bruno Hamel who was the photographer included in the Hochstetter reconnaissance.

**Hamel the Photographist**

The circumstances of Bruno Hamel’s inclusion on the Hochstetter expedition are not well documented and much of Hamel’s life and work prior and subsequent to this event remain mysterious. What is known is that six albums of photographs that were taken during his journey with Hochstetter survive, and that these constitute his entire surviving photographic legacy. The Auckland Provincial Council paid Hamel for
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45 The slightly unusual description ‘photographist’ comes from John Webster, ‘Mr Hamel The Photographist’, in Ferdinand Hochstetter and the Contribution of German-Speaking Scientists to New Zealand Natural History in the Nineteenth Century, ed. by James Braund, Germanica Pacifica, Volume 10 (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang GmbH, 2012). Webster took the term from a contemporary newspaper report of the Hochstetter expedition.

46 Webster identifies four albums, but Auckland City Libraries Photograph Historian Keith Giles wrote in an email message: ‘My understanding is there are 6 Hamel albums known to exist – ours [at the Auckland Public Library], 1 at the Auckland Museum, 2 in Nelson, 1 in Wellington, and 1 found recently by Sascha Nolden in Switzerland’ Keith Giles, ‘Hamel
forty prints, and, according to John Webster, the *New Zealander* newspaper reported that Hamel had taken “fifty or sixty views” on the expedition. The photographs reproduced here form part of the album of thirty five prints housed in the Sir George Grey Special Collections at the Auckland City Library. The albums, as was typical of the times, contain slightly different numbers and arrangements of images, as they were likely to have been compiled specifically for a particular purchaser. Ten of these images feature Waikato scenes, with the remainder including a portrait of Hochstetter, some Auckland views and, the majority, scenes of the Rotorua region. The collection of images is part record of geological and landscape features, the investigation of which was a primary purpose of the expedition, and part travelogue of the journey itself. While the effect is to emphasise a Pākehā presence, it is not surprising that one of the common subjects of Hamel’s photographs was the mission stations and other accommodation enjoyed by the party in the Waikato and elsewhere on their expedition. Considering the cumbersome equipment, and the technical procedures associated with wet plate photography, it would have made sense to use the relatively greater leisure of these stops to make images. The Waikato scenes include views of the Waikato and Waipā Rivers, the mission stations and schools at Taupiri and Ōtāwhao, and some taken at Kāwhia.

**Figs 3.5 and 3.6** were probably taken on 10 March 1859. Hochstetter remarked, after returning from climbing a nearby hill at Rangiriri that day, that he ‘found some well-executed photographs ready of the landscapes along the river’. The production of these images was somewhat of a relief to Hochstetter and an indication to him
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47 John Webster, ‘Mr Hamel The Photographist’, p. 291.
48 Webster, p. 291.
Fig 3.5 Rangiriri
Photograph by Bruno Hamel (1859)
Sir George Grey Special Collections, Auckland Libraries, 7-A158
https://tinyurl.com/y9tgytbx

Fig 3.6 Waikato River, Rangiriri
Photograph by Bruno Hamel (1859)
Sir George Grey Special Collections, Auckland Libraries, 7-A15827
https://tinyurl.com/yc4d2tx3
that the inclusion of Hamel and his equipment, ‘the transportation of which was necessarily connected with great difficulty,’\textsuperscript{50} would not be a wasted effort. The ‘great difficulty’ was borne out during the journey when, on at least three occasions, Hamel, with Māori porters, travelled separately to Hochstetter, as the terrain and locations of features of interest to the scientist were deemed inaccessible to the photographer. Hamel had been included in the party at the request of Hochstetter who must have been anxious that the considerable inconvenience and risks associated with the incorporation of a relatively new technology, in the hands of an unknown practitioner, would be justified by the potential rewards. Perhaps this is because of the early reputation of photography for objectivity and realism which promoted photography as a perfect scientific accompaniment. It was thought that photographic images constituted both ‘natural and neutral vision’, an unfiltered replication of ‘the picture on the retina of the human eye.’\textsuperscript{51} Whereas artists—Sydney Parkinson on the\textit{ Endeavour}, for example—had long travelled with scientific expeditions in order to produce a visual record of both natural and cultural phenomena, the supposed ability of the camera to bypass human agency was more suited to the empiricist ambitions of contemporary science. Hochstetter may have been influenced by this kind of thinking, but he was also pragmatic enough to realise that, despite its mechanical origins, photographic equipment in the hands of a less than skilled operator would have been a significant waste of time and resources. In any case, Hamel proved a success. Photographic historians Main and Turner go so far as to assert that Hamel’s images ‘lose nothing in comparison with photographs from contemporary overseas expeditions.’\textsuperscript{52}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{50} Hochstetter,\textit{ New Zealand: Its Physical Geography, Geology and Natural History}, p. 301. \\
\textsuperscript{51} Mary Warner Marien,\textit{ Photography: A Cultural History} (London: Laurence King, 2002), p. 23. \\
\textsuperscript{52} William Main and John B. Turner,\textit{ New Zealand Photography from the 1840s to the Present = Nga Whakaahua O Aotearoa Mai I 1840 Ki Naiatei} (Auckland, N.Z.: Published by}
\end{flushright}
Fig 3.7 Maori School Taupiri. Revd. B.G. Ashwell’s
Photograph by Bruno Hamel (1859)
Sir George Grey Special Collections, Auckland Libraries, 7-A15830
https://tinyurl.com/yaxew9eg

Fig 3.8 Mission Station Taupiri
Photograph by Bruno Hamel (1859)
Sir George Grey Special Collections, Auckland Libraries, 7-A15853
https://tinyurl.com/y8fp6klw
Paul Carter described the ‘literature of spatial history’ as ‘written traces which, but for their spatial occasion, would not have come into being,’ and it is not difficult to see Hamel’s photographs in this light. Hamel’s reputation as a photographer rests entirely on these images and the images only came into existence because Hamel accompanied Hochstetter. Hamel clearly had some autonomy over where to point his camera and how to frame his views but the occasion of the photograph was constrained, if not dictated, by the demands, and the itinerary, of the expedition. This, of course, is also true of the journey more generally and of the maps and even the book that was subsequently published. Hochstetter’s *The Geology of New Zealand: In Explanation of The Geographical and Topographical Atlas of New Zealand* included engraved versions of Figs 3.5 and 3.7, among others. These particular images were chosen to illustrate the text and so became embedded in the narrative of the expedition. The remaining images in the album have become disconnected from the spatial occasion of their creation. They have been decontextualised further by their more recent availability as searchable, individual items on the Auckland Public Libraries website from where they were collected for this work. The picture record does not reference the album, although it does acknowledge the Hochstetter expedition as the context of each image. The description of the image *Fig 3.7 Maori School Taupiri* takes the opportunity to describe in further detail Ashwell’s mission station and its school: ‘The mission school (also a boarding school), was considered one of the finest in the country and received grants from the governor’s fund until the outbreak of war in the Waikato in 1863 when Ashwell had to withdraw to Auckland.’

---

54 ‘Maori School Taupiri. Revd. B.G. Ashwell’s.’, *Auckland City Libraries Ngā Whare Mātauranga*
school, however. We do not see a classroom and students at work, but, rather, people outside the Mission building assembled for the photograph. The occasion we are witnessing is the occasion of the photograph itself, and the scene is unlikely to have occurred at all if not for the photographer’s presence.

Regardless of, and perhaps irrelevant to, the reputation and subsequent destiny of Ashwell’s mission, the occasion of the photograph was probably on 13 March 1859. Hochstetter had arrived on the afternoon of the 11th, finding it ‘cheering [...] to see once more a European house for the first time since we had left Mangatawhiri’. 55

On 12 March Hochstetter had climbed Taupiri and imagined the ‘more charming’ future European Waikato already mentioned above. 13 March was a Sunday and, as Hochstetter noted, and as Dieffenbach had already had cause to lament, ‘the Sabbath in New Zealand [was] kept by both Europeans and natives, with still greater puritanic severity, than in England.’ This necessitated another day in Taupiri, although Hochstetter was happy to interrupt his journey for a day’s rest. 56 The travelling party was treated to the hospitality of Mrs Ashwell, whose husband was away, and the day’s programme of worship, food and schoolwork was described in detail. Hochstetter was very impressed by the school and its ninety four pupils (‘46 girls and 48 boys of different age’ 57), particularly their ‘geographical acquirements’, being able to point out on the map as they did the ‘course of the Danube and the situation of Vienna’ 58. Hochstetter was especially complimentary of the sacrifices made by the Ashwells and their role in the ‘education and civilization of a people, that but a few decades

55 Hochstetter, New Zealand: Its Physical Geography, Geology and Natural History, p. 303.
57 Hochstetter, New Zealand: Its Physical Geography, Geology and Natural History, pp. 307-08.
58 Hochstetter, New Zealand: Its Physical Geography, Geology and Natural History, p. 308.
Fig 3.9 Limestone Rocks, Rakau Nui Kawhia
Photograph by Bruno Hamel (1859)
Sir George Grey Special Collections, Auckland Libraries, 7-A15834
https://tinyurl.com/y77hlnh3

Fig 3.10 Limestone Rocks, Rakau Nui Kawhia
Photograph by Bruno Hamel (1859)
Sir George Grey Special Collections, Auckland Libraries, 7-A15835
https://tinyurl.com/ycqmm9oc
ago was steeped in barbarity. The ‘objective’ scientist was no doubt unaware of the prejudice that coloured what he considered to be empirical observations and to be critical of this is perhaps unfair and ‘presentist’. The point is that science, and scientists like Hochstetter, worked overtly and explicitly in collaboration with colonisation and provided convincing and important rationales and justifications for colonial projects like that in the Waikato. Hochstetter had no doubt that Waikato would be improved by the Europeanisation of its indigenous people and landscapes. Even at that time, the implications of this must have been clear.

While Hamel made photographs of the locations and occasions of human encounters which can be read as a kind of travelogue, as befitting the scientific brief, he also recorded geological formations and landscapes. Fig 3.6 is an example and is reminiscent of later album images of Lakes Tarawera and Rotomahana at Rotorua in the large expanse of water depicted. At Kāwhia, where Hochstetter found and collected fossils, Hamel made several photographs including Fig 3.9 and Fig 3.10. The limestone outcrops pictured were described by Hochstetter as ‘picturesque rock sceneries in the shape of towers, walls and ruins, from which circumstance the settlers have given to this portion of the Kawhia Harbour the name of “New Zealand Helvetia.”’ On the map, Fig 3.4, reproduced above, the stretch where the Rakaunui River joins the harbour is labelled ‘Picturesque Rocks of Limestone’ and the hills beyond are named ‘Whenua-pu Mount’, Castle Hills or the Switzerland of New Zealand.’ Hochstetter seems to have been genuinely interested in Māori names and this bi-lingual nomenclature is not uncommon on his maps and in his book. Given his attitude to colonisation already described, however, it must be questioned whether

59 Hochstetter, New Zealand: Its Physical Geography, Geology and Natural History, p. 309.
the primacy given to Māori names was in the attempt to give his maps an exotic flavour for their intended contemporary (European) readership.

Perhaps these examples were particularly ‘picturesque’ or merely more accessible, or the light was better, but it is difficult to know why these limestone formations became the subject of these photographs and this thesis, rather than the numerous others at Aorea and Whāingaroa that were commented on by Hochstetter but photographs of which do not survive. Hochstetter may himself have become confused as the copies of **Fig 3.9** and **Fig 3.10** in the Hochstetter Collection in Basel are captioned with the location as Aotea.\(^6^0\) In *New Zealand: Its Physical Geography, Geology and Natural History*, an engraving of a detail of the image in **Fig 3.10** which focuses on the rock formations, is correctly captioned ‘Limestone rocks on the Rakaunui river, Kawhia Harbour.’\(^6^1\) An interesting point about these images is that they form a panorama when viewed side by side. On the very left of **Fig 3.9** can be seen the ghostly edge of the small boat featured prominently in **Fig 3.10**, and the background hills and the foreground shore match up precisely. A third image forms part of the panorama in Hochstetter’s Basel collection and is featured in Nolden and Nolden’s published documentation of that collection.\(^6^2\) According to John Webster, many of Hamel’s images were parts of panoramic views, a testament to his technical skill as a photographer.\(^6^3\) Hochstetter was interested in these geological features not merely for their ‘picturesqueness’. What he also saw was a possible repository of fossils, and he collected both ammonites and belemnites from different locations in the west coast harbours. His map of Aotea and Kāwhia harbours (**Fig 3.4**) contains
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\(^{62}\) Nolden and Nolden, ii, pp. 48, 49.

\(^{63}\) Webster, p. 289.
reference to locations of these fossils. The photograph **Fig 3.11** is simply captioned ‘Kawhia’, although the notes identify the specific location of Takatahi on the southern side of the harbour. The caption accompanying the version of this image in the Basel collection again misidentifies the harbour as Aotea, but offers the further description as the location of the first New Zealand belemnites. Naturally enough, these fossils and their collection were of interest to Hochstetter. Nor is it surprising that the journey and its subsequent record in photographs and other means were skewed in this direction. Hamel was interested in these locations and views because Hochstetter was interested in them. These particular images were created because of the spatial occasion of the expedition and the particular circumstances that called for, and allowed for, the application of the photographic equipment to make them. But they did not make themselves. Hamel’s voice has been lost somewhat and his specific motivations appear irretrievable. Hochstetter collected (some of) them along
with his fossils and other specimens, and used them to help narrate and illustrate his journey of reconnaissance. His scientific ‘exploration’, ‘empirical’ observation, collection and classification framed large parts of the Waikato and this knowledge and its representations predicted and abetted the invasion to come.

**Conclusion**

This scientific reconnaissance created a catalogue of the Waikato and brought its specific locations and landscapes into the realm of Pākehā frameworks of knowledge and understanding. By framing the region through language and through images, they asserted their dominion at the expense of the locals and they claimed the future for Pākehā. It is not my intention to criticise either Dieffenbach or Hochstetter personally for their words or actions, which were usually measured and moderate for their time. Nor is ‘science’ itself to blame. The then dominant paradigm of natural science held human hierarchies to be ‘facts’. But it is not unfair to highlight the role of Māori locals in sharing local knowledge that enabled the journeys in the first place. Both Dieffenbach and Hochstetter used Māori guides in their exploration, but both were dismissive, to a greater or lesser extent, of the information and assistance they provided, unless, filtered through their own preconceptions, it could be incorporated into their own constructions and representations of knowledge. Hochstetter saw no irony in stealing a carved Māori figure, despite the objections of the owners whom he designated savages.64 This kind of casual disrespect may have been a sign of the times, and the ‘collection’ of such ‘curiosities’ might even have been scientific. The effect of these actions and attitudes, however, was the dispossession and domination of Māori by Pākehā. Despite what they considered were good intentions, this outcome was
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64 Hochstetter, *New Zealand: Its Physical Geography, Geology and Natural History*, p. 454.
clearly foreseen by these cataloguists of colonisation and, indeed, was always part of the plan.
PART B

Invasion
On 12 July 1863 a contingent of British Army troops under the leadership of General Duncan Cameron crossed the Mangatāwhiri Stream and in so doing launched a military invasion of the Waikato. The fighting lasted until April 1864 when the final battle of this phase of the ‘Land Wars’ concluded at Ōrākau near the border of what subsequently became known as the King Country. This section of the thesis is concerned with this military invasion, but the colonisation of the Waikato did not begin or end with the military action. While the British military invasion in 1863-64 was extremely important in the imposition of Pākehā authority in the Waikato, it was part of a longer-lasting and further-reaching discursive invasion. Europeans claimed the right to define the Waikato well before the first shots of the military campaign were fired in 1863. Gradually, facilitated by the military victory but not completed by it, Pākehā were able to control the discursive meaning of the Waikato. Not only was the land brought under Pākehā political and economic control, but the dominant cultural conceptions of land, and the ways in which it was valued, owned and used, were claimed by Pākehā too. The intrusion of Pākehā people into Waikato spaces was motivated by ideological, as well as practical considerations. The Waikato was (re) constructed and, in some ways, (re)placed in the process.

I have emphasised ‘land’ as a significant motivating factor in the Pākehā invasion of the Waikato but this it is not universally accepted that this was the main reason
for the conflict. The names of wars are often controversial, loaded as they are
with ascribed causes and attributed blame. The ‘Land Wars’ of the 1860s in New
Zealand are no exception. Historians have long debated this issue and have often
felt compelled to justify the particular name they have chosen, and to explain why
other alternatives are less appropriate. Alan Ward offered a ‘reconsideration’ of
the ‘Anglo-Māori Wars’ in 1967\(^1\) which, as Belich later pointed out, provided ‘an
effective critique of the mono-causal Land Wars theory.’\(^2\) Ward claimed that those
who had most to gain from the opening up of Waikato lands to Pākehā settlement,
such as the speculators and colonial politicians Whitaker and Russell (see chapters
4 and 5), had little input into the decisions to wage war made by the governors. As
Belich succinctly put it, ‘the settlers may have had the motives, but they did not
have the means.’\(^3\) Belich emphasised the desire to impose substantive sovereignty as
the main cause of Pākehā belligerence. Claudia Orange agreed, writing of ‘A War of
Sovereignty’ in her book *The Treaty of Waitangi*.\(^4\) Orange and Belich both traced the
discord that came to a head in the 1860s back to the different understandings of the
agreement concluded in the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840. The British assumed that
Māori cession of sovereignty in Article 1 left Pākehā in total control over the whole
country and all of its inhabitants, including Māori, in exchange for a guarantee of
land ownership rights. Māori, on the other hand, understood that the kawanatanga
(government or governorship) ceded in Article 1 of the Māori version applied only
to the settlers and that the guarantee of tino rangatiratanga (full chieftainship) in
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1 Alan Ward, ‘The Origins of the Anglo-Maori Wars: A Reconsideration’, *New Zealand Journal of
History*, 1.2 (1967).
2 James Belich, *The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict*
4 Claudia Orange, *The Treaty of Waitangi* (Wellington, N.Z: Bridget Williams Books with
assistance from the Historical Publications Branch, Dept. of Internal Affairs, 1992).
Article 2 left their chiefs in control of their people and territory. By the 1850s, this particular contradiction was becoming a major source of friction. Both Māori and Pākehā references to the Treaty of Waitangi to support their respective positions emphasised this aspect. British sovereignty meant that Māori could own land but must submit to Pākehā authority, whereas Māori rangatiratanga meant Māori chiefs retained their authority over, as well as ownership of, their territory and its occupants, both Māori and Pākehā. The impasse around just who controlled New Zealand lingered due to an initial British inability to impose the sovereignty they desired over well-organised and more numerous Māori, whose chiefs’ authority still extended over most of the country not already occupied by Pākehā.

While Belich has dismissed the Land Wars name as suggesting a mono-causal and therefore unsatisfactory explanation, he also sets out a plausible scenario which can be used to support the Land Wars as an appropriate label after all. The term ‘land’ has been used in debates about the wars almost exclusively to refer to an economic resource. Ward and Belich dismissed settler desire for land as a major contributing factor because, although this ‘land hunger’ was evident, those who hungered the most did not have the power to obtain it by force. The governors used the British Army to crush Māori resistance to the imposition of Pākehā sovereignty, and this was particularly true of the Waikato which was the seat of the main symbol of this resistance – the Kīngitanga. As Belich himself points out, the main mechanism of the transfer of sovereignty from Māori to Pākehā hands, before, during and after the war, was land sales. As Danny Keenan has noted, from a Māori perspective, ‘far from being monocausal, the land was always the most important issue into which many

5 This gloss is probably at bit simplistic as there were several treaty versions and a number of meetings and signings around the country.
others flowed." In this section, I argue that the link between land and sovereignty was well understood by Pākehā as well.

Belich saw the New Zealand that emerged between the Treaty of Waitangi and the ‘Land Wars’ as ‘the heyday of New Zealand race relations.’ This bold claim is based on a rough parity between two zones or spheres – one controlled by Pākehā and the other by Māori. This ‘heyday’ was not how Pākehā saw it at the time as, while they expected to control the whole of the country, they had to be content with nominal sovereignty over the regions dominated by Māori iwi and hapū. During the 1840s and 1850s the Māori zone was contracting and the Pākehā zone was expanding due to ongoing land sales. As Belich points out, during this period land sales were comparable to the Louisiana Purchase where more than simple ownership rights were transferred. When the emergence of the Kīngitanga threatened to ‘put a stop to process by which Māori independence was being gradually and peacefully eroded,’ the situation quickly escalated. From a Māori point of view, and this was clearly understood by the respective governors, land as an economic resource and land as political territory were indivisible. Speculators like Whitaker and Russell were able to gain economic benefit from the conquest and confiscation of Waikato lands and the distribution of land to soldiers helped finance the war. But these were by-products of the invasion. Māori independence and Māori land ownership amounted to the same thing, and removing the latter destroyed the former. Māori economic independence was destroyed at the same time. For Māori, land loss remains a symbolic as well as practical reminder of the destruction of their rangatiratanga. From a Pākehā

8 Belich, The New Zealand Wars, p. 78.
9 Belich, The New Zealand Wars, p. 79.
perspective, the control of Waikato lands was also symbolic as well as practical. At the end of the military hostilities, Pākehā control over the Waikato was still nominal. Confiscation and occupation were resisted by the land itself as we shall see in chapters 5, 6 and 7. One of the most significant consequences of the Land Wars, and a key outcome of the confiscations and the operations of the Native Land Court, was the Europeanisation of land tenure throughout the Waikato and elsewhere. Assertions of the control of land extended to the conceptualisation of land, its uses and organisation. So the invasion of Waikato was a significant part of the ‘Land Wars’. Furthermore, the confiscations, attempts at military settlement and the Native Land Court were not only fruits of invasion but can be seen as invasions in themselves.

According to Belich, Gore Browne made plans to launch a military invasion of the Waikato before he was replaced as Governor by Grey. Grey took up the plan but ‘with much better preparation.’\(^{10}\) In fact, Vincent O’Malley provides a compelling case that Grey returned to New Zealand already determined to provoke a showdown with the Kingitanga. According to O’Malley, outgoing governor Gore Browne had tried to organise meetings with some key Māori figures for Grey on his arrival. Browne’s annotation in his copy of Gorst’s *The Maori King* reveals that the uncle of the Kingi, Tamati Ngapora, ‘remained aloof for some time’. Browne told Grey he ‘did not think this looked well. He [Grey] replied I think it is well for I want an excuse to take the Waikato.’\(^{11}\) This revealing exchange was corroborated by Harriet Browne, also quoted by O’Malley, who wrote: ‘I heard him with my own ears tell Col Browne he hoped the natives would not submit as it would be much better for both races that they should be conquered’\(^{12}\)
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12 O’Malley, p. 150.
Grey, an astute propagandist, did not announce a war of conquest and appropriation—the imperial government would not have approved or financed such a venture. Instead, Grey used rumours of an imminent attack on Auckland to frame his actions as defensive. Moreover, he emphasised what he viewed as the illegitimacy of the Kīngitanga’s organised defence of Māori rangatiratanga which was most visible in its opposition to land sales. Grey, and Pākehā in general, saw this opposition as amounting to duplicity and even treason. One of the key motives, then, in invading the Waikato was to teach ‘rebel’ Māori a lesson. The most effective way of removing the political and economic capacity of the Kīngitanga to resist Pākehā sovereignty was to remove the source of their sustenance—their land. Grey understood the symbolism as well as the practicality of displacing the tangata whenua from their whenua. From a Pākehā perspective, the term ‘Waikato’ came, in the 1860s, to be synonymous with danger and menace. Pākehā assertions of control and the extension of colonial power were normalised and the ‘Waikatos’ became ‘rebels.’ On 9 July 1863, Governor George Grey issued the following proclamation:

**IMPORTANT PROCLAMATIONS.**

**NATIVES ORDERED TO TAKE OATHS OF ALLEGIANCE AND GIVE UP ARMS.**

**NOTICE.**

To the Natives of Mangere, Pukaki, Ihumatao
Te Rimiki, Patumahoe, Pokeno, and Tuakau.

All persons of the native race living in the Manukau district, and the Waikato frontier, are hereby required immediately to take the Oath of Allegiance to her Majesty the Queen, and to give up their arms to an officer appointed by the Government for that purpose. Natives who comply with this order will be protected.

Natives refusing to do so are hereby warned forthwith to leave the district aforesaid, and retire to Waikato, beyond Mangatawhiri.

In case of their not complying with this order, they will be ejected.

By his Excellency’s order.

Auckland, July 9th, 1863.

---

13 Tangata whenua, literally the people of the land, is a Māori way of describing someone as local (as opposed to manuhiri, or visitor). It implies a legitimacy of occupancy and sense of identity which are important for individuals, hapū and iwi. As a result, separating tangata from their particular whenua destroys more than property rights.

14 Printed in English and Māori in *The Colonist*, Friday July 17, 1863, p. 3.
Grey followed this up with a further proclamation dated July 13 which claimed it was necessary ‘for the protection of all, to establish posts at several points on the Waikato river,’ and that those ‘evil-disposed people’ who wage war against Her Majesty, or remain in arms, threatening the lives of her peaceable subjects must take the consequences of their acts, and they must understand that they will forfeit the right to the possession of their lands guaranteed to them by the Treaty of Waitangi, which lands will be occupied by a population capable of protecting for the future the quiet and unoffending from the violence with which they are now so constantly threatened.15

In these proclamations, Grey described an enemy in geographic terms. ‘Waikato’ was conflated with Kingitanga and with ‘rebel’. Grey’s definition of the Waikato was not based on geological features or economic potential as Hochstetter’s had been a few year’s previously. Grey was constructing political space.

The Waikato frontier was defined, at that point, as that region north of the Mangatāwhiri River but not (yet) fully in Pākehā hands. Pākehā claimed jurisdiction over the frontier but by using that term they were acknowledging that it was contested space. Frontier was also a term of intention. It was a direction towards which the colonists felt compelled to move, both in time and space. Frontiers were not static spaces but temporary stages between ‘savage’ nature and ‘civilised’ culture. Some writers of colonial encounters have begun to avoid the term frontier because it is ‘grounded within a European expansionist perspective’16 and therefore does not convey the sense of negotiated space where contact between people was dynamic and multi-dimensional. But in this context I consciously employ ‘frontier’ because, I argue, Grey’s use of the term explicitly denied the possibility of a negotiated space and reflected European notions of sovereignty, which saw this form of authority as

whole and indivisible. The Waikato frontier was a European concept and its use by Grey in his proclamation should have alerted Waikato Māori and Pākehā settlers alike of his intention to invade.

Grey’s use of the name ‘Waikato’ does not refer to the same place that was understood by Waikato Māori to be defined by that appellation. It is not simply that Grey reduced the sides of the conflict to an ‘us and them’ binary where Waikato was the place of recalcitrant and ‘evil-disposed people.’ In expressing his definition of Waikato, in part through his delineation of the Waikato frontier, Grey announced his intention to invade and to claim the discursive space and to conceive it according to Pākehā perceptions of land ownership, use and organisation. This ‘claiming by naming’ is a similar process to that described by historian Giselle Byrnes whose study of surveying in New Zealand demonstrated how ‘settlers transformed the colony from an unwritten “space” into a known and named “place”.’¹⁷ Yet, in the case of Waikato, the local name was not superseded by an exotic label from the cultural repertoire of the colonists. This kind of renaming did occur within the Waikato as it did elsewhere. Some of these names survive to the present, like Hamilton and Mercer (named for fallen British officers), and others have failed to stand the test of time, such as Queenstown and then Newcastle (Ngāruawāhia), Alexandra (Pirongia) and Oxford (Tīrau). But, despite the persistence of ‘Waikato’, this should not be seen as a continuity of meaning. The continued use of some place names, and the revival of others, may suggest limits on the power of the colonisers to impose complete control—that the processes of colonisation were contingent and negotiated. This is not completely untrue, as the imposition of a name (or not) did not necessarily
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involve a transfer of power over the place so described. But the places did not have agency to name (or rename) themselves and the colonisers claimed more than a simple designation of a place by naming. They also claimed the right to impose names, which they did without necessarily taking into account of Māori identities or traditions. The place ‘Waikato’ was not renamed, but the name ‘Waikato’ was re-placed — the label, from a European point of view, described a different spatial entity. The geographical location was not dissimilar but its discursive parameters and the ways in which it was imagined and implemented were completely different. Grey’s use of the name at that point was a provisional claim to a Pākehā Waikato. The war still had to be fought and won in order for the Pākehā understanding of ‘Waikato’ to be imposed on the ground. Māori meanings of Waikato did not disappear but they were subordinated by the definition imposed by the invading power. Following the battle of Ōrākau in April 1864, the frontier was pushed back to the Pūniu River and the territory to the south became (and still is) known as the King Country. To reinforce the conquest over ‘Waikato’, the region was prescribed by statute and map and, fulfilling Grey’s threat, confiscated. This act precipitated a further invasion by military settlers whose assault was transferred to the Waikato landscape.

In order to know, claim and own new land in a discursive sense, Pākehā needed to imagine their place within it as well as imaginatively configuring the unfamiliar landscape in more familiar ways. Maps and photographs had significant roles in expressing and reproducing the kinds of imaginary geographies that helped colonists feel at home in alien lands. The landscapes took a great deal more taming in reality than in the imagination, however. Images of the appearances of ‘civilisation’, for Pākehā this meant the trappings of cultural practices and artifacts from their own traditions, could be comforting to colonial and wider imperial audiences despite
the unfinished nature of their transformation and even their portrayal of seemingly insurmountable obstacles. They can be seen as projections of the future and the confident expectation of the success of the colonial project. Cartographers had rather more leeway in this respect than did photographers. Notwithstanding the possibility from the very earliest days for post-exposure manipulation in the darkroom, once photographers had selected their viewpoint and composition they were generally restricted to portraying a version of what actually existed. Cartographers were under no such constraints. Waikato maps of this period frequently contained elements that were yet to exist in reality and which commonly proved to be completely illusory. Whole towns were drawn up with streets arranged neatly in grids and boasting attractive and important features which never saw the light of day.

Maps and photographs were used as part of a process designed to impose European political power and cultural norms on Waikato landscapes and people. As the shots of the military invasion died away following the Battle at Ōrākau in the Autumn of 1864, the discursive invasion gathered pace. Although there were to be no more military battles, the soldiers did not all immediately leave. The plan to plant an occupying force in the Waikato military settlements and their hinterlands was designed not only to embed a controlling force and defensive bulwark against a possible further Māori outbreak, but also to seed the Waikato landscape with Pākehā values and cultural practices. The defeat of Kingitanga forces and the displacement of many of Waikato’s tangata whenua were not sufficient victory from the point of view of Pākehā whose civilising mission extended to the land itself. Progress, from this perspective, would involve the Europeanisation of land use and organisation. Following the end of the fighting, the colonial government asserted its victory by confiscating a great proportion of Waikato lands as punishment for
the ‘rebels’. But the land was taken with little regard to the actual role of its owners in the hostilities recently brought to a close. The rough and ready calculation of the raupatu is a good indication of the lack of actual control on the ground that could be imposed by Pākehā despite their ‘victory’. Prominent geological features were joined cartographically to form an encircled but largely arbitrarily defined region.

The Waikato was still at this point, from a Pākehā point of view, better imagined than known. The end of the fighting brought an influx of Europeans who continued the invasion in the sense that they set about defining and organising the Waikato in ways that made sense to them and that extended and confirmed Pākehā control. However, the Waikato landscape, like its people, proved to be far from a pushover in this regard and many of the early attempts to depict the Waikato in Pākehā terms were more hopeful than real. Many of those initially charged with the task of unleashing the productive potential of the Waikato’s agricultural acres failed miserably in the face of the daunting reality of primeval bush and impenetrable swamp. The failure of individuals did not permanently undermine the colonising project in the Waikato. A number of discursive practices sustained and reinforced the processes involved in reconfiguring the Waikato in Pākehā terms. In the invasion of the Waikato, cartography and photography were important examples and repositories of these discursive practices. Among these practices were framing, naming, norming and claiming. These are all examined in the chapters to follow. The representation of the Waikato within a Pākehā framework and the renaming of its important places and features were important ways of imposing Pākehā cultural norms and asserting a claim to cultural as well as political supremacy in the Waikato.
While the British military invasion of the Waikato commenced in July 1863, the
discursive invasion began much earlier. Governors Thomas Gore Browne (1855-
1861) and George Grey (1845-53 and 1861-1868) took the view that the installation
of a Māori King and the involvement of Kīngitanga forces in the conflict in Taranaki
demanded a military response to crush what they saw as a ‘native insurrection’. By
the time fighting broke out in Taranaki over the Waitara Purchase, tension had
been building for some time. In May 1861, Gore Browne issued an ultimatum
requiring the submission of Kīngitanga Māori to the sovereignty of the crown.¹ Gore
Browne appealed to the Treaty of Waitangi to remind Māori of what he viewed as
their responsibilities, while making a thinly veiled threat that the protection of their
land rights enshrined in the treaty was dependant on their acquiescence to Pākehā
sovereign authority. He wrote: ‘Whenever the Maoris forfeit this protection, by
setting aside the authority of the Queen and the Law, the land will remain their own
so long only as they are strong enough to keep it.’² Gore Browne did not declare war
on the Waikato in 1861, nor did he explicitly threaten to confiscate the lands of the
adversaries of the crown – these came later – but preparations for these eventualities
began more or less immediately.

¹ ‘Further Papers Relative to the Native Insurrection’, AJHR, E-1B (1861).
² ‘Further Papers Relative to the Native Insurrection’, AJHR, E-1B (1861).
This chapter explores the archive of a military photographer, as well as official government maps, to demonstrate how these images supported, as well as recorded, discursive invasions of the Waikato. I argue invasion was well underway by the time military conflict broke out and that, even during the fighting war, further invasions were planned and executed. This chapter demonstrates that these invasions are visible through a close reading of the images and an examination of the contexts of their creation. The maps and photographs examined here illustrate attempts to normalise Pākehā presence and claims over the control of Waikato spaces. They were, and remain, important texts in the ‘literature of invasion’.

Capturing Ground: Photographic Invasions

William Temple’s photographs featured here recorded an invasion of the Waikato, if not specifically the better known military one. Temple was an Assistant Surgeon in the Royal Artillery Regiment of the British Army and he was actively involved in the military invasion of the Waikato in 1863-64. He was awarded a Victoria Cross for his bravery during the battle of Rangiriri in November 1863. But these images pre-date that military invasion and do not feature guns or battles. According to most modern definitions, they do not feature the Waikato either. Yet, in the context of the times they were taken, these photographs clearly represent an important phase in the discursive colonial invasion of the Waikato.

The photograph **Fig 4.1, Deviation on the road to Waikato, made by the Royal Artillery, through Williamson’s clearing**, captures a stage in the construction of the Great South Road from Drury to Pokeno during 1862 and 1863. The original version of the photograph reproduced here is in the Urquhart Album at the Alexander Turnbull Library. The album is a collection of images compiled by Lieutenant C. J.
Urquhart of the 65th Regiment. It includes scenes associated with the Taranaki and Waikato campaigns by a number of photographers, including John Nicol Crombie and John Kinder. Seventeen of the photographs are attributed to William Temple. The photographic print has been trimmed of its top corners, possibly to remove areas of non-image due to the intrusion of the photographer’s fingers onto the plate during the application of collodion solution. The text beneath the image identifies some of the soldiers depicted, from left: Lt Hunter, R.E. Officer in charge; Capt. Watson R.A.; and Lt. Magnis R.A., as well as pointing out the ‘New bridge’ and, at right, a ‘Dead Rimu (red pine tree)’. Another three people are unnamed. Williamson’s Clearing, now the site of Bombay township, was the location of one of five redoubts
on the road built to protect the line of supply to the rear of Cameron’s troops as they prepared to advance south across the Mangatāwhiri Stream. The widening of the road and the clearing of bush from its edges pictured was made necessary by the success of Kingite raiding parties which harassed and disrupted the British supply and reinforcement columns.³

The intention of the photographer, with the co-operation of the subjects of the images, was clearly to record the activities of the soldier road-builders as well as the progress of the object of their work. As such, it exemplifies a number of emerging discourses of photographic representation. The military photograph became an important genre of early photographic practice. Regiments like the Royal Engineers and the Royal Artillery, Temple’s unit, were early adopters of the new technology.⁴ This was not yet ‘war photography’ as it was to become, due to the fact that the technology was not suited to the dynamic action of the battlefield. Nevertheless, images of the Crimean War and the American Civil War, for example, became very well known during the period. Neatly arranged rows of British tents differed little whether they were actually in Sebastopol or Drury—yet in each of these locations, static army encampments were deemed worthy of photographic representation.⁵ It was also typical for the class and gender biases of Victorian Britons to be reflected in the emphasis on the activities of the officers and the general absence of women subjects, except in certain circumstances. The framing of military endeavour in this

³ For an extensive account of the construction of the Great South Road during this period, see Maurice Lennard, The Road to War: The 1863 Redoubts of South Auckland: A Narrative of the Making of the Great South Road to the Waikato River and the Establishment of the Redoubts and Military Strong Points Protecting It, and of the Conflicts Between Pakeha and Maori Culminating at the End of the Road in the Battle of Rangiriri (Whakatane, N.Z: Whakatane & District Historical Society, 1986). This book includes another version of the image in Fig 4.1, although here it is entitled Baird’s Hill, Road and Bridge construction by Royal Engineers, and dated 1862.
⁵ Hodgson, p. 45.
way was amplified by the collection of these images in Urquhart’s album - which can be seen as another kind of frame. The selection of images for the album by Urquhart was almost certainly a sub-set of the scenes selected for photographing by Temple. For both men, no doubt part of their purpose (perhaps their main, overriding purpose) was to record their direct experience and these images could be seen as souvenirs—bearing in mind that selfies were not yet practical alternatives, Temple himself does not feature in many of the images attributed to him. The archive is thus framed by these men and their priorities which are not explicitly available. It is not a remote possibility that the selection would have been slanted towards positive views and memories. It is true that in the case of these images (and Temple’s photography more generally) the non-battlefield activities of soldiers served to demonstrate a positive side of military action. The horrors of war were absent from direct representation in these images. Viewers could vicariously take part in the victory in a way that was ‘safe, culturally sanitized and physically insulated’ without being subjected to actual (by being there) or even imaginary (by viewing a more graphic version) discomfort. The positive and progressive intent of the campaign, and more generally colonisation itself, was in this way re-presented and re-communicated.

As a result of this there is little obvious evidence in Temple’s ‘Great South Road’ images that the activities depicted were indeed a prelude to war. The road’s invasion through the environmental obstacles to safe and easy travel was rendered innocuous through images of mundane work, accentuated by the necessarily static nature of the scenes depicted. In **Fig 4.2 Scene showing Razorback Hill on the Road to Waikato**, Temple captured a small group who were stationary and posing for the camera.

Again there is evidence of work having been done, if not being done. The evidence...
of progress towards taming the ‘savage’ wilderness is equivocal. The difficulty of the terrain was highlighted and the Great South Road looked anything but ‘Great’ at that moment. Similar scenarios played out in Construction of a road to Waikato, Pokeno Hill (Fig 4.3) and Camp of the 65th Regiment near Drury, Auckland (Fig 4.4). In Fig 4.3, some men were bent over shovels or holding horses steady and wheelbarrows at the ready, and, while there is evidence of hard and intensive labour having been undertaken as the road was cut into the hillside, the work stopped and the men faced the camera for the photographic occasion. Fig 4.4, according to the inscribed album note below the image, shows men of the 65th Regiment ‘stone breaking’. In fact it shows men who presumably had been stone breaking and probably were to go back to this strenuous activity, but who were at the time of the photograph posing for

**Fig 4.2** Scene showing Razorback Hill on the road to Waikato
Photograph taken by William Temple [ca 1861]
Ref: PA1-q-250-50, Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington, New Zealand

https://tinyurl.com/y9cznptb
the photograph. As far as the actual breaking of stones is concerned, it is left to our imaginations to fill in the details.

The peaceful atmosphere of these photographs was not necessarily the photographer’s intention and the views and poses may well have been chosen for practical as much as aesthetic reasons. Contemporary photographic practice was limited by technological constraints to stationary subjects in order to avoid a blurring of the image. “Action photography” was still a genre for the future and photographers of Temple’s generation had to make the most of static scenes.\(^7\) Sometimes such a blurring was a sought-after effect, or was unavoidable due to

\(^7\) Hodgson, p. 12.
factors like uncooperative children, animals, or natural phenomena like wind and water. But most scenes were carefully contrived to be rendered as sharply as possible. In Temple’s images, there is no sense of spontaneity or candidness as, either by necessity or design, the bustle and toil of the difficult work of road building have been reduced to static displays. The illusory impression of calm, even relaxation, belies the violence and energy of tree felling, earth moving and stone breaking that has of necessity contributed to the creation of the scenes depicted, as well as the danger and tension of the fighting to come.

Notwithstanding the lack of movement or military hardware on display, however, these images clearly depict an invasion of the Waikato. The road construction was an
important part of Governor George Grey’s strategy to overcome Waikato ‘rebels’ by force of war. On his return for his second term as governor in September 1861, Grey turned his attention to the increasing tension in race relations symbolised by the emergence of the Kingitanga. Asked by Wīremu Tamihana whether he opposed the Māori King, Grey is said to have replied: ‘I shall not fight against him with the sword, but I shall dig around him till he falls of his own accord.’8 While this was clearly a metaphorical reference to undermining support for the King, Grey ordered actual digging to commence on the widening and extension of the road from Drury to the river at Pōkeno in order to facilitate and sustain military operations against Waikato. The construction of the Great South Road was a practical as well as symbolic statement of the intention to re-invent the Waikato. The section of the road as far as Drury had been completed by 1855, but travellers had to make do with simple tracks from there southwards to the Waikato River. From a military perspective, the road’s deficiencies seriously restricted the feasibility of successful invasion from the north, a point immediately grasped by Grey. He suspended the invasion planned by his predecessor, Gore-Browne, in favour of a two-pronged war and peace policy.9 His ‘war policy’ included the construction of the Great South Road.

Although the geographical locations depicted in these images fall outside most contemporary and modern Pākehā designations of the Waikato, they can be seen to, at least indirectly, include the Waikato as a subject. According to a Māori perspective, the ‘Waikato’ could be said to include territory as far north as Tāmaki (Auckland),10 and it is true that Te Wherowhero himself was living at Awhitu on the Manukau in

---

10 See, for example, the tribal pepeha discussed in the introduction.
In this sense, the images can be said to portray the Waikato. But most contemporary and modern Pākehā interpretations would place these sites outside the Waikato.

Governor George Grey, for example, in issuing his proclamation of July 9 1863 requiring Māori of the Waikato frontier to declare their allegiance to the Crown and surrender their arms or to ‘retire to Waikato, beyond Mangatāwhiri’. Today’s maps place the locations of these Temple photographs well within the Auckland City boundaries. So, by this definition, these photographs do not picture the Waikato or its invasion at all.

Yet, in another sense, the invasion of the Waikato is clearly in the frame. Three of Temple’s photographs featured here were captioned by Urquhart with the description ‘Road to Waikato’ - Figs 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3. The direction of the road’s construction was expressed as a spatial intention. Those involved in the creation of these photographs and the album collection did not at that time have the knowledge of the outcome that necessarily colours our interpretation of ‘Road to Waikato’. For them, the Waikato was their destination. As we shall see in Chapter 6, by which time the frontier has moved well to the south, frontiers are claims to conquered space. They can be seen as bridges to be crossed—arrows towards what lies beyond indicating the direction of intended action. ‘Road to Waikato’ indicated not only the destination of the troops but also the direction of colonial intention more generally.

So while the construction of the road was carried out by soldiers in support of a planned military campaign, this invasion was part of a greater campaign to control the meaning of the Waikato. The Waikato frontier was as much the subject of the

---

photographs as the soldiers constructing of the road, and the landscape was as much the object of their invasion. In Temple’s images, European intrusion into this contested space was proclaimed and celebrated by focusing on the ‘improvements’ being made. Victory in the campaign of ‘civilisation’ over ‘savagery’ was not yet assured and what we see was merely a moment in time within a lengthy process. The yet to be completed task was the taming of the Waikato frontier to the point where it would be rendered useful from a Pākehā perspective. Nature, like the natives, was an impediment to this progress and the battle to transform the landscape was an important aspect of the ‘Land’ Wars.

The photographs themselves can be seen as yet another means by which Pākehā colonised the physical and cultural spaces of the Waikato. Temple’s camera was not trained on the primeval Waikato wilderness but instead on the activities and efforts of the Europeans transforming it. The partially completed project could have evoked a range of responses from contemporary Pākehā viewers depending on whether they were a road half completed or a road still half unfinished kind of person. However, the documentary nature of the images and their collection in a souvenir album lend them a sense of celebration, even perhaps as trophies. The locations depicted here were on the margins of territory controlled by Pākehā and the clearings, roads and bridges had a symbolic importance for the colonists. The creation of farms from a primeval wilderness was driven by ideological as well as economic imperatives, and the construction of roads and bridges served a military purpose; this also represented progress in a more general sense. The inscription below the image Fig 4.1 pointed out the ‘new bridge’ and the ‘dead rimu (red pine tree)’ so as to highlight the march

of ‘civilisation’ and the conquest of ‘savage’ nature. The inclusion of soldiers and their road-building equipment within the frame served to normalise a European presence. The location was ‘captured’ and re-configured for European audiences by its framing and composition to claim control over and justify the appropriation of what, to them, was still ‘alien’ space. These images, and others like them, ‘confirmed the progress of Western civilization and proclaimed cultural, technological, industrial and military superiority’. As such, their contribution was symbolic. The following images also provided a more practical application.

**Battle Lines Are Drawn: Mapping Invasions**

Maps, such as the ones selected for detailed here, were used as tools of invasion in both a literal and metaphorical sense. Waikato became a place of military action after it was invaded by the British Army and maps were used to directly promote this process. But, even prior to this event, Waikato was already a contested location. Europeans had begun to visualise the region in terms of its potential from their own cultural perspective. Control over the Waikato’s physical resources required the conquest of its discursive spaces, and these were both imagined and predicted before physical and political authority was achieved. Maps provided powerful justification for the invasions, both military and cultural, of the Waikato.

Charles Heaphy, Chief Surveyor and later to be awarded a Victoria Cross for his action at Waiaari during the Waikato War, produced this map in March 1861, just as the First Taranaki War was ending in stalemate with a truce signed at Te Arei on 19 March. The information collected together on this map, and its interpretation by Heaphy, serves to provide a justification for the subsequent invasion of the

---

13 Schwartz, p. 31.
Fig 4.5 A map of the North Island of New Zealand shewing native and European territory

Auckland: Martin & Kinloch, 1861.
Sir George Grey Special Collections, Auckland Libraries, NZ Map 2562

https://tinyurl.com/ybuo6ju7
Waikato. The map clearly demarcates ‘Native and European territory’ in the North Island quoting reference to ‘Official Maps of the Native Land Purchase Department and elsewhere.’ Native territory is not coloured, European lands are shaded red. A third category marked in green indicates ‘Districts that have fed the war.’ Another important feature is the inclusion of figures indicating the ‘numbers of the Maoris in each locality.’ Ignoring the actual differences in the involvement of Waikato tribes in the fighting in Taranaki, the whole region south of Ngāruawāhia is implicated by its green shading. The implication is that the green areas are preventing the extension of the regions marked in red. The different sides of the conflict are framed for ease of recognition.

Heaphy made use of this map to illustrate an 1864 memorandum justifying the British invasion. This was part of a strategy that named Waikato Māori as ‘rebels’ and framed them as aggressors. Heaphy refuted the assertion that the wars had been caused by ‘apprehension on the part of the Natives of the white people dispossessing them of their lands, and by the existence of an actual pressure arising out of the spread of colonization.’\textsuperscript{14} He concluded that, as no (or very little) land had been alienated within the ‘rebel’ territory, therefore Māori in those districts could not have been ‘apprehensive’. Heaphy had already made similar claims as early as 1861.\textsuperscript{15} Heaphy’s assertion reflected his view that Māori were the aggressors in the ‘Land Wars’, a perspective reinforced by government documents referring to the war as ‘Native insurrection’ or ‘rebellion’.\textsuperscript{16} Grey justified the military invasion of the Waikato on the pretext that he was pre-empting a planned Māori attack on

\textsuperscript{14} ‘Memorandum by Charles Heaphy, C.e., on the Native Land Question.’, \textit{AJHR}, E-09 (1864).
\textsuperscript{16} For example, ‘Further Papers Relative to the Native Insurrection’, \textit{AJHR}, E-1B (1861) and ‘Further Papers Relative to the Native Insurrection.’, \textit{AJHR}, E-03 (1864).
Auckland. However, it is generally accepted now that Waikato Māori were fighting a
defensive war in 1863–4 and that the British Army’s advance and attack had little to
do with quelling a Māori uprising.\textsuperscript{17}

Heaphy’s map actually provides good support for Belich’s contention that the
military invasion of the Waikato was designed to crush the Kīngitanga because it
had become too prominent a symbol of ongoing Māori independence. According
to Belich, the Kīngitanga, ‘together with the rise in anti-land-selling generally, […]
raised the profile of Maori independence from a level which the British disliked but
tolerated, to a level which many found entirely unacceptable.’\textsuperscript{18} As a result of the
Treaty of Waitangi and subsequent gubernatorial declarations, all of New Zealand
had become, in British eyes, part of the British Empire and subject to the sovereign
authority of Britain. That this sovereignty was not able to be exercised in a substantive
sense over Māori districts was a source of frustration for the British. Belich has
suggested that this unwelcome state of affairs was tolerated in the 1840s and 1850s
partly because events like the Wairau incident and the Northern War showed the
British that they lacked the military capability to impose their authority, and partly
because the situation was gradually changing.\textsuperscript{19}

Land alienation was the key to the extension of British control over New Zealand.
Land owned and occupied by Pākehā was effectively British territory, whereas Māori
areas were, in practical terms, independent. While land sales were proceeding,
the British ‘zone’ was expanding at the expense of the Māori ‘zone’. The Māori
recognition of these implications was a key factor in the decision by them to create
the Kīngitanga, as land placed under the mana of the King could be protected from

\textsuperscript{17} Belich, \textit{The New Zealand Wars}, p. 76.
\textsuperscript{18} Belich, \textit{The New Zealand Wars}, p. 78.
\textsuperscript{19} Belich, \textit{The New Zealand Wars}, p. 79.
alienation. To the British, this innovation made Māori independence look rather too prominent and too permanent and, therefore, intolerable.

Heaphy’s position as Chief Surveyor and his reference to ‘Official Maps’ both give authority to the map. The precisely bordered areas shaded red (European lands) reinforce the scientific approach to cartographic measurement and representation. The fact that the European lands were so precisely defined and represented adds to the assertion of the advance of civilisation. Native lands, including the ‘Districts that have fed the war’, were yet to be demarcated in this careful and explicit way. The border of the green area is hazy and indistinct, while the unshaded areas are represented as empty and undefined. Any knowledge of indigenous boundaries (even concept of boundary) was omitted in order to highlight the difference between ‘civilised’ European territory and Native ‘savage’ lands. By contrasting these features, Heaphy has drawn a sinister threat to Māori cultural and political independence, not merely in the green shaded area, but in all of the portion of the map not (yet) shaded red.

While the border of the green shaded area is not a hard line, it may have been assumed by contemporary map readers that the area within it had been equally objectively classified. This is clearly not the case. The green districts were not united in their attitude to the fighting in Taranaki when the map is dated - i.e. July 1861. For example, while both Ngāti Hauā and Ngāti Maniapoto had sent contingents to support Wiremu Kingi at Waitara, to paint their respective leaders, Wiremu Tamihana and Rewi Maniapoto, the same shade is to trivialise the complex rivalry between these pillars of the Kingitanga.

Furthermore, Heaphy includes the King’s headquarters at Ngāruawāhia (not named but located at the confluence of the Waikato and Waipā Rivers, at the northernmost
point of the green shaded area) but not the King’s tribal lands to the north. To have done so would have brought the red of the settlement of Auckland and the green of the ‘rebels’ into much closer proximity. This would have undermined his assertion that the rebellious Māori had little cause to fear the direct encroachment of colonisation and the resulting loss of land and independence.

Heaphy tellingly equated land ownership with territory, implicitly identifying the mechanism by which Māori were losing their independence, a situation that resulted in the formation of the Kingitanga in the first place. His appeal to ‘official’ sources and the ‘scientific’ nature of cartographic representation lent weight to his identification of the impediment to legitimate, in his eyes, extension of British control over the Waikato. He has simultaneously conflated and underestimated the extent of opposition to these aims. But in so doing he has framed an enemy and provided a context for invasion.

Another Heaphy map, Sketch of the Waikato River from ‘Whangamarino to Rangariri [sic] showing approximately the soundings obtained from on board the “Pioneer” October 30th 1863 has a more directly military purpose. But perhaps more importantly, subsequent versions, lithographed and coloured, represent an opportunity for viewers to take part in the invasion, if imaginatively, after the event. Thus maps such as this performed dual functions as aids to real military invasion as well as to a vicarious participation in the victory.

The map’s intention as an aid to military invasion is clear. At the end of October, the siege of Meremere was nearing its conclusion and the use of the Pioneer and other boats at their disposal proved decisive for the British. Not only could the ships’ guns be brought to bear on the Kingitanga defensive positions, but troops could be landed
Fig 4.6 Sketch of the Waikato River from Whangamarino to Rangariri [sic] showing approximately the soundings obtained from on board the Pioneer, October 30th, 1863.

Auckland: John Varty, 1863.
Sir George Grey Special Collections, Auckland Libraries, NZ Map 3583

https://tinyurl.com/y9d7kra9
to their rear. Kingite forces abandoned Meremere on 1 November and retreated to Rangiriri to prepare for another stand there.

This map, more specifically a hydrographic chart, was primarily an aid to navigation and did not attempt to provide a context beyond that function. Detailed indications of water depth within the river’s course were presented in order to assist with the safe progress of the invading boats. The depths were gauged by means of a weighted line lowered into the water until the river bed was reached and knots or other markings on the line could be read and the measurements recorded. This method and the resulting charts were very common and important at a time when water transport was prevalent and Heaphy’s chart would have been seen as necessary, useful and normal.

Other features marked, for example, ‘good landing place’ and ‘leaning tree dead’ also indicate landmarks to guide the journey upriver and other features deemed useful or informative. Beyond the environs of the river, the land has been left blank as if the river wended its way through a featureless desert. The map has been oriented to show the direction of the intended voyage, that is towards the south. This sense of invasion was reinforced by the indication in the title ‘From Whangamarino to Rangariri’ [sic], the latter being where Kingitanga fortifications were already under construction.

That this chart and the information it contains would be directly useful to the invading British forces is evident. However, the version described here was possibly not used for this purpose. The soundings were taken on October 30 1863 but it is not certain when the map was made. Heaphy’s original hand-drawn sketch was reproduced by lithographer John Varty, and this version has been at some point hand-coloured. A second copy of this lithograph is also located in the Auckland City
Libraries collection, although this is not coloured. Both of these maps bear Heaphy’s signature. A very similar image, clearly based on the same original sketch but lithographed by the Admiralty in London and dated 1864 is housed at the Australian National Library and accessible online.\(^2\)

The multiple variants of this map indicate there was an important residual purpose for these maps subsequent to the actual military use. The hydrographic information that forms the basis of these charts would have served a vital practical purpose during the period between the date of the soundings on October 30 1863 and the end of the battle of Rangiriri three weeks later. However, the aesthetic attributes incorporated into the lithographic reproductions belie the original pragmatism and utility of this information. The hand-coloured embellishments do much to add to the attractiveness of the image but little to its value as a hydrographic chart. It is likely, and in the case of the 1864 version certain, that these lithographed reproductions appeared after their military use was no longer relevant. The river continued, of course, to be plied and navigational aids remained of direct benefit to these endeavours. However, this section of the river was a fragment of its navigable course and, on its own this chart would not have justified publication on these terms. Other maps and plans of battle scenes, contested terrain and troop movements have also been treated in this fashion. A possible reason for the production of such elaborate images after their practical purpose had lapsed, was as trophies of war and claims of victory. While the results of the fighting were still to be determined, such a map would have had a sense of urgent focus but knowing the outcome of the subsequent battles changes the meaning of the map to a great extent. The landscape could, and can, be framed as uncontested and the map can be enjoyed as an art work. Even when the Admiralty version was

made in 1864 it was unclear whether the war had been won, so the claim to the control over the land depicted was provisional. The decision to colour and embellish the image can be seen as a metaphor for the claim to control the actual space. The following section demonstrates that maps were used to assert more practical forms of power as well, even if the claims that were represented were sometimes more hopeful than real.

**Invasion by Confiscation**

Well before the end of the fighting war, Pākehā authorities began making plans to continue the invasion of the Waikato through confiscation of land. In a despatch to the British Colonial Secretary, The Duke of Newcastle, in August 1863, George Grey set out the rationale for the occupation of the Waikato—and other affected regions—by military settlers. Grey wrote:

> I feel certain that the Chiefs of Waikato having in so unprovoked a manner caused Europeans to be murdered, and having planned a wholesale destruction of some of the European settlements, it will be now necessary to … inflict upon those Chiefs punishment of such a nature as will deter other tribes from … attempting to carry out designs of a similar nature …'  

Grey, seeking the approval of the imperial government for the implementation of the scheme of military settlement, emphasised the justness of such a punishment and the benefits in securing long lasting peace that such an arrangement would provide. In a memorandum attached to Grey’s, Alfred Domett, the Premier and Colonial Secretary of the New Zealand settler government, added that the Waikato tribes were ‘determined to try their strength with us, and to allow us no peace until we have inflicted upon them the punishment their acts of aggression deserve.’

---

Fig 4.7 Map to illustrate a memorandum on Roads and Military Settlements in the Northern Island of New Zealand

Ref: AJHR, A-08a (1863)
University of Waikato Library Map Collection
was to be a particularly instructive example for reasons of justice and policy:

Justice because they have been the heart of the insurrection, the abettors and perpetrators of barbarous murders and desolation without a shadow or even a pretence of an excuse; policy because no tribe will venture to hope that resistance can be effectual against the power that has humbled Waikato.\(^2^3\)

This kind of thinking neatly squared away practical and ideological considerations to justify and support the military operations in the Waikato. Colonial militias would be recruited, and tribal land confiscated as punishment would be redistributed to the soldier-settlers as part payment. These military settlers would remain on alert in the district to deter and, if necessary, repel any further aggression by Māori. The Domett memorandum already cited went on to set out the specifics of the settlement scheme. Land was to be allocated according to the rank of the recipient, with officers receiving more land and priority in selection of the town allotments and the farm sections. Military settlers would receive rations for a year and would be bonded for three years to serve as a local militia. After the three year period, ownership of the land would pass to the settler. The map **Fig 4.7** was attached to another lengthy memorandum written by Domett in October 1863. The legend at the bottom of the map tells us that it depicts proposed roads (red), the local positions of military settlements (red circles), roads to be made in the future (brown) and the distribution of the ‘Native population’ (black crosses). At the time of the map’s creation, presumably shortly before early October 1863, the features mentioned, at least in as far as they portrayed the Waikato, were all projections. This is made clear in the memorandum itself as the descriptions of the physical landscape reveal a very rudimentary knowledge of its actual nature. It was recognised that victory over the Kingitanga would require more than military superiority. The memorandum looked beyond the armed fighting

\(^{23}\) ‘Papers Relating to Military Settlements in the Northern Island of New Zealand’, p. 3.
to the permanent establishment of Pākehā control by strategies that could be ‘put into execution as soon as the process of the merely military operations [would] permit.’

Considerable further length is devoted to the practical details of extending the invasion and to the consolidation of Pākehā colonial power in the Waikato and elsewhere. To Domett, this continued invasion was justified as punishment for Māori ‘rebels’, but he was also of the opinion that Māori would ultimately benefit from such a policy. He suggested that teaching Māori to respect Pākehā colonial power was the basis on which to ‘rear the superstructure of moral sway.’

His extended agricultural metaphor sought to explain the necessity of invasion and conquest as a pathway to civilisation for Māori:

> Until you get rid of the rank growths of savagery, how can you rear the plants of civilisation? The axe and fire are wanted before the plough and seed-corn. 
> Cut down the towering notions of savage independence so long nursed by the Maoris—stately, imposing, even attractive as they may be—root up their ill-concealed passion for lawlessness self-indulgence. Then you will have clear space and a free soil for the culture of gentler and more useful products of the heart and intellect.

It is clear from this that, according to Grey and Domett, Māoris’ main crime had been their failure to acknowledge and acquiesce to the moral and cultural superiority of Pākehā. They could not accept that Māori assertions of rangatiratanga, symbolised by the emergence of the Kingitanga, were legitimate responses to threats to their independence and their way of life. Paternalistic Pākehā attitudes amounted to a ‘spare the rod and spoil the child’ kind of disciplinary regime. Taking the land was a means to an end – part of a wider plan to impose Pākehā political authority on

25 ‘Memorandum on Roads and Military Settlements in the Northern Island Of New Zealand’, p. 11.
26 ‘Memorandum on Roads and Military Settlements in the Northern Island Of New Zealand’, p. 11.
'rebel' Māori. But it was also designed to hasten the realisation of Pākehā cultural dominance that Pākehā like Grey and Domett expected. These men understood the close connection between the tangata and their whenua. Confiscating land, and repopulating it with military settlers was enacted as much with the ideal of destroying Māori identity by severing this connection as with more directly undermining political and economic independence. These latter, of course, were also powerful motivating factors and all complemented each other in the rationale and justifications for the invasions of the Waikato.

Domett’s plans for the military settlements did not extend to their precise number and location. The map in Fig 4.7 bears little or no resemblance to the final plan that was put into effect. The details of the confiscations and the extent of the military settlement were the subject of some heated debate between Grey and colonial government ministers, including the new Premier, Frederick Whitaker. It is hardly surprising that it should be difficult to implement in practice a scheme that aimed simultaneously to punish and benefit (in the long term) both ‘rebel’ and ‘friendly’ Māori, to defray some of the expenses of waging war, to plant the Waikato with a numerous and well-armed settler population to promote colonisation and peace, and to serve as a warning to potentially disputatious Māori in other parts of the country.

The extent of the confiscations was a particular bone of contention. The Suppression of Rebellion Act (1863) and The New Zealand Settlements Act (1863) set out the legal justification and mechanism for the confiscations but left the amount of land and its specific boundaries undetermined. While Grey and the various government ministers like Dommett and Whitaker broadly agreed that ‘rebel’ Māori should forfeit land, they entered into some increasingly tetchy correspondence over the finer details. Grey was of the opinion that as little land as possible should
be taken as to specifically serve the stated purposes of the measure, whereas the ministers appeared to have concluded that such a surgically precise arrangement was not feasible and that regulations should allow for the broadest possible confiscation which could be refined as time went on. Grey’s caution was perhaps also influenced by his stated view that, while punishment was necessary, showing leniency would be important for longer term conciliation.\(^{27}\) The New Zealand Settlements Act required an Order in Council to be issued declaring a district to fall under the provisions of the act as a prelude to confiscation. It required a second Order in Council to set out particular land as suitable for settlement. Grey refused to sign an Order in Council presented to him on 17 May as he felt the district proposed would be so extensive as to likely disadvantage the neutral and friendly tribes within it. Government ministers claimed this was a draft submitted for approval.

Grey also wished to issue a proclamation allowing Māori to voluntarily relinquish land ahead of possible confiscations whereas the government wanted to implement the regulations of The New Zealand Settlements Act right away. Part of the government’s haste was no doubt due to the significant financial difficulties in which the colony found itself as a result of the burden of the costs of the war. A combination of these concerns and the increasingly bitter relationship between Grey and Whitaker’s government led to the resignation of the latter and a new ministry under Frederick Weld was established in November 1864. It is difficult to avoid the impression that these, at times seemingly wilful, misunderstandings were largely part of a wider power struggle between the governor and the settler government. At that point, the governor was responsible for Native Affairs but that was not to last.

\(^{27}\) ‘Confiscation of Native Lands’, *AJHR*, E-02b (1864), p. 19.
Fig 4.8 Map illustrating the extent of the land proposed to be eligible for settlement under the New Zealand Settlements Act (1863)

Ref: Accompanying Order in Council, 28 May 1864, AJHR, E-02c (1864)
University of Waikato Library Map Collection

http://digital.libwaikato.ac.nz/nzc/map/084.html
Fig 4.9 Map illustrating the extent of the land proposed to be declared to be a district under the New Zealand Settlements Act (1863)

Ref: Accompanying Order in Council, 28 May 1864, AJHR, E-02c (1864)
University of Waikato Library Map Collection

http://digital-lib waiveka.ac.nz/res/image/399.html
much longer, giving the settler government a free hand in the implementation of the confiscations.

Grey did sign the Orders in Council presented to him on 28 May, although he subsequently refused to release them. Maps Fig 4.8 and Fig 4.9 illustrate these Orders in Council. The difference between these maps illustrates the tensions between the different rationales for confiscation. While the governor was reluctant to alienate potential Māori allies in case of further conflict, the government was already financially committed to settling a large number of military settlers and they needed to find a sufficient quantity of usable land and this was becoming urgent. The governor accused the government of prolonging the war, and the government accused the governor of weakness and vacillation. Both accused each other of forgetfulness and misrepresentation in increasingly bitter and sarcastic terms in memoranda recorded in the Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives (AJHR). Other maps not reproduced here were already obsolete when they were lithographed, printed in colour and enclosed in the governor’s despatch to the imperial government on 24 November. One was a slightly amended version of a map sent with a despatch on 3 September that was deemed misleading.

The inclusion of these maps seems mainly to have served the purpose of attempting to justify the positions of the New Zealand factions for the benefit of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Edward Carswell, than to illuminate the issues of the confiscations themselves. The memoranda that accompanied the maps to London were the same as those included in the AJHR, although the quality of the maps was significantly upgraded for publication in the British Parliamentary Papers (BPP) compared with the AJHR versions. The dates on the BPP versions are also misleading as the dates on these maps refer to the dates of the despatches and not the date of
Fig 4.10 Map accompanying Ministers' Memorandum, 5 October 1864, showing proposed areas for confiscation

Ref: AJHR, E-02 (1864)
University of Waikato Library Map Collection

Fig 4.11 Map Shewing Approximately the Territory Proposed to be Confiscated in the Waikato Country, in the Province of Taranaki and Near Wanganui


http://digital.liby.waikato.ac.nz/bppnz
the creation of the maps themselves. For example, Fig 4.10, compiled by Charles Heaphy, which accompanied a memo dated 5 November, contains a comment noting that it is a copy on a reduced scale of the map that accompanied a memorandum on 5 October. The earlier memorandum contained an explanation from the Premier, Whitaker, that, while it was impossible for the ministers to supply the governor with a tracing of the intended confiscation area that he had asked for, the ministers had ‘in order to comply as far as possible with His Excellency’s wishes’\textsuperscript{28} provided such a plan. Fig 4.11 is, perhaps, a version sent to London of the original map refered to by Heaphy but, while it is clearer, it is much less informative. The AJHR version, Fig 4.10, contains specific information about the acreage of the proposed tracts proposed for confiscation which is omitted from the BPP version Fig 4.11. The legend of each map notes red shading. This is not visible on this version of Fig 4.10 but is presumably contained within the boundaries of the areas consistent with those that are visibly red on Fig 4.11.

The confusion about the nature and purpose of the confiscations is accentuated by the difference in the description of these red areas on the legends of the maps – Fig 4.10 describes the red areas as land proposed for settlement, whereas Fig 4.11 labels these territories as proposed for confiscation. It is unclear who was responsible for these legends or whether the importance of their difference was noted at the time. It has already been pointed out, however, that these two motives were supposed to be separate according to the regulations of The New Zealand Settlements Act. It seems likely that, having failed to secure agreement for a larger confiscation from the governor, the government ministers adopted a strategy to get some land confiscated so they could fulfil their commitments to the soldier settlers. By the end of 1864, the

\textsuperscript{28} ‘Papers Relative to Native Affairs’, AJHR, E-02 (1864), p. 96.
Fig 4.12 Sketch Shewing Proposed Portions of Militia Townships as Indicated by Ministers in Minute of 6th June 1864

Ref: AJHR, E-02 (1864)
University of Waikato Library Map Collection

whole situation was somewhat chaotic. The neat lines on the various maps cannot
disguise the fact that clearly expressed intentions to punish, deter and ultimately
civilise Māori by confiscating land, and to pacify as well as Europeanise the country
by planting Pākehā settlers in their place, was more challenging in practice than in
theory. It is instructive that none of the maps mentioned so far closely resembles the
final confiscation that was implemented.

So, while the factions could not agree about the punishment of rebels or the
plantation of soldier/settlers, it seems to have been the military goal of establishing
and defending a frontier that was most influential in carrying the day. Grey had
erlier advocated a temporary frontier between about Waikato Heads and the Firth
of Thames, while other plans had included lines between Whāingaroa (Raglan)
and Tauranga, or perhaps Kāwhia and Tauranga. What became the final picture
began to emerge after the battle at Ōrākau was over in early April. The sketch Fig
4.12 was intended as a rough plan of the possible locations of military settlements
with their defensive stockades that was sent to the military commanders with a
view to implementing the best positions of these settlements on the ground. On
December 17, Grey issued a proclamation stating that the ‘Governor will retain
and hold as land of the Crown all the land in the Waikato taken by the Queen’s
forces, and from which the rebels have been driven’ and he proceeded to describe
the boundaries of this territory. The map included here as Fig 4.13 includes an area
designated ‘Government Lands’ (within the blue line) that matches precisely Grey’s
proclamation. Grey announced straight lines between named geographical features
– for example, ‘… thence in a straight line to the summit of Pukemoremore, thence

---

29 Enclosure No 2 in Copy of Despatch No. 162 from Sir George Grey, K.C.B., to the Right
Zealand.
Fig 4.13 Map showing the Conquered territory in the Northern Part of the North Island (New Zealand)

Ref: Enclosure No 1 in Despatch No 162, 14 December 1865
University of Waikato Library Map Collection
in a straight line to the summit of Maunga Kawa, …’30 – and these features are
depicted, connected by the blue line, on the map.

The proclamation and the map indicate that, by this time, Grey had abandoned
his earlier plan for a surgically precise confiscation of rebel land in favour of a
blanket confiscation with potential for later redress. The ‘Government Lands’ on the
map include some labelled ‘Rebel’, ‘Doubtful’ and ‘Mixed’, and also includes land
designated ‘Friendly Natives’ (shaded yellow) and a few ‘Crown Grants’ (shaded in
green). Grey’s proclamation included the assurance that ‘the land of those Natives
who have adhered to the Queen shall be secured to them’ as well as an offer to return
some land to ‘those who have rebelled, but who shall at once submit to the Queen’s
authority’. It seems clear from both proclamation and map that all that the Pākehā
authorities could say with any certainty about the territory depicted was that it had
been ‘conquered’. The note printed on the map signed by General Cameron asserted
as much, although he included two southern boundaries. Cameron considered ‘a
straight line from Pukekura to Orakau’ to more accurately reflect the situation on the
ground. Grey heeded Cameron’s caution by using this line in the description of the
confiscation boundaries in his proclamation.

However, it also became clear that dissension remained about the wisdom as
well as the logistics of this plan. While the map itself is dated December 186431, the
version that is included here as Fig 4.13 was attached to despatch by Grey to the
British Colonial Secretary, Edward Cardwell, sent to Britain a year later in December
1865. Grey was responding to criticism by Cardwell about a disagreement between
Grey and Cameron over the potential timeline for removing British troops from New

30 Enclosure No 2 in Despatch No 162.
31 Note that Charles Heaphy has signed the legend on 15 December 1864 and Cameron’s
appended text is dated 16 December 1864.
Zealand to be replaced, in part, by forces raised from within the colony. Cameron was evidently of the view that such a large confiscation would have the effect of delaying the withdrawal of the British Army. He wrote to Earl de Grey, the British Secretary of State for War, in January 1865 suggesting that Grey’s plan would in his opinion ‘render the early withdrawal of any of the troops from this colony impossible’.32 It would appear that Grey’s inclusion of this map in his reply to Cardwell’s censure was in order to point out Cameron’s assertion that the territory within the blue line had been conquered. He referenced the map and repeated the text in full in his despatch in order to implicate Cameron in the confiscation decision. He went so far as to claim that, in the light of public feeling in New Zealand, Cameron’s designation of conquered territory as shown on the map actually forced his hand over the confiscation decision. He wrote: ‘General Cameron may fairly be said by this act on his part to have rendered the issue of my proclamation on the 17th December a necessity, from which I could not well escape.’33

In making this defence, Grey once again glosses over a distinction he was earlier careful to make between conquered territory and that which should be confiscated. In fact, the territory itself had not been conquered as much as the inhabitants had been defeated. It did not necessarily follow that these defeated inhabitants would acquiesce to the permanent alienation of their land as a result. The status of the ‘friendly’ and neutral tribes further muddied the waters despite Grey’s assurances. It was clear, as Cameron was aware, that confiscation would have to be imposed and that a measure of force was required. As such, Grey’s proclamation constitutes a further invasion

33 Copy of Despatch No. 162.
despite the fact that by the end of 1864, let alone the end of 1865, the fighting war in the Waikato was over.

Conclusion

The military and discursive invasions were mutually enabling. The military invasion of the Waikato was undertaken, at least in part, because the discursive invasion was not bearing sufficient fruit. Pākehā expected Māori to acquiesce to the cultural superiority of the invaders and felt insulted when they did not. Māori desire to maintain cultural, as well as political and economic, autonomy does not seem unreasonable to us now, but for contemporary Pākehā this was like red rag to a bull. And colonisation was not simply a matter of imposing limits on the economic and political independence of the colonised. The land itself, including concepts of its organisation, uses and value, was invaded in ways that superseded direct military action. The images that have been the focus of this chapter can be seen as records of the preparation, conduct and fruits of the military invasion. But, in less tangible ways, they also exemplify a discursive invasion of Waikato spaces as well. This discursive invasion captured Waikato spaces by framing Pākehā activity as normal. Cartographic and photographic technologies and practices brought the Waikato into focus in ways that were readily comprehensible to a Pākehā audience. This normalised Pākehā presence was incompatible with a continued Māori domination of the idea of Waikato. The assumption of Pākehā control of Waikato spaces was not completed by military means. As the next chapter will show, military victory, although limited, opened the way for further discursive invasions.
CHAPTER 5

Extending the Invasion

The military invasion supports the discursive invasion

In April 1864, the military invasion of the Waikato was over. The garrisons remained in place but the last of the battles had ended following Rewi’s Last Stand at Ōrākau. The discursive invasion continued and gathered strength, buoyed by the military victory and the arrival of thousands of Pākehā into the area. In order to know, claim and own new land in a discursive sense, Pākehā needed to imagine their place within it as well as imaginatively configuring the unfamiliar landscape in more familiar ways. Maps and photographs had significant roles in expressing and reproducing the kinds of imaginary geographies that helped colonists feel at home in alien lands. Yet the landscapes took a great deal more taming in reality than in the imagination.

Following the end of the fighting in the Waikato Wars, colonisers wasted no time in attempting to define and describe the spoils of war. Much of the Waikato was subject to raupatu (confiscation) but the details of many specific Waikato localities were unknown to Pākehā and mapping the region and its constituent parts became an important step in the imposition of Pākehā ideas of land organisation on the Waikato. Cadastral maps, in particular, were important as they are not just a representation of a place but a method to represent place involving the hierarchisation, ordering and organisation of land according to Pākehā cultural norms. Whereas before this point, the Waikato had often been described cartographically in crude and imprecise ways, as more Pākehā made it their business to invade the Waikato, a more seemingly
A detailed and accurate picture began to emerge. This was often misleading as these maps, despite their bold titles and confidently drawn lines, were often inaccurate and not only because they ignored the continued reality of a Māori presence. Many features of these maps were more wish than reality as the intentions of the Pākehā colonists were projected onto images of the land—a kind of road map to the future rather than a snapshot of the present. Wider maps of the region featured areas that were ‘known’ by the colonists in some detail but which were interspersed with voids and blank spaces which fed the Pākehā impulse to ‘discover’ new lands and were therefore a challenge to a culture intent on control. It also exemplifies the process by which indigenous space became colonial space. ‘Savage’ nature had first to be removed so it could be replaced with ‘civilised’ culture and these maps were one way of recording and promoting this process.

This chapter focuses on cadastral maps created with the purpose of describing and defining Waikato landscapes in Pākehā terms, and photographs taken by an engineer involved in the development of Pākehā infrastructure in the region. These images make confident assertions of Pākehā presence and control, but this is misleading and sometimes imaginary. The final section of the chapter deals with two images that have been commonly used to represent the Waikato of this time but whose content does not support the modern meanings attributed to them. In a way, the invasion of the Waikato continues into the present.

**Asserting victory**

The Waikato War of 1863-64 was a watershed in the colonisation of the Waikato because it allowed for the arrival of a significant number of Pākehā into the region for the first time. Earlier Pākehā incursions had been relatively small scale. A modest
trader and missionary presence on the coast and along the central waterways accounted for the bulk of Pākehā direct knowledge of the Waikato. Some Pākehā farmers had also ventured into the region but it was the war that opened up the Waikato to Pākehā settlement on a much larger scale.

In July 1864, not long after the defeat of Bay of Plenty Kingite supporters at Te Ranga, the King’s capital, Ngāruawāhia, was offered for sale by the government. Not only was this a hasty attempt to recoup some war expenses, but it was a blatant assertion of the British victory on the ground. The map Newcastle QUEENSTOWN (Ngāruawāhia) (Fig 5.1) is evidence that it was necessary to extend the discursive invasion of the Waikato even after the military victory was officially complete. The map depicts the survey of Ngāruawāhia (renamed Queenstown) and its division into 401 lots with a sale price of £100 per acre.¹ Potential buyers may have been tempted by the advantages of the new town's location, nestled in the fork of the two major river arteries of the region. In addition, the Great South Road (150 feet wide) suggested a connection to what was then the capital, Auckland, to the north. This would have been a significant advantage for prospective settlers for both economic and security reasons at a time when the war was not yet concluded. The redoubt featured would no doubt have been reassuring for the same reason.

The name initially given to the new settlement, ‘Queenstown’, can hardly have been more pointed in its message that the Māori King had been displaced by the British Queen. The question of the name provoked excited debate in the columns of the Daily Southern Cross in July and August 1864, in the course of which it was clear that one correspondent understood clearly that applying the name Queenstown

¹ Sections ranged in size from 1 rood 24 perches (0.1619 hectares or .4 acres) which could be purchased for £40, down to 19 perches (0.0481 hectares or 0.1188 acres) available for £11/17/6.
Fig 5.1 Newcastle QUEENSTOWN (Ngaruawahia)
University of Waikato Library Map Collection
http://digital.lib.waikato.ac.nz/nzmap034.html
asserted ‘the Queen ha[d] now possession of what was formerly the Maori King’s
town.’ 2 The same writer also bemoaned the use of the name Cambridge: ‘Is it on the
river Cam? or is it a seat of learning? or is it more euphonious than Pukerimu? No!
decidedly not! to all three questions.’ 3 This was countered by another correspondent
who, referencing Greek, Roman Gothic, Celtic, Saxon and Norman precedents,
claiming that ‘[a]s, then, Maori savage courage has had to succumb to British
civilized valour, so let Ngaruawahia give place to Queenstown.’ 4 While each writer
had markedly different views on the appropriate system for applying names within
the newly conquered territory, neither considered the power to impose names to be
in question. Even the ‘Lover of Maori Names’ did not invoke Māori perspectives
on the background and meaning of Ngāruawāhia (or Pukerimu), even though
he acknowledged that the replacement of Māori names by those of Pākehā origin
would lead to, for Māori, a suspicion that ‘we wish to obliterate every evidence of
the country having ever belonged to them or their fathers.’ For others, like W. O’N.,
this was precisely the point. In any case, it was clear that Pākehā Ngāruawāhia was
different to Māori Ngāruawāhia—the town was not given back to the Māori Kingi.

The seeming haste with which the colonial government moved to promote
the sale of land in the conquered territory was expedient for political as well as
economic reasons. The speedy confiscation, survey and auction of lands such as
those represented on this map, were justified by the imperative of recouping the
considerable cost of waging war. Māori who had resisted the imposition of British

---

3 Not only was there no ‘river Cam’, the name Cambridge was bestowed before there was a bridge! Davis, Te Aue, John Wilson, and Tipene O’Regan, Ngā Tōhu Pūmahara: The Survey Pegs of the Past: Understanding Māori Place Names (Wellington, N.Z.: The Board, 1990), p. 19.
control by retaining the lands that enabled them to exercise political and economic independence, were obliged to relinquish the very resource which had hitherto enabled them to do so. Land which was taken was then sold to Pākehā settlers with the effect—similar to the Irish experience some hundreds of years earlier—of promoting the occupation, pacification and civilisation of the region. The Kūingitanga was deprived of its political and economic strength and government expenses were defrayed at the same time. This was not the first, or indeed the last time that a system of ‘loser pays’ was used with considerable effect.

Ngāruawāhia had the dual advantages of its location at the confluence of the Waikato and Waipā rivers, and as the former capital of the Māori King, now exiled to the ‘King Country’. The British victory over Kingite forces in the Waikato paved the way for the extension of roads and, in time, the railway into the region. In 1864, however, and for some considerable time after, the region’s rivers remained the principal transport routes, especially towards Auckland in the north. The Waipā was then equally as important as the larger Waikato. The port of Te Rore on the Waipā was the loading point for much of the produce destined for Auckland and beyond from the agricultural centre at Rangiaowhia during the 1850s. The bar at the mouth of the river at Waikato Heads made access to the river by large vessels difficult, but having surpassed this obstacle, the river system was navigable as far south as Pukerimu (Cambridge) on the Waikato and to Te Rore, for most of the year, on the Waipā.

The original attempt to rename Ngāruawāhia was only short-lived. ‘Queenstown’ was in turn officially displaced by ‘Newcastle’ in 1878. Newcastle was an emblematic name for two reasons. Firstly, it was the 5th Duke of Newcastle who, as Secretary of State for the Colonies, acquiesced to the original confiscation legislation. The other
factor was the presence nearby of coal and the association of Newcastle in the United Kingdom with the coal industry. A common simile which suggests a pointless or unnecessary act is ‘like taking coals to Newcastle.’ Perhaps those who proposed the name Newcastle for Ngāruawāhia were, as in Australia, responsible for turning this maxim on its head and bringing Newcastle to the coals.

The imposition of the new name ‘Newcastle’ and its labelling on the map marked the beginning of the assertion of Pākehā control over the physical place and the discursive space of Ngāruawāhia. The survey on the ground and its representation on the map delineated this location according to Pākehā practice. A number of the shapes created by the interplay of roads and sections are reminiscent of the British Union Flag superimposed on the ground which reinforces a sense of the assertion of British sovereignty. The lots defined and displayed for sale laid claim not only to the ownership of the land but the right to control how that land was imagined, valued and used. Indigenous perceptions of and associations with this whenua have been supplanted. In this regard, the spoils of war did not merely include the acquisition of Waikato soil, economic resources and communication links. Nor did the fruits of this invasion cease at the wresting of political control and the subsequent imposition of British law and government on a previously independent polity. On top of those extremely important consequences of the British invasion of the Waikato, came the seizure of control of the cultural associations and practices which allowed the Waikato to be defined in a Pākehā framework. One of the key functions of maps, such as that of Newcastle Queenstown (Ngāruawahia) above, was to assert this annexation of the concept of place.

Typical of cadastral maps in the European tradition, this map organised plots into geometric shapes. Ideally these were rectangles, although the regularity was broken
by a sometimes uncooperative terrain. The geometrising of the land went further than to deny Māori values of land use and organisation. It also deliberately ignored topography and other geographical features like swamps, to render all plots flat and equally accessible. The landscape itself was ‘civilised’ in this way. Inconvenient natural features were overcome by making them invisible. This practice had the disadvantage, though, of making such maps less accurate. Neat lines on the map did not necessarily equate to well-defined boundaries and other similar features on the ground; the orderliness of the representation contrasted with first-hand experience of the actual location. When first drawn, maps like \textit{Newcastle Queenstown (Ngaruawahia)} were not depictions of what was really there, but were projections into the future. The intentions of the surveyors, cartographers and colonists were not always realised in straightforward and predictable ways, and sometimes not at all.

The map \textit{Township of Pokeno, Mangatawhiri Creek} (Fig 5.2) represents another attempt to Europeanise this Waikato space by organising the proposed town into regular, rectangular grids. The conflict between the order of the street pattern and the seemingly random meandering of the Tani te Whiora Creek, at left, is jarring. The edges of the mapped area are subject to the forces of nature in a way that is overcome, or at least overwritten in the centre. The allotments are advertised on the map as measuring 99 x 33 feet unless otherwise marked, and this extraordinarily regular design adds considerably to this sense of orderliness. Another contributor to this Pākehā order is the reassuringly familiar names given to the streets: British Royal Family (Victoria, Albert, William Streets and also the Queen’s Redoubt), British military heroes (Marlborough, Wellington, and Cameron Streets - it is perhaps pushing it to describe Cameron in 1863 as a military hero in the same league as the other two but this gesture may have been made out of hope that Cameron would
Fig 5.2 Township of Pokeno, Mangatawhiri Creek, Waikato River at Auction at Cochrane's Market, Queen Street, Wednesday 17 June 1863

Sir George Grey Special Collections, Auckland Libraries, NZ Map 4498-18

https://tinyurl.com/y9558tqd
cover himself with comparable glory in New Zealand’s British military endeavours), possibly New Zealand Colonial and government officials (Gray, Brown, McLean Streets, although if this is true the first two are misspellings of Grey and Browne), as well as descriptive names typical of English towns (Market, Church, Ford and High Streets). Dividing the town, and highlighted by its boldly written label and colour, is the Great South Road. This road bisects the Market Square in the centre of the town which is coloured the same shade as the Great South Road so as to seem part of the same space. They are clearly seen as significant features and no doubt the highlighting of the connectedness with Auckland and the mercantile possibilities of the settlement was an intentional marketing ploy for the sections being sold. The Queen’s Redoubt, a key part of the British Army’s capability for both defence and attack in the region, is prominently featured at a time when inter-racial conflict was on-going. In fact, the date on the map for the advertised auction is June 17 1863, less than a month before Cameron’s invasion across the Mangatāwhiri at a point very near the Pōkeno township.

Whether the advertised auction went ahead is not clear as many of the lots were up for sale (or re-sale) by the same auctioneer just under a year later on 23 April 1864. In advertising for this latter auction, Pōkeno was advertised as ‘The City of the Waikato’ and its freehold building lots as suitable for ‘Homes for Military Settlers and Traders’. The location of the township at the crossroads of the thoroughfares between the lower Waikato, Thames and Auckland was emphasised. The map appears to be a clearly expressed promotion of the possibilities of Pōkeno but some features may not have been viewed universally as positive. While the prominence of the Queen’s

---

Redoubt may have been reassuring from a security point of view and the business potential of supplying a potentially large number of military personnel attractive, the existence of the redoubt is also a reminder of the contested nature of this location and may have been seen by some as a symbol of danger rather than security. Reinforcing this point is the proximity of the area marked 'native land.' The detailed order and organisation of the Pākehā town is contrasted with the featureless surrounds, including the ‘native land’, which may have been interpreted as either potential benefit or hazard depending on whether it was viewed as territory for expansion or the home of hostile neighbours.

Apart from their place on the edge of the map, and perhaps also the consciousness of the planners and mapmakers, tangata whenua also appear to be center stage in the name of the township: Pōkeno. The location is noted with reference to Mangatāwhiri Creek and Waikato River. A street at the northernmost edge of the town is Pokino Street. But this is not a Māori village resettled and renamed by Pākehā settlers or developers. There was such a village nearby, the original name for which was Pokino and it seems likely that the name Pōkeno is a misrepresentation in English of this earlier Māori name. Pokino may be derived from po, which can be translated as darkness, night, or perhaps the underworld, and kino, bad or evil. Therefore the name Pōkeno, far from being an acknowledgement of the indigenous name and its history and meaning, has been transplanted to a different place, albeit nearby, and altered so as to render it meaningless in Māori. Perhaps this was just as well. It is certainly one of the clearest examples of the phenomenon whereby Pākehā co-opted Māori names without reference to their traditional meanings, but simply as exotic

---

sounding words of local colour. It is unlikely that Pākehā settlers would have been lining up to buy sections in a town they knew to be named ‘Evil Underworld.’

Not that the name Pōkeno was a successful attraction to section buyers at this time either. The map reproduced here, like many of the time, was a speculative and optimistic projection of the anticipated future rather than an accurate description of the contemporary reality. The vision of Pōkeno depicted here was only partially realised and the seeds of Pōkeno’s failure to live up to the grand dreams of the promoters of the land sales advertised can be seen on the map. The insert map labeled ‘General Plan shewing the position of Pokeno’ reveals the weakness of the location of Pōkeno as soon as military activities were scaled back or removed altogether. It had previously held a strategically important position adjacent to the Mangatāwhiri Stream. That waterway was the acknowledged border between British and Māori and was the terminus of the Great South Road at the beginning of the Waikato War. Subsequently, however, the road was extended, initially to the Mangatāwhiri, and then to the Waikato River at Point Russell. The river system became the extension of the highway and linked Auckland to the military settlements further upstream like Hamilton, Cambridge, Whatawhata and Alexandra (Pirongia).

Despite the continued existence of the Queen’s Redoubt and its garrison, the other strategic benefits of the transport hub at the nexus between road and river moved southwards to the new town of Mercer. At least this map has not changed

---

7 The authentic Māori derivation of this name is likely to be quite different. It is also interesting to note that modern property buyers are being attracted by a different interpretation of the name. A recent online promotion claims ‘For those very first inhabitants, and many who have taken up residence since, Pokeno - meaning ‘a place of refuge’ - has gained the reputation as a safe haven where people can escape the stresses of city life and relax amongst friends and family.’ ‘Pokeno Village Estate | History’ <http://www.pokenovillageestate.co.nz/history.html> [accessed 20 June 2017].
Fig 5.3 Town of Mercer, Point Russell, Waikato River
Auckland, G. Pulman, 1866
Sir George Grey Special Collections, Auckland Libraries, NZ Map 4498-20
https://tinyurl.com/y7nmyjh6
Mangatāwhiri from a stream (manga) to a mountain (maunga). Many references to the district and river at this time mislabel it Maungatawhiri. Interestingly, Mangatāwhiri could mean beckoning stream (manga = stream and tāwhiri=beckon, welcome, wave to, even fan (as in a fire)). It certainly beckoned George Grey and fanned his flames when it was deemed the aukati by the Kingitanga.

_Town of Mercer, Point Russell, Waikato River_ (Fig 5.3) is another map in which ‘civilising’ influences and ongoing problems fight for attention. The town sections drawn have not completely obliterated the vegetation and swampy ground that are also depicted. On the other hand, a very large north pointing arrow and an arrow on the road and another on the river leave the reader in no doubt that Mercer is well connected to somewhere pretty important—in this case, Auckland to the north. This town is the place where the Great South Road met the Waikato River and so formed an important link in the chain of transport and communications between Auckland and the Pākehā towns and districts, including military settlements, further south in the confiscated Waikato.

The Point, as in Point Russell, was an obvious feature of this locality as it afforded a convenient natural landing and loading place for boats plying the river, but this is clearly according to Pākehā practices and priorities. Paina is a transliteration of the word point and therefore Te Paina was a probably a newly coined name for the place that seemed to reflect a new reality of practice in river transport. Māori use of the river would not necessarily have found this location important, as they used the river system all the way to Auckland and beyond. In any case, the name Te Paina has been superseded by Point Russell, after Thomas Russell, an Auckland businessman and politician who, in collaboration with politician (Premier in 1863) Frederick Whitaker, notoriously made a fortune from land deals in the Waikato following
confiscation (see next chapter). The town itself became known as Mercer and, like Hamilton, was named for a fallen British officer of the 'Land Wars'.

The strategies of claiming with maps such as these are easily discernible as the claims are directly and literally inscribed on the image. As is shown in the following section, such strategies can also be seen in photographs, although in much more subtle forms. This subtlety may even add to the subliminal power of photographs.

**Invasive Gazes**

The photograph Fig 5.4, *Scene near Whangamarino bridge* (1866) by surveyor and photographer Daniel Manders Beere, features a range of powerful colonising forces and accessories: the ‘male’ colonising gaze, the gun and agricultural implements and the photographic representation itself. In spite of the apparent peacefulness of this scene, this image is an example of the ways in which visual representations of landscape recorded the discursive invasion of the Waikato by Pākehā. The man pictured, the photographer’s brother, is seen to survey the landscape with his southward gaze. The fence, right, and the title *Scene near the Whangamarino Bridge* suggest the location was not completely removed from Pākehā ‘civilisation’. In fact, nearby were a lodge and a flaxmill—these were also photographed by Beere and recorded in other contemporaneous images. Yet, in this image, Beere has chosen to emphasise the wilder, untamed aspect of this landscape. Invading the edge of the image is a single figure, gun sloped across his shoulder in military manner, in his

---

8 The version reproduced here is a digital copy of the original glass negative (4.5 x 7.25 inches) held at the Alexander Turnbull Library. Note the darkened upper corners - this is a common feature of the wet collodion process where a tacky, viscous solution was poured over the glass in order to create a light-sensitive plate. The photographer was obliged to hold the plate by its corners which allowed for the even spread of the fluid across the surface of the glass, but prevented those areas covered by the photographer’s grip from being sensitised. These areas are rendered completely black in any subsequent positive print.
right hand what appears to be a short canoe paddle held like a walking stick. Leaning against the fence are two longer rowing oars and close at hand is a wheelbarrow with a spade or similar implement. A large tin lies apparently casually discarded in the foreground. The Waikato River divides the image and its seemingly calm waters reflect a scrub-covered island and far bank which, in turn, are bounded by the low hill country to the west in the background.

Although by 1866, when Scene near Whangamarino Bridge was made, the military invasion was complete and the imposition of Pākehā political dominance over the region (at least as far south as the Pūniu river) had been achieved, the landscape was proving more difficult, from a Pākehā point of view, to bring under control. What had already changed—and what this photograph exemplifies—was that it was now Pākehā who claimed the right to make the decisions about the future direction and development of the region. Tangata whenua did not simply abandon the field, but
the military victory confirmed in Pākehā minds the inevitability of progress in a way they viewed as natural.

Bearing in mind that the technological processes of constructing such pictures involved a time-consuming set up and a long shutter speed, it is highly likely that such images were not spontaneous and casual, but carefully planned and arranged. The intentions of the photographer are, therefore, almost certainly explicit in the image itself. This was not an accidental or candid shot, but a carefully and painstakingly composed tableau. By assembling the elements in this way, both the photographer and the subject have located themselves on the frontier of Pākehā expansion with an active role to play. Taming both ‘nature’ and ‘natives’ was an essential part of the colonising process that led to the construction of Pākehā Waikato. Military and agricultural invasions played their parts in the displacement of indigenous people and landscapes and their replacement with Pākehā alternatives.

Despite the fact that a Māori name has been given to the place represented in the image, it was not used in a way that takes account of its meaning(s) for the indigenous inhabitants of the region. Whangamarino refers to the calm or still waters of the wetland, but the words in translation provide a superficial gloss on the indigenous name. For Māori, Whangamarino was a large and productive source of food such as eels and birds and would therefore no doubt have had positive associations. From the Pākehā point of view, however, swamps like Whangamarino were impediments to progressive development. Re-imagined in this way, ‘Whangamarino’ was co-opted by the colonisers and shorn of its indigenous

---

9 Whanga: bay, cove, bight, estuary (also the span between thumb and little finger), marino: calm, still (usually of the sea). Source: *Te Aka Māori-English, English-Māori Dictionary*, http://www.maoridictionary.co.nz/. As with Pōkeno above, the prosaic translations of Māori names such as this into English cannot convey the whakapapa (genealogy) and associations of their indigenous uses and meanings.
history and meaning. The place was not renamed so much as the name was replaced. This act of appropriation allowed the newcomers to construct a local history which enabled them to identify as locals. Furthermore, this Waikato location also entered the lexicon of Pākehā imperialism. The Pākehā controlled, or at least claimed jurisdiction over, the physical as well as discursive spaces and photographs like this one proclaimed their successful incursion.

Whether Beere had these issues in his mind when he was taking this image is not clear. What is known is that Beere was no stranger to promotional photography. During his stint in Canada before he arrived in New Zealand, he was associated with a photographic attempt to convince British authorities of the claims of Toronto to become the permanent national Canadian capital in the late 1850s. In 1857, the City of Toronto purchased 100 photographic views of the city from Armstrong, Beere and Hime, a firm of “Land Agents, Engineers and Photographists” to use as part of their campaign. Having arrived in New Zealand in 1863, Beere was employed as a surveyor by the Auckland Provincial Government. The five Beere photographs of Whangamarino in the Alexander Turnbull Library archive, all dated 1866, are possibly associated with his surveying job—the Daily Southern Cross advertised the ‘Sale of Allotments, at Whangamarino Creek, at the Waste Lands Office, at noon’ on 17 August of that year. Available biographical information is sketchy but, apart from his photographic legacy, he appears to have been an important figure in the

11 The company was started in 1855 by Beere and his uncle, William Armstrong, who appears to have given Beere his early photographic instruction.
12 Ironically, it seems that the images designed to impress may have had the opposite effect.
14 ‘Sales, Meetings, Amusements. &c, This Day,’ Daily Southern Cross, 17 August 1866, p. 3 [<http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/newspapers/DSC18660817.2.11> [accessed 20 June 2017]].
**Fig 5.5** Mercer
Photograph taken by Daniel Manders Beere, 1866
Ref: 1/2-096119-G, Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington, New Zealand
https://natlib.govt.nz/records/2289355

**Fig 5.6** The Waikato from Whangamarino Lodge
Photograph taken by Daniel Manders Beere, 1866
Ref: 1/2-096116-G, Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington, New Zealand
https://natlib.govt.nz/records/22708102
design and construction of bridges and railway lines in the Waikato and elsewhere. His brother, Gerald Butler Beere, was a captain in the Waikato Militia and an early Hamilton dignitary.¹⁵ Beerescourt, a Hamilton suburb, is named for him. Daniel Beere’s photographs can be read as a record and a celebration of the colonial invasion in which he took a prominent and practical part.

The view of the town of Mercer (Fig 5.5) from the west highlights its important commercial features. The wharf, the hotel, some other single and two storied buildings as well as a long, low building on the waterfront which is perhaps a warehouse, imply a small but bustling trading settlement. The barge or other low boat moored at the northern (left as we look at it) end of the wharf reflects the key role of the town as a communications link between the Great South Road northwards to Auckland, and the Waikato and Waipā River systems to the south. The view is taken from the eastern shore of an island in the Waikato River and has been carefully framed by the photographer using the natural vegetation. The Pākehā town has itself been rendered as an island of civilisation in the surrounding wilderness. The ordered and organised nature of the town is contrasted strongly with the rather chaotic scrub, fern and flax which form the frame. This is accentuated by the blur of some of this vegetation, no doubt due to the wind moving the branches.

Beere’s photograph of Whangamarino Bridge called The Waikato from Whangamarino Lodge (Fig 5.6) offers multiple layers of interpretation. Tributaries of the Waikato River, such as the Whangamarino, were obstacles to the completion of the Great South Road which pressed on southwards towards the military settlements. The colonists were far from intimidated by these obstacles, however, and bridges

like the one depicted here were thrown up over far more obstructive waterways than the Whangamarino River. This apparently solid if not spectacular wooden bridge is typical of the successful contemporary mastery over such impediments to progress. And yet the bridge, along with the curved road adjacent to the wide stretch of the Waikato River, has become an important subject of Beere’s 1866 photograph. It stands out as an island of ‘civilisation’ in an otherwise unchanged natural scene. Framed in this way, the bridge and road also form a pleasing compositional element, even if the winding road might be more attractive to the viewer than the traveller. The viewpoint achieved by Beere accentuates the diagonal of the bridge and the repetition of the curve of the road with the bank of the river which accord with Pākehā pictorial conventions and render the scene pleasant to a Pākehā eye. Therefore, Beere could be said to have framed this image according to Pākehā ideals in order to impose a Pākehā way of seeing onto this otherwise untamed landscape while at the same time celebrating the advance of progress. But there is more to Beere’s interest in bridges than meets the eye. Beere was a surveyor and engineer as well as a photographer and he was directly involved in the construction of bridges (as well as roads and railway lines) in the region. He was awarded a contract for the design of at least three bridges including one at nearby Mangatāwhiri and we can assume his interest in bridges was professional as well as aesthetic.

It is unclear how these photographs were received at the time of their creation. The contemporary meanings ascribed to historical images of this kind are therefore always tentative. The following images, however, have gained prominence in more recent discourse and their meanings and importance can be critiqued with much more certainty.
The Invasion Continues into the Present

The following images are some of the most commonly associated with the Pākehā invasion of the Waikato and, as such, they continue to shape more modern understandings of their times. They have been used in multiple publications to illustrate aspects of the Waikato Land War with a frequency that almost lends them a status as emblematic representatives of this historical time and place. On closer inspection of the images, however, it can be seen that their representative nature is illusory or even misleading. The meanings ascribed to them in text and caption, either explicitly or by implication, often bear little relation to the circumstances of their creation. Furthermore, while both Figs 5.7 and 5.8 were taken by William Temple, they are by no means typical of the archive of existing Temple photographs. Fig 5.7 is unique in this archive in that it portrays a Pākehā female subject. There are
few images to feature Māori, and no other includes such a large group as Fig 5.8. So, how have two images which were marginal to the work of the photographer come to be virtually metonymic images of the hardships suffered by soldier-settlers on the one hand, and the resistance of Māori to Pākehā encroachment on the other, when neither image actually depicts soldier-settlers or Māori resistance? One explanation is that, superficially, the content of the images resembles and can be used to illustrate aspects of the story that historians have wanted to tell. Using images in this way, to aid in evoking a mental picture for the reader, has its place. Starting from the images themselves, however, we can end up in quite a different place.

**Fig 5.7** *Scene in the bush* has been selected to ‘represent’ the Waikato in several New Zealand general history publications. Illustrated histories of New Zealand typically contain few Waikato images. Despite the existence of myriad possible photographs depicting all manner of Waikato activities, people and places, *Scene in the bush* has achieved such a prominence by its repeated appearance that it may be mistakenly imagined to be representative of the Pākehā experience of colonisation in the Waikato. Not only that, but the image has often been used to illustrate or represent ideas or experiences which may bear little relation to actual circumstances of the people and place depicted. **Fig 5.8** *Maori group at Pokeno* seems to have also taken its modern meaning from the uses to which authors have wanted to put it, rather than its actual content. Modern viewers may experience a range of responses to the images depending on the perspective from which they view it, but they are likely to be influenced by the captions and contexts. The rationale for the inclusion of a photograph is usually to provide an illustration or a visual aid to understanding of a point being made, but the effect in these cases is that the images seem to have taken their meanings chameleon-like from the context.
It is important to note that, in re-viewing these images, I do not intend to offer a definitive re-interpretation of their content. I am not in a position to reveal new information about the actual identities of their subjects or the specific location of their execution. Rather, I am highlighting the complexity of image-making about places and spaces represented by these images. Taking into account the context of the whole of the body of Temple’s work that remains in the Alexander Turnbull Library collections, it is almost certain that the photographs were taken during the course of the construction by the British Army of the Great South Road between Drury and Pōkeno in 1862 or 1863; in other words before war in the Waikato broke out and the subsequent raupatu (confiscation) of Waikato land and, furthermore, beyond the ‘official’ boundaries of the Waikato region. However, the exact timing and location of the inceptions of these photographs and the precise identities of their subjects are unknown, and at this time perhaps unknowable.

Scene in the bush is unique among the Temple images to record a Pākehā female presence and the domesticity of the scene is exceptional. Yet, despite—perhaps because of—its unusual subject matter, this image has been commonly used to illustrate colonial life in the region. The image has appeared in a number of publications and has most often been used in the manner that Peter Burke has described ‘as mere illustrations’ or ‘to illustrate conclusions the author has already reached by other means’. 16 One such example of the use of Fig 5.7 is its inclusion in historian Judith Bassett’s chapter ‘The English Island 1860-1870’ in The People and The Land - Te Tangata me te Whenua: An Illustrated History of New Zealand, 1820-1920. 17 In this chapter, Bassett observed that soldier settlers who took up

17 Judith Binney, Judith Bassett and Erik Olssen, eds., The People and the Land = Te Tangata Me Te Whenua: An Illustrated History of New Zealand, 1820-1920 (Wellington, N.Z: Allen & Unwin,

She added that ‘[i]n return for the inestimable boon of ‘free’ land, soldiers were invited to endure years of toil and hardship’ and that ‘the soldiers and their families who founded Hamilton were acutely uncomfortable.’ Bassett, p. 119.

One of the images chosen to illustrate the conditions and circumstances of this early Pākehā settlement in the Waikato was this William Temple photograph, which was captioned: ‘William Temple photographed these soldier settlers in their bush camp in the Waikato in the 1860s’, and it takes little imagination to see in this image the kinds of pioneering hardships described by Bassett. This interpretation of the image was repeated in *Frontier of Dreams*, the companion to the New Zealand television series of the same name. The caption that accompanies the image reads: ‘Military settlers and their families did it tough as they carved farms out of the Waikato bush. Many gave up and went back to town.’ There can be no argument with the accuracy of the statement but it bears little connection to the photograph used to illustrate the point. The people in this photograph were almost certainly not soldier settlers, and the location was almost certainly not within what we now consider to be the Waikato. In other words, although this photograph might resemble the kind of situations described in these texts, its co-option as a visual aid to understanding the actual experiences of those described is quite misleading.

In addition to these questionable associations of the image with soldier settlers in the Waikato, the image appears in the *Reed Illustrated History of New Zealand* (2004).

19 Bassett, p. 119.
20 Bassett, p. 120.
by Matthew Wright, where it is accompanied by other images of women, washing and domesticity. The caption this time suggests: ‘Living in a raupo whare did not reduce the need for a washing line. This soldier’s family were [sic] photographed around 1863, probably in the Waikato.’ The context of the image in this publication is a section on the ‘Working Classes’, yet it is highly likely that, if this represents a married soldier, he was an officer and therefore not working class. The conditions faced by the ordinary soldiers are likely to have been considerably worse; for example, a typical army issue bell tent was considered suitable for accommodating one officer or 12 men. Another appearance of the image also emphasises the washing. Headed ‘Wash Day’, it illustrates Bronwyn Labrum’s article on ‘Rural clothing’ in the online encyclopedia Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand. The caption reads: ‘A woman and two men stand outside a dwelling thatched with nikau fronds in the Waikato in 1863, with washing drying on lines. Women’s long dresses were rather impractical in a damp bush environment, and the hems were often muddy.’ But the description of the washing on the lines, and the comment that hems were often muddy, implies a connection that is not borne out by the content of this particular photograph. While there is certainly evidence of difficult conditions, there does not appear to be any damp bush or actual mud, and the impracticality of women’s clothing is implied rather than demonstrated in the image. In fact, this image of the completed washing hanging to dry in what appear to be benign conditions may undermine — at least for modern viewers — attempts to portray the real difficulties faced by women in

performing domestic tasks in this kind of environment. If this was their home (even if it was temporary) it does not appear to have a chimney and there is no obviously convenient water supply. The woman pictured may well have had difficulties with muddy hems but this photograph contains evidence of, perhaps, more pressing problems.

There are several other interesting aspects that none of these caption writers has mentioned. Perhaps they were so distracted by what they were looking for that they did not notice that this woman is clearly pregnant, or that, even given that these men were probably employed in the dirty business of road-building, there appear to be too many shirts — by my count about 15-20 — for the two men pictured. Perhaps, then, this woman took in laundry from the regiment of which her husband was a part but, if this is true, it immediately destroys the illusion of isolation suggested by the rest of the scene and assumed by some of the caption writers. The familial relationships assumed or implied by the caption writers are also speculative.

*Scene in the bush* is in many ways an inadequate representative of the Waikato. This is not because the location of the scene represented in the image happens to fall outside commonly understood boundaries of the Waikato region. On the contrary, as has been discussed above, from a Pākehā colonising point of view, the Great South Road building project and its related activities helped to define the Waikato in Pākehā terms. This frontier was secured before being pushed back towards the south. The Waikato was, at least by implication, a subject of Temple’s photographs including *Scene in the bush*. Picture editors and caption writers have typically used the image in ways that have meant it has become a virtually metonymic representation of the colonial Waikato experience. However, there were many experiences of colonisation in the Waikato and the actual scene pictured was by no means commonplace. Yet,
in another sense it could be considered archetypal of the encroachment of Pākehā cultural practice and perception into the frontier between Pākehā ‘civilisation’ and the space inhabited and controlled by Māori. Far from depicting Pākehā being overwhelmed by the difficulties inherent in transforming uncooperative nature (and natives), Temple’s photography in general exudes a confident endorsement of the progressive colonising project. I wrote in Chapter 1 that ‘Recognition’ and ‘excavation’ both have their place as methods of retrieving information from photographs. The difference between how this image has been typically treated by historians and my own analysis demonstrates this distinction nicely. In this case, however, I argue that mere recognition has been inadequate. Photographs have the capacity to carry reference to meanings not actually visible within the edges of the image frame and in this way operate much as other kinds of metaphors do. Photographs are often considered snapshots of a moment in time and place. It is perhaps ironic that ultimately they can become timeless and even placeless. Taken at face value, Scene in the bush has something to offer modern readers of the Waikato. However, grounded in its discursive context, it can be mined for richer and more nuanced meanings and we should not continue to ignore this opportunity.

Fig 5.8 Maori group at Pokeno is another Temple image that is unusual in its subject matter and has been used to illustrate points that may not be justified. Few Temple images feature Māori as subjects and not in such large numbers. The image has been used on several occasions alongside the suggestion that this group was protesting against the building of the road. For example, in Judith Binney’s chapter ‘Wars and Survival’ in the The People and the Land, the adjacent caption reads: ‘A

---

25 This side by side, or stereographic, image was designed to viewed in a special device that provided a kind of three dimensional effect. A number of Temple images, and many others during this period, were produced in this way. It is interesting to note that in Binney’s, Byrnes’s and Te Ara’s use of this image, mentioned below, it was cropped to show a single view.
photograph showing attempts to stop the military road. A group of Māori men and women obstruct the path by the surveyor’s tripod at Pokeno. Photograph taken by Dr William Temple, VC. C. J. Urquhart Album, Alexander Turnbull Library.\(^{26}\)

Notwithstanding that Temple was not a doctor but held the rank of Assistant Surgeon at this time, and that he was not to be awarded his VC until after the battle of Rangiriri in 1863, the images do not support the interpretation of the caption. Similarly, Giselle Byrnes’ use of *Maori group at Pokeno* reflected the same assumption that these Māori were photographed in the act of protesting. Her lengthy explanatory caption reads:

> The photograph, taken on the military road at Pokeno, south of Auckland, between 1861 and 1863, is a clear example of what might be termed ‘passive resistance’. A group of unidentified Maori protest against the conduct of the survey and, moreover, its purpose: the construction of the Great South Road from Auckland to Waikato, which began in 1861. The road was part of the Crown’s plan to penetrate the Waikato. This was, rather ominously, a portent of worse to come. The survey team was no doubt frustrated by this protest:

---

but Maori were simply protecting what was theirs. This was a conflict about sovereignty as much as a contest over the land itself.27

Similarly, *Te Ara-The Encyclopedia of New Zealand* categorises this image as depicting “[a] group of Māori block[ing] the building of the military road into the Waikato at Pōkeno in the early 1860s. The protest failed to stop the road’s completion.”28 Yet this photograph does not depict an antagonistic Māori presence at all. At the moment of the photograph, the group can be seen to be calmly cooperating with the photographer who is recording their image. This is not a candid photograph—as has been pointed out, technological limitations prevented such photography for the time being. The actual image required careful and time-consuming preparation in its setup and execution. The Māori subjects seem a little ill-at-ease and some are seated as if conducting a kind of civil disobedience protest that became popular in other contexts in the following century. But this kind of reading should not be imposed on the Waikato of the 1860s. Māori were commonly depicted in photographs and paintings of the period sitting outside in groups. Furthermore, the tangata whenua had recourse to far more assertive means of protest than staging sit-ins. At this time, there was significant harassment of supply lines and danger to outlying farms in the region as disruptions and delays to the completion of the road were sought through military means. I do not know who the people portrayed in Fig 5.8 were and I do not know if they opposed the construction of the Great South Road. What I can tell from this image, however, is that at this point in time they were not actively opposing it. This may, at first glance, appear a trivial distinction.

But this image has been commonly used to represent opposition to the road, to the
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point where it may appear to modern readers that this was the typical nature and extent of Māori opposition to the road and to colonisation more generally. This is a serious distortion of the reality of the situation which was far more dangerous. It is not surprising that photographs of genuine Māori opponents of the road in the act of opposing it are not available. It is simply not tenable, however, to use this image in their place. James Belich has argued that the Land Wars have often been portrayed as ‘gentlemanly bouts of fisticuffs’ between virtuous rivals before differences were put aside in the pursuit of progress. This kind of image used in this way supports this kind of myth-making.

**Conclusion**

In the previous chapter, the link between photographic and cartographic practices and the military invasion of the Waikato was examined. In this chapter, maps have been shown to be tools in the ongoing invasions which were necessitated by the stubborn resistance of the indigenous Waikato people and landscapes. Even where maps turned out to be works of fiction or exercises in futility they remain important attempts to reconfigure Waikato landscapes using frameworks and practices familiar and significant to the Pākehā world view. In other words, cartographers were often involved in providing a blueprint or roadmap for progress as much as describing the actual lay of the land. In so doing, however, they were exerting a claim to a control not only of the land but also of the viewpoint from which the landscape should be contemplated. Not only did they aim to set the value of the land, but they also asserted control over the values by which the land was assessed, organised and used. As such they can be seen as integral to the resumption of hostilities in the discursive
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battle for control over Waikato spaces and places. Actual control was not achieved by resort to this kind of rhetorical process and the claims to dominance had to be imposed by some kind of more powerful force. Pākehā could apply names to this feature and that place and imagine productive farmland until the cows came home but, until political power was established in the Waikato, Pākehā cultural dominance and their ability to control actual spaces and their designations remained figments of cartographic, and photographic, imagination.

In the following section of this thesis, continuing Pākehā attempts to assert control over indigenous people and landscapes are examined as thousands of Pākehā arrived in the Waikato and the fruits of invasion became occupation.
PART C

Occupation
Occupation: an introduction

This section is concerned with the occupation of the Waikato by would-be Pākehā settlers following the completion of the battles associated with the British Army’s military invasion. ‘Occupation’ is used here in its military sense where soldiers are deployed to control and pacify a region after its conquest. This term has the benefit of describing the actual process of planting soldiers in the Waikato as well as implying that dispossessed locals needed controlling and pacifying. Occupation in this sense involves the imposition of power and authority by force, and that is what happened in the Waikato. Yet ‘occupation’ has other relevant shades of meaning. It can simply refer to the inhabitation of a space without comment on the status of the inhabitant. Occupiers are residents who could be owners, tenants or squatters. The tension between the aim of ‘settlement’ and the more ambivalent reality is invoked by this kind of ‘occupation’. I argue that, although ‘settlement’ was the goal, it was seldom the outcome of Pākehā migration into the Waikato. In the chapters that follow, I consciously undermine narratives of settlement as the overarching framework of colonisation in this region. I argue that, even from a Pākehā perspective, attempts by Pākehā to settle in the Waikato were often characterised by failure. The images analysed here can be read as representing attempts by Pākehā to claim local status, but the images themselves do not necessarily support these claims. That the claims were deemed necessary indicates that Pākehā ‘settlers’ might best be described as occupiers,
and this justifies my use of ‘occupation’ instead of ‘settlement’ as the overarching theme of this section of the thesis.

The occupants who arrived in the Waikato after the end of the direct hostilities of the ‘Land Wars’ in 1864 were Pākehā, mainly British and Irish, many of them former soldiers who had taken part in the British Army’s invasion of the region. Soldiers were promised land grants in part payment for their military service and land was confiscated from Waikato ‘rebels’ and used, in part, to fulfill this obligation. Other parts of the region were opened up to Pākehā settlement through land purchase, and efforts to transform Waikato space from Kīngitanga heartland to Pākehā farm land began in earnest. Unlike the previous Pākehā incursions, the fact that these migrants intended to stay had significant implications for their relationships with the local people and the land.

This section is concerned, therefore, with the ways colonists saw the Waikato from the inside. With longer term aspirations than the scientists, soldiers, surveyors and engineers who preceded them, the colonists set about becoming local. Their relationship with the landscape was different as they tried to scratch a living and a way of life out of the Waikato soil. Their efforts to tame the land had a practical edge. Their landscape representations took on new meanings, too, as landscape change was planned, carried out and recorded. ‘Progress’ was celebrated, sometimes in advance. Maps were drawn which did not reflect the reality on the ground but were, at times, ambitious blueprints which may or may not have come to fruition. Photographs commonly depicted roads and bridges — powerful metaphors for ‘progress’ as well as practical evidence of the Waikato’s connection with the wider European world. As we have seen in the previous chapter, these features were also part of the vocabulary of invasion images which were created with the prospect of
settlement in mind. The images that are the focus of this section, however, were created by those who believed settlement was already taking place. As such, they can be seen as practical attempts to impose European ideals of landscape and land use on the Waikato. They seldom took Māori into account, except sometimes as marginal by-standers or, as they saw it, obsolescent relics of the past. The prospects and intentions of the settlers were linked to specific and very Eurocentric values and perspectives. These were incompatible with the aspirations of the tangata whenua who were displaced physically and discursively. From a Māori point of view, the ‘settlers’ were an occupying force and ‘progress’ meant dispossession and marginalisation. In order to become local ‘insiders’, Pākehā had to remove the previous insiders and keep them ‘outside’. The tangata had to be separated from their whenua in order for the Waikato to become Pākehā domain.

It is important to point out that this was not a phenomenon unique to the Waikato and this section aims to place the occupation of the Waikato into its colonial context while focusing particularly on local examples. It is certainly not unique that Europeans invaded and occupied new territory and displaced the original inhabitants. Moreover, not only Europeans engaged in imperial practices. However, the occupation of the Waikato was part of a British imperial impulse that was unprecedented in its scale and reach. The red-shaded areas on world maps which marked out the British Empire, proclaimed the extent of British imperial control and distinguished British territory from the rest of the world. But the uniformity of the shading disguised the complexity and variability of experience within and between the colonies. Imperial sentiments may have united these places within an imperial discourse but local realities were not always helpful factors in the cause of imperial unity.
‘Settlement’ has a number of relevant shades of meaning, including the resolution of conflict and the payment of an account. In terms of the Waikato, and New Zealand in general, the colonial period has left us with ongoing unresolved conflict and there are some large bills that remain to be settled. To call those Pākehā who arrived in the region during this time ‘settlers’ seems to be quite inappropriate. ‘Occupation’, with its sense of an imposed and perhaps temporary appropriation of territory and the subjugation of its people, is more in line with contemporary Māori experience. This is what Stephen Turner calls ‘the self-contradiction of the settler.’

Turner highlights the discontinuities that, despite attempts by would-be settlers to ‘settle’, disrupt the colonising intent to become local. In fact, the continued presence of Māori whose connections with this whenua pre-date and overwhelm those of the newcomers lead to the idea that ‘the place itself is still in some sense tapu, strictly speaking still possessed.’ The Māori word ‘tapu’ is not one I am comfortable with here, but Turner’s point is a vital one. In order to claim ‘settlement’, colonisers needed to either ignore or somehow suppress a Māori presence. Turner considers ‘the “prospect” of settlement to be a dream, according to the terms of which the new country could be considered a frontier, or open space, rather than someone else’s country.’

As Katie Pickles points out, ‘settler’ is ‘a term that reinforces the status of settlers each time it is used.’ Therefore, the uncritical use of the term can be seen as a colonising act in its own right. The displacement of the indigenous population
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was a necessary precursor to ‘settlement’. Land that was already occupied could not be settled, yet invasion would undermine the legitimacy of settlement. This contradiction could be resolved by the discursive construction of settler space and several powerful myths were employed in the creation of a discursively empty Waikato. The designation ‘rebel’ that was imposed on the Kingitanga by Grey justified the military invasion and consequent confiscation of Waikato lands. Notwithstanding that the term ‘rebel’ is now seen to be unwarranted, and therefore the invasion and confiscation illegitimate, at the time it provided a morally expedient justification for the displacement of Waikato Māori (whether or not they actively supported the King).

Another construction which helped deflect too close an inspection of the logic and validity of this was the myth of the imminent ‘dying out’ of the Māori race. The inevitable passing of the indigenous population opened up the discursive space for ‘setters’ to inhabit without the need for invasion. As Māori were dying out anyway, according to this scenario, there was little need to take their concerns into account. This neat discursive sleight of hand was undermined, however, by the continued survival of the tangata whenua.5

As a result, even in Pākehā terms, ‘unsettlement’ may be a more apt description. The historians Francis Porter and Charlotte Macdonald use this term as an overarching theme in describing the lives of nineteenth-century New Zealand women. An antidote to the extreme characterisations of women as ‘either victims in a trial of unending privation and tribulation, or larger than-life heroines who triumph

(always cheerfully) over adversity’, ‘unsettlement’ is preferred as more inclusive of the often uncertain lives of women in this period and the constraints they faced in controlling their fates. As Porter and Macdonald point out, it was not only Pākehā women who were unsettled. In late nineteenth and early twentieth-century Waikato, Pākehā progress, both as individuals and as a collective, was an expectation rather than a reality. For some, hopes were unfulfilled, while for others, unsettlement was something they were likely to have experienced as well as caused.

The theme of settlement and unsettlement was also used by Giselle Byrnes as a framing label for part three of the *New Oxford History of New Zealand*. In her introduction, Byrnes writes that this ‘suggests that all processes of settlement involve consequent processes of unsettlement.’ It may therefore be more helpful to think of ‘unsettler colonialism’. Perhaps, in the end, we may revert to the term ‘colonist’ which in its original usage referred to Roman citizens who garrisoned newly subdued lands under Roman occupation. According to Johnston and Lawson, and fittingly in so far as this context is concerned, ‘normally, the colonists were granted land, and many were former soldiers.’

‘Settlement’ also has implications for the landscape and for landscape representations. Rather than simply live within existing landscapes, ‘settlers’ needed to impose their own sense of order and land use on the natural environment. Māori had already caused some significant environmental changes but this process accelerated
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greatly with the arrival of the Pākehā. The purpose and direction of change were clearly understood and the results of ‘settlement’ were inscribed on the land itself: new boundaries and borders, fencelines, roads, railways, gridded towns all imposed order and ‘civilisation’ on the formerly ‘savage’ and ‘unsettled’ landscape. Settler space was re-shaped in ways that were more readily understood and valued by the newcomers. Maps and photographs confirmed and reinforced this process as they celebrated progress and proclaimed intentions. Maps could emphasise order and downplay unhelpful or inconvenient features by simply omitting them. Photographs, while less susceptible to such manipulation, were (and are) the product of a particular perspective—distasteful scenes or aspects would not be photographed at all, or at least left outside the frame of the final image. These kinds of images could contribute to the legitimisation of ‘settlement’ by portraying the colonists in the process of ‘enacting possession through the creation of new, settler defined places.’\^{9} This is further justification for substituting ‘settlement’ and ‘settler’ with ‘occupation’ and ‘occupier’.

Having rejected the term ‘settler’, I am immediately obliged to use it in order to tap into the existing literature around the concept of ‘settler colonialism’. Several features distinguish ‘settler colonialism’ from other kinds of colonialism. According to Lorenzo Veracini, the term ‘colony’ has two different, though related, meanings. On one hand, a ‘colony’ is a ‘political body that is dominated by an exogenous agency’. It can also refer to ‘an exogenous entity that reproduces itself in a given environment’.\^{10} ‘Settler colonialism’ straddles these shades of meaning to describe
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the specific situation where the exogenous power both replicates itself and acquires control in a new territory. In other words, migrants who create a self-perpetuating polity of which they are in control, are settler colonists as opposed to other kinds of migrants and even other kinds of colonists. By implication, and by practice, this process involves the displacement and/or subjugation of indigenous populations. As Mahmood Mamdani has said, settlers ‘are made by conquest, not just immigration’.\textsuperscript{11}

Furthermore, Patrick Wolfe argues that ‘settler colonies were (are) premised on the elimination of native societies. The split tensing reflects a determinate feature of settler colonization. The colonizers came to stay – invasion is a structure not an event.’\textsuperscript{12}

In the Waikato, the connection between conquest and settlement is clear and this has had significant implications for the ‘settlers’ and those they displaced. But the conflicts inherent in this process are not confined to a settler-indigene binary. The settlers, by definition, must also identify themselves in contradistinction to their metropolitan source. This is related to the aspect of the settler definition which precludes a return to the metropolis—such migrations are destined to be one-way and permanent. This triangular relationship between metropolis, settler and indigene caused the settler, according to Johnston and Lawson, to be caught between ‘two First Worlds, two origins of authority and authenticity’. On one hand, their origin in Europe was the principle source of their cultural authority, whereas the “other’ First World is that of the First Nations whose authority they not only replaced and effaced but also desired’.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{11} Mahmood Mamdani, inaugural lecture as A C Jordan Professor of African Studies, University of Cape Town. Quoted by Lorenzo Veracini, Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview (Houndmills, Basingstoke ; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), p. 3.


\textsuperscript{13} Johnston and Lawson, p. 369.
Not all indigenous elements were effaced, however, and not only indigenous authority was replaced as we have already seen. Would-be settlers continued to employ some Māori names for places, although they were often unrelated to the original indigenous uses and meanings. These co-opted names can be seen as attempts by occupiers to appropriate the legitimacy of the indigenes. As Peter Gibbons writes, ‘in settler society ... cultural borrowings from the indigenous society ... are designed to legitimise the settler society as an indigenous community.’ Nor is the passing of time itself enough to lend legitimacy to the settlers’ occupation as, as Kirstie Ross writes, the ‘view that becoming indigenous is a by-product of time effaces the colonial relationship, since it suggests that if they wait long enough, colonists cease to be colonists.’

According to Fiona Hamilton, ‘pioneer’ histories are the genealogies of communities striving for a sense of legitimacy in a recently settled land.

Developing this idea, I interpret the content and style of a range of Waikato maps and photographs, analysed in detail below, to incorporate a settler desire to portray themselves as local, or, in other words, to lay claim to an authentic and legitimate presence in this landscape. To confirm this legitimacy, it was not simply enough to plant a flag—the landscape itself had to be transformed. The clearance of bush and swamp, as well as the building of roads and bridges, were practical steps towards achieving the economic and social goals of linked farming communities. They were also symbols of progress and examples of the civilising direction of change. Pictured
cartographically and/or photographically, they were not only signposts for the future, but also evidence of time spent interacting with the landscape in the past. Settlers needed to take control of the Waikato’s history, as well as its geography in order to demonstrate to themselves and others that their occupation was legitimate. The disavowal of other geographies and histories was an important part of this identity building.

Historian James Belich offers another conceptual framework that may be useful in providing context for the exploration of Waikato landscape images during this period. According to Belich, later nineteenth and early twentieth-century New Zealand was characterised by a transition between phases of ‘progressive colonisation’, or ‘explosive colonisation’, and ‘recolonisation’—together ‘hyper-colonisation’.17 Each phase is also associated with different ideals of social and economic development. ‘Explosive’ colonisation was fueled by the ‘progress industry’, another term coined by Belich to describe the comprehensive array of inter-related activities contributed to extraordinary rates of growth in ‘Anglo’ colonies such as New Zealand during the nineteenth century.18 ‘Progress’ was a powerful motivator of settlers and it played a dynamic role in their relationship with both the indigenous people and the landscape. Nature and natives were key obstacles to progress but the ideologies that drove the ‘progress industry’ provided a clear direction for the transformation of the former and a justification for the displacement of the latter. Allies of progress included gold and war which provided the impetus for the arrival of large numbers of people in a particular location with the immediate effect of boosting local demand for goods and


services and leading to rapid economic growth. ‘Progress’ for the whole also made possible the prospect of ‘getting on’ for the individual. New Zealand was promoted as a paradise for various groups of would-be migrants. These ideal societies often incorporated ideas like land ownership and greater economic autonomy as key aspirations which could be realised in New Zealand.

The 1880s provided an abrupt end to ‘progressive colonisation’, according to Belich. Population and economic growth slowed markedly as New Zealand entered the ‘Long Stagnation’. At the same time, the technological innovation of refrigerated shipping opened up distant markets to perishable goods such as meat and dairy products, heralding the development of what Belich calls the ‘protein industry’. This shift enabled New Zealand to become much more tightly enmeshed in the British economy than had previously been possible. This tight economic integration, according to Belich, precipitated, or at least coincided with, a conceptual shift as the settlers modified their goal of superseding Britain in size and importance. Now they much more modestly accepted a junior role in relationship to Britain in terms of power and size, while retaining a sense of superiority in other respects. The progressive phase featured ‘an optimistic ideology, and bold prophesies about great futures’ whereas during the later recolonisation phase, ‘quality replaced quantity as the centrepiece of New Zealand pride; Better Britain replaced Greater Britain.’

In the Waikato, it is not clear if, or when, this conceptual shift occurred, but it is unlikely to have followed the timetable outlined above. War clearly generated rapid settler population increase, although concomitant economic growth was slower to get underway. Military settlements sprang up following the end of open hostilities
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19 Belich, *Replenishing the Earth*, p. 179.
in 1864, and the continuation of army pay and rations was a vital part of the settler
economy for the time being. Soldier/settlers were granted land allotments of varying
sizes, locations and accessibility which, although ‘free’, proved difficult and time-
consuming to bring into production. Gold may have actually retarded progress in the
Waikato — the development of the Hauraki goldfields from 1868 proved too attractive
to many struggling Waikato soldier ‘farmers’ who abandoned their allotments and
headed to Thames. Some Pākehā were farming in the Waikato before 1864 but the
raupatu, in particular, opened up the greater part of the region to the possibility of
progress. Of course, there were extensive Māori cultivations in the Waikato prior to this
time, but, from a Pākehā ‘progressive colonisation’ point of view, these did not count.
So quite large numbers of Pākehā came to the Waikato during the early-mid 1860s and
many stayed, at least for a while. But, even during this phase the growth was hardly
‘explosive’ as nature proved as determined an obstacle as had ‘natives’. The Waikato’s
swampy plains and forested ridges did not become prosperous farms overnight.

Other conceptual symbols and practical signposts of progress that were so important
in other parts of the colony, like railways, for example, were slow to get up a head
of steam in the Waikato. Although there were several significant railway-building
projects undertaken in the region during this period, and the North Island main
trunk line had reached Te Awamutu by 1880, the King Country remained impervious
to railway development until an agreement was made with Ngāti Maniapoto in
1884. Even then, progress was slow and the first train to travel the newly completed
Auckland-Wellington line did not leave Wellington until 7 August 1908, whereas, in
New Zealand’s South Island, the Dunedin-Christchurch line was finished thirty years
earlier.\footnote{‘Building the Main Trunk - The North Island Main Trunk Line’, New Zealand History Online Nga Korero a Ipurangi O Aotearoa <https://nzhistory.govt.nz/culture/main-trunk-line/building>
Whether or not Waikato ‘settlers’ were influenced by ideas of recolonisation, they did become early and influential players in the ‘protein industry’. New Zealand’s third dairy factory was established in Te Awamutu in 1882, and industry pioneer Henry Reynolds set up his first factory at Pukekura, near Cambridge, in 1886.\textsuperscript{22} Butter and cheese were the main sources of protein the Waikato sent to Britain while other districts focused on frozen meat exports. After many years of plans and proposals, the Horotiu Freezing Works, near Ngāruawāhia, was completed in 1915. Prior to this, Waikato stock was processed outside the region. The prospects of a Waikato of extensive and productive farmland envisaged by Cook and Banks in their reconnaissance, and confirmed by Dieffenbach and Hochstetter in theirs, as seen in chapters two and three of this thesis, were becoming a reality.

The ‘development’ of the Waikato was therefore dramatic, if not ‘explosive’. Progress was incremental and required a huge commitment from those involved. The imaging of the Waikato during this period can be read within this ideological dynamic in terms of what was represented, how and by whom. ‘Settler’ dreams and aspirations were undermined by inconvenient realities. According to the traditional progressive narrative, the ‘settlers’ were well on the way to taming the landscape, and the indigenous people had exited the stage. Neither was entirely true, however. ‘Progress’ was not linear in its direction nor uniform in its spread. Images featuring evidence of Pākehā development might be read as confident celebrations of progress, or, Alternatively, as isolated examples of the prospects and intentions of aliens within an environment in which they were trying desperately to be at home.

Cartographic and photographic representations, therefore, can be read as discursive tools that occupiers could employ in the service of creating for themselves an identity as local. They continued and amplified the practices of framing, naming, norming and claiming. Each of these practices has distinct features in this period and each can be seen as contributing to the advancement of occupier goals. The new frameworks that were imposed on Waikato landscapes most obviously include cadastral maps which divided the land into clearly defined and regularised shapes and holdings. Land that had previously been characterised as ‘frontier’ and imprecisely recorded on maps, was now neatly ordered and tamed cartographically. Photographs featuring roads and bridges, and telegraph and fence lines, reinforced this sense of orderliness. Naming continued to be used as an important means of asserting political dominance and, with the influx of occupiers and the opening up of new land for occupation, the opportunities to impose new names, or co-opt old ones, flourished. While many of the natural features already had accepted names, new towns and other political entities such as counties, and new streets and roads provided new contexts for this exercise. Norming may be the most important of these discursive practices in this period, and the others were to some extent carried out in the service of normalising the presence of the occupiers in the Waikato. Recording, and sometimes predicting, the progressive development of European-style landscapes and lifestyles, images had a significant role to play in rendering occupation as settlement. Planting European tree species made the landscape more familiar (and normal) to Pākehā. Naming the streets of Tawhare poplar, elm, pine, cedar, oak and acacia amplified this point (see Chapter 6). Claiming changed focus from an assertion of rightful, if future, ownership and control in the invasion phase to a more celebratory proclamation of progress.
Images which championed the positive direction of landscape change, and therefore may be seen as future-focused proponents of progress, also recorded evidence of change that had already happened. In a society which rated the relative entitlements to land ownership of indigenous peoples on their relationships to the landscapes—agriculture was a higher stage of human development than hunter-gathering and animal herding and therefore tillers of the soil had a superior claim to land ownership than nomads—evidence of human ‘improvement’ of the landscape was important to establishing the legitimacy of ‘settlement.’ Even where, as in the Waikato and New Zealand more generally, the indigenous people were agriculturists and therefore entitled to a recognition of their land ownership rights, their displacement could still be justified by the superior nature of the Pākehā land use practices. The modern and ‘civilised’ Pākehā ‘settlers’ could assert their claims to supremacy over out-moded and ‘savage’ nature (including Māori) but this would only be vindicated if the ‘improvements’ could be shown to have been made. Maps and photographs were important means of achieving this.

The following chapters show that the goal of settlement was elusive for those Pākehā who attempted it in the Waikato during this period. Maps and photographs are contextualised to examine the unsettled nature of specific Pākehā experience, as well to show how these images contributed to the construction of imaginary histories and geographies to discursively claim authentic local identities.
CHAPTER 6

Settlement and Unsettlement

The unsettled nature of Pākehā occupation

This chapter focuses on attempts made by Pākehā occupiers to represent themselves as settling. In traditional colonial narratives, pioneering settlers overcame great hardships and obstacles to develop productive farms and settled lives. The reality is that the hardships were probably as underestimated as the settlement was exaggerated. In the Waikato, even when the tangata whenua had been physically displaced and discursively replaced, the landscape resisted the colonists efforts to tame it to their ends. The agricultural (and pastoral) idyll that had been the dream arguably since Cook imagined the interior from the mouth of the Waihou, was eventually to a large extent achieved. But in the late nineteenth century, this was still far in the future and what was still often represented in landscape images was the unfinished colonial project and the as yet incompletely realised potential of the Waikato’s lands and landscapes. Here, I argue that maps and photographs of Waikato locations in this period can be read as celebrations of potential and actual progress which recorded and promoted the occupation of Pākehā and their transformation of real and imagined landscapes. The landscape was framed in new and particular ways. These frameworks not only normalised the landscape so as to make it readily accessible to
Fig 6.1 Map of the Waikato frontier; Province of Auckland; New Zealand
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University of Waikato Library Map Collection
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Pākehā sensibilities by representing the exotic as familiar, but they normalised Pākehā places and roles within the landscape. In this sense, they were important discursive champions of colonisation and endorsements of occupation as they portrayed Pākehā presence and ‘progress’ as ‘normal’.

This chapter examines the ways that large scale maps of the Waikato, in which the ‘frontier’ is highlighted, can be seen to depict unsettlement despite the intentions of their creators. It also focuses on the misleading nature of superficial readings of maps associated with proposed land sales and photographs of ‘settlers’, both in the Tauwhare area and neither as settled as they seem.

Frontiers of Hopes, Dreams and Nightmares

Despite apparently attempting to illustrate Pākehā settlement and progress, the maps Fig 6.1 and Fig 6.2 in fact reveal the unsettled nature of the Waikato frontier in the decade following the end of the ‘Land Wars’ and the subsequent raupatu (confiscation). The continued existence of the frontier in these years is, in itself, a clear indication of unsettlement. Although the aukati had been pushed back from Mangatāwhiri to the Pūniu River, its function as a border between Pākehā civilisation and natural or ‘savage’ Māori space served as a constant reminder of the contingent nature of the Pākehā intrusion into this region. According to Paul Carter, ‘the rhetorical significance of the frontier is that it empties the beyond of any cultural significance even before it is subdued.’

‘Frontier’ is a claim to conquered space and a discursive rejection of what lies beyond. It invokes myths of heroic pioneers who determinedly push back the frontier in the vanguard of civilisation. Frontiers were

necessary stages in settler-colonial projects, but they were, by definition, contested and unsettled spaces. The Waikato frontier was a place where Pākehā ‘settlement’ was a claim that was yet to be substantiated — *unsettlement*, for Māori and Pākehā, was a more prominent feature. It was also a signal for further invasion to come.

**Fig 6.1** *Map of the Waikato Frontier* illustrates and exemplifies this unsettlement, even as it asserts Pākehā control. According to its legend, this map was made by A. Bogle (late of the A.C. Force) in 1875. It claims to be ‘compiled from the most recent and reliable sources of information’, and, despite its date more than ten years after the last battles of the Waikato Wars, shows the Waikato still on a war footing. The map is oriented with south at the top, as many maps of the period were. In particular, military maps were designed to indicate an intended direction of movement, the target as destination. This map is oriented to face what is clearly perceived as a significant threat—at the very top is marked Tokangamutu, Te Kuiti, which was the headquarters of the exiled King. A stylised flag and fort symbol indicate the military nature of this settlement but no other information is given, unlike the redoubts and blockhouses north of the aukati for which potential and actual garrison numbers are specified. Coach and Dray Roads, Bridle Roads and Telegraph Lines are marked and additional information about some of the places shown is given under the heading ‘Reference’. The region to the south of the aukati, designated Hau Hau Territory, is generally portrayed with less detail than the Pākehā controlled district to the north.

The intentions of the cartographer are perhaps to reassure readers that the defence of the district is in hand, but by emphasising the threats and dangers, a sense of foreboding is communicated. Bogle’s connection to the Armed Constabulary may also help to account for this emphasis as the ongoing importance and contribution of the force is highlighted. As well as the garrison numbers provided for the redoubts,
many of the roads and tracks depicted have been labelled “made by A.C.” The orientation of the map gives a clear indication that the source of any potential threat is located in the Kingitanga stronghold to the south.

The emphasis on referencing events of the war over a decade after they occurred, compounded by the decision to include the locations of three killings of Pākehā close to the border, accentuates the danger. The reference to Hau Hau territory, however, reflects a shift in the focus of Pākehā concerns about the threat of continued conflict with Māori in the decade following the putative end of the ‘Land Wars’ in the Waikato. Hau Hau was a name given to followers of Pai Marire, a movement based on the religious teachings of prophet Te Ua Haumene. Pai Marire, influenced by Te Ua’s Methodist training as well as containing traditional Māori elements, comprised seemingly contradictory messages of peace and explosively radical political ideas which were taken by some adherents to very unpeaceful lengths.\(^2\)

From the Pākehā point of view, Hau Hau represented a widespread anti-Pākehā movement whose adherents were often demeaned as being in the thrall of a barbaric cult. In reality, what Pākehā deemed Hau Hau was not one movement at all. The religious beliefs of Tāwhiao, Te Kooti and Titokowaru were all influenced by Te Ua, but they were never politically unified. Yet, all were labelled ‘Hau Hau’ which became a catch-all designation for disaffected or anti-government Māori in this period. The possibility that they might actually join forces was the worst nightmare for Pākehā who feared the resumption of war. They had proved formidable foes separately and their combined threat was a very alarming prospect. Thus, the label Hau Hau
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\(^2\) For a comprehensive survey of Māori prophetic movements of the period see Bronwyn Elsmore, *Mana from Heaven: A Century of Māori Prophets in New Zealand* (Auckland [N.Z.]: Reed, 1999)
territory on this map, does not reflect reality but, instead, Pākehā fear. Kingi Tāwhiao, who was in control of the area designated as belonging to Hau Hau, would never have called himself or his followers by that name. The cartographer has therefore followed the practice of simplifying the nature of Māori resistance to Pākehā invasion and occupation, but, at the same time, he has exaggerated the threat of a co-ordinated Māori response.

In addition, the map highlights the on-going danger faced by Pākehā occupiers by the reference to the killings of the three Pākehā men, Lyons, Todd and Sullivan, in separate incidents in the early 1870s. The location of each incident is marked, drawing attention to their proximity to the aukati line and also their spread across the width of the line at this point. This, in combination with the depiction of the blockhouses and redoubts, and the descriptions of their garrisons, helps to accentuate the contested nature of the confiscation and the ongoing friction of the frontier zone. The legend labelled ‘Reference’ also gives a further description of the ‘murders’ and names the alleged perpetrators. The fact that no one was immediately arrested for these crimes was also a source of irritation for the occupiers as it highlighted the unsettled nature of their existence which contradicted their expectations.

While the incidents in which the three men were killed were isolated and unconnected, there was still a fear that they were associated with, or might escalate into, a more general ‘Māori outbreak’. Contemporary newspaper reports communicated occupier outrage at the killings while often playing down their political context, highlighting instead the criminality of the perpetrators. John Lyons had been building a fence on the banks of the Pūniu River when he was apparently stabbed during a scuffle as he attempted to retrieve a stolen coat. The gruesome
details of his subsequently being ‘tomahawked … frightfully about the head’ and his body stripped and thrown in the river were widely reported.3

The fear of such a grisly fate must have added to the sense of danger of life on the frontier. Amplifying this feeling would have been the fact that the alleged perpetrator, a man named Kiharoa, had reportedly linked up with Te Kooti. At the time of the Lyons killing, Te Kooti was on the run from colonial and kūpapa forces in the central North Island and a source of dread among the occupier population. Having successfully evaded his pursuers and notorious for several bloody attacks and daring escapes, Te Kooti’s rumoured presence in the Waikato was a cause for alarm. The same report that first announced Lyons’ death in the New Zealand Herald also informed readers that Tāwhiao had offered refuge to Te Kooti in the King Country.4 In fact, at this precise time, Te Kooti was negotiating with the government through Josiah Firth as intermediary. According to a report in the Daily Southern Cross on 20 January, Te Kooti ‘was tired of fighting, and if the pakehas would let him alone he would cease slaying them and sit down quietly.’5 The newspaper report commended the government’s hard line response that nothing short of Te Kooti’s absolute surrender’ would be acceptable. This response would, it was claimed, ‘meet with the cordial approval of every right-minded man—of everyone who desires to see law and order vindicated.’ Reinforcing the perceived threat posed by Te Kooti to ‘settlement’ in tangible and intangible ways, the report concluded that ‘the security of life and
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3 ‘Latest from the Waikato. Particulars of the Late Murder. Mr. Firth and Te Kooti.’, Daily Southern Cross, 18 January 1870, p. 3 <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/newspapers/DSC18700118.2.17> [accessed 7 June 2017]. The same report, identical or nearly, was reproduced in several newspapers around the country including the Taranaki Herald, the Colonist, the Nelson Examiner and New Zealand Chronicle and the Wellington Independent.


property can only be established by the destruction of Te Kooti and his followers.’

The second killing highlighted by information on the map (Fig 6.1) was that of a surveyor, Todd, who was reportedly ‘murdered by Tapihana & party’ on 28 November 1870 ‘in the Pirongia ranges.’ Once again, the newspaper reports provided mixed messages about whether the killing was an isolated incident, tragic but no cause for ongoing alarm, or whether it was symptomatic of continued or renewed tensions over political issues or racial conflict, and therefore of considerable concern to the occupiers and their safety. The Daily Southern Cross reported on 29 November that news of the killing had ‘caused much excitement, as we have for many months past enjoyed an immunity from alarm, and, under the influence of peace, settlement has been rapidly progressing in the Waikato district.’ The same report reassured readers, however, that Todd’s body was ‘not molested in any way, so that the belief that the murder has been caused by a personal quarrel is strengthened. We believe that the authorities did not regard the matter at all in the light of an outbreak.’ Yet it soon became clear that it was Todd’s survey work near the aukati that was the reason for the attack. He was in the process of surveying a disputed block that had been awarded by the government to Ngāti Hikairo in compensation for land taken during the Waikato War in 1863. Ngāti Hikairo traditionally had no claim to this land and its grant to them was a bone of contention. According to another Daily Southern Cross report on 2 December, ‘the Kingites opinion [was] that it is right that the land should belong to the pakeha, but that it is decidedly wrong to give it to
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Ngatihikairo.’7 Todd had apparently been warned of the danger he was in but had chosen to ignore it.

The killing of Timothy Sullivan in April 1873 also caused consternation but newspaper reports were once again at pains to reassure readers. The Colonist reported on April 29 that ‘the murder has naturally created considerable alarm amongst the frontier occupiers, but the Government have [sic] received assurances from influential native sources that it has no political significance [and] is thoroughly denounced by respectable natives.’8 Sullivan was one of a group of three men working on the property of Messrs Walker and Douglas at Pupekura near Cambridge. The other two men escaped, while Sullivan was captured, killed and his body mutilated—he was decapitated and had his heart removed. While this particular block of land was not part of the confiscation, it had passed through the Native Land Court and been sold. The leader of the group of Sullivan’s killers was reported to have claimed entitlement to a share of the block but had not been included in the Crown grant due to his having not attended the Native Land Court hearing. It was also reported that, previously, cattle had been driven off and huts burned, and that two weeks before the killing, the men had also been warned.

In accounts of each of the three ‘murders’ attempts to downplay the wider ramifications of the confrontations were undermined by the publishing of gruesome details of mutilation as well as references to underlying disputes which contextualised the actions of the killers. A report in The Colonist reassured readers that there was ‘no reason to believe that the murder [of Sullivan] differs much from similar crimes

8 ‘Native Outrages in the Waikato’, Colonist, 29 April 1873, p. 3 <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/newspapers/TC18730429.2.20> [accessed 7 June 2017].
The cartographer responsible for Fig 6.1 clearly disagreed with this assertion. By including the locations and some of the details of these ‘murders’ on the map, whereas other crimes were not recorded, the cartographer makes it clear that these incidents were part of the context of historic and ongoing inter-racial conflict which characterised the Waikato frontier. The map also reflects the ambivalent attitudes expressed by Pākehā towards the indigenous Māori population. References to both ‘Hau Hau’ and ‘Native Contingent’ exemplify the complex relationships between the occupiers, the Pākehā government and various Māori groups. Usually deemed ‘natives’, the tangata whenua could be divided into two categories—essentially good and bad. The ‘good’ Māori were ‘friendlies’ or ‘queenites’ or ‘kūpapa’—that is individuals or hapū who supported the government in some way against ‘bad’ Māori who fought against, or remained in conflict with or denied the Pākehā government’s authority. These ‘bad’ Māori were ‘rebels’ or ‘hauhau’ or ‘kingites’. The map clearly delineates the space into good and bad by labeling the area to the south of the confiscation line ‘Hau Hau Territory’.

Different spaces are also allocated to descriptions of ‘good’ and ‘bad’ Māori in the lists of additional information at top left and top right of the map. The list at top left, labelled ‘Reference’, is used to record events of the war of the 1860s, as well as detailing the murders of Lyons, Todd and Sullivan, aligning these events and categorising them together. The notes towards the top of the right side outline the current forces available for the defence of the district from these threats. The strength of the redoubts and blockhouses, their respective garrison numbers and capacities, as well as the ‘Native Contingent’ are listed. The total strength of the Armed Constabulary Force in the Waikato was given as 190 men, plus the Native
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Contingent of a further sixty. In addition, ‘about 130 Natives under the chiefs Te Wheoro, Hori Kukutai, Hargreaves, & Aparahawa Barlow’ were reported to be employed in road building between the redoubts. Te Wheoro’s and Kukutai’s men were ‘armed and enrolled as Native Contingent.’ The inclusion of such figures not only indicate that the Waikato was still on a war footing, but exemplify the importance of the support of some Māori groups to the safety and security of the occupiers. Relying on the support of ‘Natives’ who, in other circumstances, were characterised as unpredictable and duplicitous must have been a very small comfort to some.

This ambivalent attitude towards Māori was often explicitly, if perhaps unconsciously, expressed in the press reports of the ‘murders’. Headline writers do not necessarily express the view of the majority and some allowances can be made for the sake of brevity or hype. However, it is clear from these reports that Māori in general (or Natives as they were often called) were seen to be the problem. The Sullivan case appeared under the headline ‘Native Outrages in the Waikato’ and “The Murder of Sullivan by the Maories’, for example. The Todd incident was reportedly a ‘Quarrel between Natives and a Survey Party’, even when, as became clear from the article itself, the survey party included some Māori and one of the injured was described as a ‘half caste’. The coronial jury returned a verdict of “Wilful [sic] murder against a native or natives unknown”.

A report of the Lyons case appeared under the headline ‘A Man Murdered by a Native’, a perhaps inadvertent, but nonetheless telling,
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12 ‘Murder in Waikato’, Daily Southern Cross, 6 December 1870, p. 3 <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/newspapers/DSC18701206.2.7> [accessed 7 June 2017].
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implication that Natives were a different category to (Pākehā) men. This capacity to commit ‘outrages’ without any real provocation or cause, or at least none recognised or acknowledged by the Pākehā, added to a sense of uncertainty and anxiety among Pākehā residents who lived on the frontier. Māori were categorised as ‘good’ or ‘bad’ but, when it came down to it, the term ‘Native’ classified all Māori as different and potentially dangerous. The map, Fig 6.1, reflected and reinforced this ambivalence and clearly demonstrates the unsettlement of the frontier in this period.

Fig 6.2 Sketch Map of the Waikato District, covers a similar geographical extent to Fig 6.1 Map of Waikato Frontier but with a very different emphasis and style, and a different kind of unsettled frontier is represented. In this map, the landscape itself is shown to be an important obstacle to settlement and the focus is on the tension and interplay between communication links and the natural features that interrupt them, or at least render them less efficient or convenient. The large areas of swamp land which characterised the region are clearly identified but the intervening spaces seem to be well serviced by roads or tracks. Not simply an illustration of natural and cultural features, the map maker also offered a commentary and critique of progress in the region. Many individual farms are marked, and some properties are designated ‘stations’, indicating their superior size, productive capacity or development. Roads and some bridges are labelled, and some are given the added description ‘good dray road’ or ‘good bridge’. The swampy ground is contrasted to areas designated ‘open level country’ or ‘open fern hills’. The additional information given under the map’s title emphasises the distances between townships and it seems as a result that an important intended use of this map was as an aid to travel within the district. ‘Distances by road’ are given in miles, although there is little indication of the possible impact of the state of the roads and the country passed through or how long
Fig 6.2 Sketch Map of the Waikato District

Date 1870
University of Waikato Library Map Collection

http://digital.lib.waikato.ac.nz/nzsm/map040.html
these journeys might have taken. The roads are represented by broken, or dashed, lines which would usually indicate a track or path rather than a fully formed road. Even the quality of the ‘Good Dray Road’ was probably very weather dependent.

Other categories of services and facilities that are specified are ‘Defensive Works’ (blockhouses and redoubts), ‘Constabulary Stations’, ‘Telegraph Stations’ and ‘Post Offices’. ‘Resident Magistrates Courts’ are also listed along with a calendar of session dates. This information indicates that the map was intended to be of use to those who lived in the area rather than to visitors or outsiders. Yet the idiosyncratic nature of the information marked on the map itself leaves questions in this regard. The facts that the Waikato River was ‘navigable to Cambridge’ and the Waipā to ‘Alexandra in winter but only to Te Rore in summer’ were presumably well known to locals and, instead, read like a promotion of the district to the outside. Likewise the news that the ‘Steamer Bluenose plies up and down both rivers once weekly at present’ provides the implication that the map was also perhaps intended as a statement of the progress of the region to date. Many of the additional landmarks noted are occupiers’ farms and the overall effect is to emphasise the ordered and orderly interconnectedness of the region from a Pākehā point of view. There are, however, some features that undermine this settled image. While the populations of the Pākehā towns and farms are not specified, Māori kainga (villages) labels also include population totals and tribal designations. For example, at Tamahere we learn that Te Raihi’s settlement comprised 45 Ngati Haua and at Peria, near Matamata, there were 15 Ngāti Haua.\textsuperscript{15} This practice of enumerating Māori populations is reminiscent of earlier military maps where a strategic advantage of knowing the strength and whereabouts of one’s

\textsuperscript{15} Some of these descriptions are indistinct as to be illegible, at least on the copy of the map I have been using. Also, the information given for Matamata (Pop 12 Nguturape) appears to refer to a village rather than a tribe or hapū.
enemy was an obvious rationale for their inclusion. The continuation of this usage may indicate the persistence of concerns about Māori opposition to and obstruction of the Pākehā settlement of the region. Furthermore, despite the fact that it was quite likely that a contemporary response to this map would have focused on possibilities of travel and the accessibility of the important places depicted, rather than on the hindrances and difficulties to be encountered, it also seems clear that the extent of ‘settlement’ has been exaggerated.

At some point, this map has been stamped PWD towards the bottom left which indicates it has been filed by the Public Works Department. This, along with the idiosyncratic and seemingly incoherent content of the map, suggests this sketch may have been intended to be used as a basis for a number of other maps. In that sense, it may have been an attempt by this cartographer to collect what was ‘mappable’ about the Waikato to be used as an aid and a guide for other cartographers, or for himself, to construct more specific and/or specialised maps of the region. The version of the map being examined here is a reproduction held by the University of Waikato Library Map Collection but its provenance has been lost and the original has so far proved impossible to track down.

Being so uncertain about the circumstances around the creation of this map means I cannot be unequivocal about its meaning. However the similarities between this and the previous map, notwithstanding the stylistic differences, indicate a shared framework of priorities and understandings about what should be mapped and how. **Fig 6.1** is oriented with south at the top, and is focused on the military’s, in particular the Armed Constabulary’s, contribution to the security and development of the region while in **Fig 6.2** north is up and the focus is on the possibilities of travel and the accessibility of the region’s places and features. Both, however, betray
an anxiety about the ongoing unsettlement of the frontier. Both ‘natives’ and nature were proving difficult to subdue and, while both of these maps can be read within the traditional narrative of Pākehā progress, it can also be clearly seen that Pākehā settlement had not yet been achieved and that it was not an inevitable outcome of the situation illustrated in either map.

While the Waikato frontier was by definition unsettled, there were small sub-regions within the Waikato where serious attempts were made to reshape the land into forms that were more familiar and appropriate from a Pākehā point of view. The following section shows that some Pākehā greatly contributed to the unsettlement of others.

**Selling Settler Dreams**

The dreams of land ownership, close settlement and prosperous farming communities informed the organisation of Pākehā space in the Waikato as well as its promotion as a settler destination. In the traditional Pākehā progress narrative, heroic pioneers eked a farming livelihood out of bush and swamp on the way to becoming the ‘backbone’ of the nation. Both **Fig 6.3 Plan of the Eureka Portion** and **Fig 6.4 Tawhar Suburban Lots** were clearly intended to assist in the sale of subdivided land around 1880 to those intent on living that dream. The Waikato Land Association, referred to in both maps, was one of a small number of significant estate owners in the Waikato, having bought up large numbers of the smaller allotments abandoned by earlier military ‘settlers’. The key investors in this company included Thomas Russell, a key attractor of private investment funds from Britain to New Zealand in this period, and Frederick Whitaker, another prominent Auckland lawyer, businessman and politician. Both men had been instrumental in the implementation of the raupatu
in the Waikato—Whitaker was Premier in the colonial government that enacted the confiscation legislation and Russell was his Minister of Defence—and both made (and lost again) significant sums of money on land speculation in the region. According to the historian Russell Stone’s account of the rise and fall of the Auckland business community *Makers of Fortune*, these men, including Whitaker and Russell, ‘for all their frailties […] were men of great inventiveness and drive who helped to give their city much of its modern shape and structure, and assets and amenities which still contribute much to our standard of living today.’ In a chapter devoted to ‘Thomas Russell and his Associates’, Stone claims that the acquisition by Russell of 86,502 acres of confiscated land to the east of the Waikato river below Taupiri was the ‘result of clandestine negotiations with the Vogel Ministry’ and that the sale, ‘indefensible in law, was justified by the Vogel Ministry which had made it, on the grounds of expediency.’ He also suggests that Russell was ‘such a prolific buyer of Maori lands that his name was invariably mentioned among radicals in terms of scandalised disapproval.’ The fact that only radicals were scandalised by this clear conflict of interest suggests that most, and seemingly Stone himself, agreed with the Vogel ministry about expediency and that, as far as progress was concerned, the ends justified the means. Not only farmers, but politicians and businessmen also got their hands dirty in pursuit of progress in the Waikato.

The scheme proposed by the backers of the Waikato Land Association involved the ‘formation of a settlement on a colossal scale.’ The merger of several properties
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17 Stone, p. 177.
18 Stone’s main criticism of Russell appears to be that the failure of his speculative schemes undermined progress.
Fig 6.3 Plan of the Eureka Portion of the Waikato Land Association Property Shewing Proposed Subdivisions

William Brown & Co Lithographers, 1880
University of Waikato Library Map Collection
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Fig 6.4 Tawhare suburban lots and township, the property of the Waikato Land Association to be sold by Auction in Auckland on Wednesday, 6th December, 1882, by B. Tonks & Co.

Wilson and Horton Lithographers, Auckland, 1882
Sir George Grey Special Collections, Auckland Libraries, NZ Map 4566

https://tinyurl.com/yc9hwkdo
into a single entity of over half a million acres was designed to render more manageable the ‘improvement’ of the region’s potential farm land, which would then be subdivided for ‘desirable settlers’ on small farms. A *Waikato Times* report on the proposal in June 1877 leaves no doubt as to the benefits of such progressive development for the region and for the land itself: ‘The greater part of the land … is lying comparatively unimproved, and it will be a great boon to the Waikato to cut the land up into small farms, and introduce immigrants and small capitalists to settle upon it, and develop its resources.’ By April 1880, it was being reported in the *Auckland Star* that a prospectus had been issued in the hope of raising half a million pounds from British investors for the ‘purchase and drainage of further areas of land, in addition to that already drained, and to settle the whole with small farmers.’

At the same time, the *Waikato Times* was announcing the acquisition of Eureka Station by Mr W. B. Suttor of New South Wales and suggesting that he would be the ‘pioneer of numerous “happy families” on what was years ago apparently a wilderness of swamp.’ It was, according the article, the ‘commencement of a new era in the history of colonisation and settlement … [and] the inauguration of the cutting-up principle’ which would lead to the regions land being offered ‘in small lots for sale on fair terms.’ The scheme to subdivide and sell land at Eureka and Tauwhare, then, neatly exemplifies the social and economic goals of progressive colonisation—the creation of viable family farming communities and the construction of Europeanised landscapes. Both necessitated the transformation of discursive and actual spaces.

The maps ‘shewing proposed subdivisions’ and offering ‘suburban lots and
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township’ are therefore bound to be subject to the propaganda of advertising, and it is true that positive descriptions are highlighted. Despite this, a closer inspection reveals some disquieting details that undermined the idealistic progressive vision being promoted. The name ‘Eureka’ is suggestive of wealth by its association with gold, both in ancient Greece and, more recently, in the goldfields of Victoria. However, the Waikato Times reported that Eureka was named by Captain Steele ‘in memory of the difficulty he experienced in wading through the swamp in search of a piece of dry land suitable for a homestead.’ This is one of many contemporary references to the extensive swamps which hindered the development of Pākehā farming in the region. This feature is hinted at in the descriptions in the schedule, top right of Fig 6.3. Sections are described in relation to their progress towards usability as farms, emphasising drainage and grass cover. Descriptions such as ‘Land good and well drained’ and ‘Land all in grass and well drained’ would have no doubt been attractive to prospective farmers while ‘Land not all first-class, part dry’ and ‘Half undulating, half swamp, mostly in grass’ may have been less appealing. The presence of the railway in both maps is also misleading. The larger scale inset of Fig 6.4 shows the Hamilton-Morinsville section of the Thames Waikato Railway (called Thames Valley Railway in Fig 6.3) The dates of Figs 6.3 and 6.4 are 1880 and 1882 respectively, whereas the line between Hamilton and Morrinsville was not completed until 1884. It might be assumed from Fig 6.3 that the railway extended as far as Thames but this connection was not completed until almost twenty years later in December 1898.

Fig 6.4 Tawhare Suburban Lots advertises an auction to be held in Auckland on 6 December 1882. The following day, the New Zealand Herald reported that the
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auction was ‘in all respects a most successful one’. Particularly praised was the fact that ‘the majority of purchasers are intending settlers on their new acquisitions’, a significant step towards the time when, once twenty occupiers were resident on their property, the Waikato Land Association had committed to building and operating a cheese and bacon factory. The achievement of the Association’s goals for the development of the region, and their own financial returns, seemed assured. The same article which extols the success of the auction, however, lists the lots sold, to whom and at what prices. Of the sixty three suburban sections described on the map (Fig 6.4), only twenty three were sold. A further twenty eight town sections, which are not delineated on the map, were sold. Furthermore, contrary to the assertion that most of the purchasers intended to be settlers, eight of the twenty three suburban sections, all clustered tightly around the township, were purchased by the same person, RC Greenwood, who also bought eight town lots. Greenwood was, at this time, an Auckland auctioneer apparently in competition with B. Tonks who sold these properties on 6 December. Greenwood remained in Auckland rather than ‘settling’ in, or even occupying, Tauwhare, but his speculative investment does not seem to have paid off either. By April 1886 it was being reported in the Waikato Times that the Piako County Council had successfully sued Greenwood in the Cambridge Resident Magistrates’ Court for arrears of rates totaling £5 12s 6d, not a large sum but one that indicated his significant financial woes. On 8 May, also in the Waikato Times, Greenwood’s bankruptcy was reported.

The unsettled nature of this ‘settlement’ was also illustrated by the attempts to build a cheese factory in the Tauwhare area. The factory was clearly intended to be a major draw card for prospective dairy farmers and its planned existence was used to promote land sales. This was not enough to ensure the sale of all sixty three suburban sections in 1882, however, and efforts to sell enough of the remaining sections continued throughout the next three years. The same advertisement dated April 11, 1883 which appeared regularly in the *Waikato Times* until at least October 1885, offered ‘Improved Dairy Farms on lease with purchasing clause … Terms Easy,— Interest, six per cent.’ But the cheese factory was a kind of ‘catch 22’—in order for the factory to be viable, a regular and reliable supply of local milk was required, but prospective dairy farmers needed access to a local market for their milk in order to provide a return on their investment of capital and labour. Despite these difficulties, and those experienced by Greenwood, others persisted and Tauwhare School opened in November 1884 with ‘upwards of 30 scholars’ and the cheese factory was in ‘active operation’ a year later.

The vision of Whitaker, Russell and the Waikato Land Association was at least partly realised, if not in the comprehensive and straightforward, not to mention profitable, way they had hoped. By the 1890s, the political climate had changed against the estate owners in both islands and the Liberal Government’s plans to ‘burst up the big estates’ proved popular. To be fair, the Waikato Land Association was never intended to be a long-term land owner on a large scale. The aim had always been to subdivide for a profit but the demand for semi-developed properties of questionable
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viability did not materialise in the 1880s. Russell and Whitaker lost a great deal of money, although other backroom deals, some involving the Bank of New Zealand which was left trying to sell off most of the Waikato lands in the 1890s, meant others were obliged to carry the burden of these failed speculative ventures. Maps Fig 6.3 and Fig 6.4 are not evidence to support the narrative of progressive development of the Waikato from ‘savage’ wastelands to productive and profitable farmland. Far from depicting ‘settlement’, their context is the immoral, illegal and unprofitable occupation of Waikato lands by Pākehā in this period.

This section has focused on attempts to provide opportunities for ‘settlement’ whereas the images in the next section depict actual ‘settlers’. Yet some of the same features which undermine traditional narratives of settlement are represented in the photographs, if in different ways.

**Occupying land and landscapes**

The photographs examined here all feature the ‘settler’ Francis Wise Browning, his family and property. Daniel Manders Beere, the photographer whose work was featured in chapter five, created the negatives of the images reproduced here as Figs 6.5-6.7 sometime in the mid 1880s. The location of the property was on what is now Tahuroa Road, Tauwhare. Browning’s land can be seen marked on the map Fig 6.3 above, to the east of the proposed Tauwhare township and separated from the Waikato Land Association’s property by the confiscation line. The three Beere photographs were probably taken some time in 1886. The house pictured was completed in December 1885, having replaced an older dwelling that had burned down in June of that year. Another Beere photograph, of nearby Tamahere School, See more on this in the next chapter.
is more firmly dated 1886. Beere and Browning may well have known each other for some time before the photographs were taken. Beere had been the District Engineer and was involved in the Thames-Waikato Railway mentioned above,32 and the Brownings had been on their Tahuroa property since at least 1879. The other people pictured in these photographs are likely to be Francis Browning’s wife Meta (née Burke), and their daughter Emily.

The photographs, individually and as a group, create a strong image of the Browning family and their place in this Waikato landscape. For technical as well as aesthetic reasons, the images have been carefully composed in order to demonstrate the skill of the photographer and to portray the Brownings ‘at home’. At first glance, these images seem to fit nicely into a common genre of colonial New Zealand photographs featuring families, their houses and horses. Photographs of families, even those living in homes far less imposing than the one pictured here, would often include what appeared to be their worldly property—and frequently this included a horse. Horse ownership rates were high in New Zealand, and more widely distributed than in the United Kingdom. Whereas horse ownership in Britain usually signaled wealth and status, in New Zealand they were more of a necessity than a luxury. Home ownership was another marker of class that played out differently in New Zealand.

Land ownership, or to own one’s own home, was a key aspiration of working class migrants, and beyond the reach of most in the United Kingdom. Colonial New Zealand has sometimes, as a result, been seen as a ‘working man’s paradise’. According to James Belich, the ‘adoption’ of habits and practices usually associated with higher classes, such as house and horse ownership, was one way that working class migrants

Fig 6.5 Browning house, Tauwhare, Waikato Region

Photograph taken by Daniel Manders Beere. Date: [ca 1880s]
Ref: 1/2-096201-G, Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington, New Zealand

https://natlib.govt.nz/records/23242888

Fig 6.6 Browning house, Tauwhare, Waikato Region

Photograph taken by Daniel Manders Beere. Date: [ca 1880s]
Ref: 1/2-096202-G, Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington, New Zealand

https://natlib.govt.nz/records/23354948
could succeed in “‘getting on’ … the great colonial game for individuals and families, as well as for towns, districts and regions.” It is therefore likely that photographs demonstrating house and horse ownership would have been received in Britain as evidence of ‘getting on’ and a vindication of the decision to migrate in the first place.

It is likely, however, that, in this case, the content and meaning of these photographs must be read quite differently. The Brownings were not working class immigrants happy to eke out a precarious existence comforted by the knowledge that land ownership would protect them somewhat from the possibilities of exploitation by boss or landlord. The Browning property comprised 451 acres and was purchased from neighbour J.B. Whyte in 1879. The recently built house pictured was described in the *Waikato Times* as ‘one of the prettiest country residences in the district’ featuring ‘about ten rooms and fitted with all modern appliances and conveniences’, and built ‘in the classic style of architecture.’ Among the many signs that Browning was a man of means was the fact that, despite a report that the losses associated with the razing of his original house were estimated at ‘£500 over and above the insurance’, he was able immediately to arrange for the construction of this substantial replacement.

Rather than a ‘working man’s paradise’, then, these images may illustrate another form of ideal migration situation—the lesser sons of wealthy Britons making good
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in the colonies. Francis Wise Browning was the fifth son of an Irish landowner from County Limerick. His father had died in 1865 but his mother Emily owned 228 acres in County Limerick in the 1870s, while his eldest brother, Thomas Wise Browning, owned 238 acres in county Limerick, 238 acres in county Cork and 898 acres in county Waterford. Francis was later to return to Ireland to take up residence at ‘Clorhane’, a house in County Limerick, inherited by his second wife Jane Fosberry. It was not uncommon for the younger sons of property owners to emigrate in search of adventure or fortune as they had little chance of inheriting large estates in the United Kingdom. For Francis Browning, 451 acres at Tahuroa

---


39 ‘Estate Record: Browning (Cos Waterford & Limerick)’.
in Waitoa County may have been a less than ideal substitute for an estate at ‘home’ in Ireland, but the photographs appear to be designed to emphasise the Brownings’ comfortable circumstances.

They are also evidence of the Europeanisation of this landscape and the normalised presence of the Brownings within it. Fig 6.5 shows Francis Browning on the verandah of his newly completed house with Meta and Emily at the window on the left. Many photographs of the period show people standing in windows or doorways, both within the building but lit by sunlight so as to be exposed correctly on the negative and subsequent prints. There are very few photographs of interiors from this period and I am not aware of any by Beere. This may be partly due to interest or preference but is likely to be mainly because of the technical challenges such pictures posed. The two dogs which appear in Fig 6.5 also are pictured in Fig 6.6. They may have been working dogs, or for hunting, or they may have been pets. In any case, they have been given a prominent place in these two images and may hint at a lifestyle involving leisure pursuits such as hunting that carried greater cachet in the United Kingdom than in New Zealand where it was more commonly pursued by a wider range of class and wealth groups.40

The house itself is a prominent feature of these two images as well. The views of the single-storey wooden dwelling in Figs 6.5 and 6.6 do not provide a good indication of its size, although it can be seen to be solidly constructed and attractively presented. The third image, Fig 6.7, however, does give a wider perspective allowing for a view of the house, out buildings and their setting. The Brownings are pictured standing in the foreground, an umbrella and broad-brimmed hats protecting against the bright sun. The extent of the pastureland is emphasised by this elevated

40 James Belich, Making Peoples, p. 376.
viewpoint, taking in, as it does, the rolling countryside down to the plains towards Eureka to the west, and beyond. It is this image which clearly sets out to situate the Brownings in this landscape, normalising and naturalising their presence to the point where, their feet hidden by a slight rise in front of them, they appear planted in the ground. The Brownings and their house and buildings are the only visible human presence in the image, giving the illusion, perhaps intentional, that they are lords of this whole domain. In fact, the Brownings did not own any of the flat land visible in the background, much of which, but not all, had recently been reclaimed from swamp. The framing of the image includes only land which has been ‘developed’, or Europeanised to the extent that the photograph’s location could be somewhere in Europe.

While the scene accentuates a sense of calm, abetted by the benign weather conditions, an invisible but significant rupture is the elephant in this picture. The confiscation line runs approximately parallel to the horizon, the Brownings’ property being outside the confiscated area, but much of the flatter land in the background was subject to raupatu under the 1863 legislation. As pointed out above, much of this confiscated land fell into the hands of the Waikato Land Association whose attempts to subdivide are pictured in the maps Figs 6.3 and 6.4. But the fact that the Browning property was not confiscated from its Māori owners does not mean the transaction was free from controversy. Less well-known but far more destructive to Māori land holding and political, economic and cultural autonomy was the operation of the Native Land Court, especially from 1865. On 14 November 1868, following hearings at Cambridge, Judge John Rogan ordered a Crown Grant be issued for Tahuroa number one block, of which the Browning property was part, in
favour of nine Ngāti Hauā individuals in trust for themselves and others.\textsuperscript{41} Under the legislation these nine, Penetito and eight others, were effectively owners of the block and could sell their individual shares without regard to claims of the wider hapū and iwi. The case was back before the Court in December 1869 in an attempt by the trustees to have the trust clause removed as ‘it would be better for them to leave out that clause altogether, as it would thus be much simpler’.\textsuperscript{42} Penetito testified that this was their wish ‘in order that anyone might be able to dispose of his part of the land if he thought proper’. Judge Rogan issued a Certificate of Title to the nine with no restrictions placed on it. On 27 April 1870, the grantees sold 6,146 acres to the Crown comprising Tahuroa number one and other blocks. The Crown purchase agents were Francis Fenton, Chief Judge of the Native Land Court, and George Drummond Hay, a surveyor who had originally surveyed Tahuroa number one block in 1868\textsuperscript{43}. The price paid was between two shillings and sixpence and three shillings and sixpence an acre.

The operations of the Native Land Court, particularly after 1865, were responsible for far greater loss of land from Māori than the more famous confiscations, and were often equally contentious. The ironically named Native Land Court was designed, not to protect Māori land in the hands of its owners, but to convert Māori land into Pākehā title in order to facilitate its transfer into Pākehā ownership—in other words it was an \textit{anti}-Native Land Court. Māori called it ‘Te Kooti Tango Whenua’, the Land-taking Court. Historian Judith Binney has called the Native Land Court

\begin{enumerate}
\item Waikato MB, No. 03, p. 200.
\item Waikato MB, No. 03, p. 312.
\item Drummond Hay was the interpreter and guide who accompanied Hochstetter on his Waikato reconnaissance a decade earlier.
\end{enumerate}
legislation an ‘act of war’\textsuperscript{44}, and prominent Ngāti Whātua academic Hugh Kawharu labelled the Court an ‘engine of destruction’.\textsuperscript{45} Christopher Hilliard has shown that, despite contemporary claims to the contrary, the rules applied by the judges in their adjudications ‘ran counter to indigenous people’s understanding of their culture.’\textsuperscript{46} According to Court architect and Chief Judge Francis Fenton, in its first seven years of operation the Court had issued titles to 5,013,839 acres of Māori land.\textsuperscript{47} This, along with the 3.5 million or so acres of the confiscation, represents approximately forty per cent of the lands that had remained in Māori hands before the Court first began operation in 1862, and about one third of the total North Island land area. Not all of this land was alienated, but it was all converted to Pākehā title. The destructive effects of the Court’s practices on Māori, the intentions of the politicians and judges who were responsible for the legislation and its implementation, as well as the variety of motives Māori had for bringing land before the Court, have been well documented and it is not my intention to cover that ground in detail again here.\textsuperscript{48}


What is important to understand, however, is that the controversial Native Land Court and its practices played a significant role in the reshaping and reconfiguring of space in the Waikato.

The difference between confiscated land and land acquired by other means, fair or foul, mattered little to its control and use by Pākehā in constructing what they saw as ‘civilised’ space. The methods used to acquire the land pictured also illustrate that, as far as Pākehā were concerned, the end justified the means and their determination to ‘develop’ what they deemed ‘wasteland’, rescuing it from Māori hands where it would remain under-utilised. In theory, the Native Land Court allowed for the continued Māori ownership of land, albeit under Pākehā title. In practice, the costs associated with the Court processes often meant at least some of the land for which a Crown Grant was issued had to be sold. A Crown Grant ordered by the Court was not a transfer of title, but a confirmation of an existing land right. What changed, however, was the complex system of customary land rights was replaced by Pākehā title. Many Māori owners were forced to sell the land of which they had just been confirmed as owners in order to pay the costs of proving their ownership.

The Native Land Court legislation also revoked the previous mechanism for alienating Māori land, Crown Pre-emption, and so land not passed through the Court was unsaleable. Not that it was easy to avoid the workings of the Court in order to retain the land. Any Māori individual could issue a claim to any block of land, whether a legitimate applicant or not. Only evidence delivered in person could be admitted by the Court, so real owners would be forced to turn up to defend their rights or risk losing them to another claimant. Court sessions in Pākehā towns, like Cambridge, were particularly notorious for the practices of unscrupulous shopkeepers and hoteliers in advancing credit to Māori claimants who were compelled to spend
whatever time their case took in town. A successful claim often resulted in the sale of the land in order to repay these debts.

The Land Court records do not specify how, if at all, Penetito and the others distributed the proceeds of the sale of Tahuroa number one, but they were not obliged to do so. They acquired the land as de facto owners and were at liberty to dispose of it as they saw fit, without reference to any other person. This was not really individualisation of title. It was, in Alan Ward’s words, ‘pseudo-individualisation, which systematically converted Māori customary land rights into negotiable paper.’49 This led to the possibility of large numbers of Māori ‘owners’ whose names did not appear on the Crown Grant being dispossessed in unfair, but legal, methods.

Another problem with this process, the questionable roles played by the Native Land Court judges and other officials in the alienation of Māori land, is also highlighted by this case. There was a seeming conflict of interest in the parts played by Fenton and Hay in the sale of Tahuroa number one, just as there had been in the financial benefits gained by Whitaker and Russell from the confiscation legislation they were instrumental in passing. The goal of ‘progress’ and the alienation of as much Māori land into Pākehā hands as possible, in as short a time as possible, was clearly too important a result to let such quibbles get in the way.

The Browning family pictured in Figs 6.5-6.7 were not necessarily aware of the problems associated with the original purchase of the land on which they were standing. As far as they were concerned, they were settlers, although, even for them, their ‘settlement’ was not permanent.

Conclusion

The maps and photographs Figs 6.1-6.7, when read alongside a traditional narrative of settlement in the Waikato, could easily be taken as evidence of progress towards that goal, and traditional historians would have no difficulty in ranging these images in support of such an argument. The displacement of ‘savage natives’, the transformation of ‘savage’ landscape and the development of prosperous Pākehā farms are all apparently visible in these images. However, returning to the main theme of this thesis, scratching beneath the surface to enable a closer, more deeply contextualised reading suggests that that kind of interpretation can be seen to be, at best, superficial and, at worst, misleading or even plain wrong. What can, on the surface, resemble settlement, can, in reality, be quite unsettled. Attempts made to claim a legitimate and permanent Pākehā presence in the Waikato during this time, and historical attempts to repeat and confirm these claims, are undermined by the actual content and/or circumstances of these images. The ambivalent attitudes towards the tangata whenua, and the whenua itself, demonstrated in these images or readily available to researchers into their background, support a different interpretation. The ‘heroic pioneers’ did not settle the Waikato. Following what is now seen as an illegal military invasion, corrupt, or at least questionable, business practices and the active collusion of politicians and the judiciary combined to effect the occupation of the Waikato by Pākehā in this period. This occupation was in many ways tenuous and its persistence should not mislead us into assuming it was then inevitable.
CHAPTER 7

White Space?

Pākehā occupiers construct imaginary local identities

This chapter continues the examination of the Pākehā reframing of Waikato spaces from the inside. I argue that, in order to consider themselves locals, as well as changing the face of local geography, occupiers also had to construct a local historical past. In fact, colonial landscape reconstruction, at the same time as rendering geographic space more familiar and comfortable for would-be settlers, could also be repurposed to supporting local historical identities. The images analysed in this chapter can be seen as backwards and forwards looking at the same time. Progress was still in the frame, but highlighting the changes and emphasising the length and continuity of Pākehā presence lent a legitimising sense of history to their occupation. The question mark appended to the white space in the chapter’s title signals my contention that this sought after legitimacy was far from assured.

The term ‘White Space’, as I use it here, refers to two relevant shades of meaning. First, white space to a designer or artist is the empty or unfilled space around the main image which adds context to the subject by framing it. Sometimes known as negative space, it is the non-image counterpoint to the image and it is a design element in its own right. In some ways it can be seen as a blank canvas on which the image is made. Maps and photographs both include white space as a matter of course—in maps the unshaded areas or those without detail are left blank. In
photographs, especially the black and white images of the time, the highlights are rendered white. For both maps and photographic prints, the image is defined by the darker lines, shapes and patterns against the original white background. White space in this sense is not necessarily white, but its actual colour depends on the colour of the background that is left blank. In many instances, the paper used to print maps, including many of those included here, was not white but an off-white or buff colour. So in this case, white space is a metaphor for blank space. Metaphorically speaking, it also refers to the blank slate that Pākehā occupiers considered the landscapes of the Waikato to be. They were not blank, of course, as we have seen, but the occupiers ignored or disregarded Māori understandings of the land. Perhaps, in the manner of palimpsest, they mentally erased or effaced the existing images in order to reconfigure the landscape as a blank canvas for their own work. This kind of white space was a discursive and actual frame for the main subject of the image—the occupiers and their activities.

Second, white space is used here to mean discursive space that is white due to its association with ‘white’ Pākehā occupiers. Reconnaissance, invasion and occupation were all in the service of the construction of this kind of white space. In fact, the overwriting of indigenous space by (white) Pākehā is a description of colonisation. For the occupiers to construct local identities, physical and discursive spaces needed first to be made (or considered) blank (white) in order to then be reconstructed as being controlled by Pākehā (white). Ironically, the white (blank) space on maps that indicated the omission of unknown or insignificant details was considerably reduced as white (Pākehā) space was extended. The increasing detail on Pākehā maps can therefore be seen as a claim that the occupiers knew more, and in more detail, about the land they were mapping.
This chapter examines different styles of photographs made by Raglan photographers the Gilmour brothers to show how European pictorial traditions were imposed on Waikato landscapes, both those that had been significantly altered by Pākehā activity and those which depicted more natural features. Two series of related maps are also employed to exemplify the tension between white (blank) and white (Pākehā) space discussed above.

**Imaging White Geographies, Imagining White Histories**

European picturesque traditions of image making were clearly influential when the Gilmour brothers set their camera to capture these photographs Figs 7.1-7.3. The photographs are reminiscent of romantic evocations of bucolic landscapes in the pastoral tradition of British painters of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Roads feature pictorially as a means to divide space diagonally and to lead from foreground to background through land that has been developed to a varying extent into Pākehā-style farms. There is a human subject in only one of these images, but in all of them human activity is indirectly, but clearly, featured. Road-building, bridge-building, fencing, and forest clearance are seen to varying degrees. The roads are pictured in peacefully calm settings, while their muddy ruttedness often hints at the difficulties as well as the commonness of travel on them. By photographing this location in this manner, the Gilmour brothers framed and claimed space as under Pākehā control.

While evidence of the geographical transformation of the district is clearly visible, the focus on the work that has already been done, combined with the romantic pictorial tradition of the compositions, also emphasises the historical time taken to achieve these developments. The framing of these images can be interpreted as a
statement claim to the control of geographical and historical space in order to confer legitimacy to Pākehā occupation. In other words, these images can be seen as, in themselves, acts of colonisation.

I am not arguing that the Gilmour brothers necessarily had this overt purpose in mind when they made the pictures featured here. However, it is evident that they intended to represent the Raglan and Te Mata districts in a specific style. Perhaps they were influenced by the newly popular artistic style ‘pictorialism’, as Felicity Barnes has shown their contemporary Harry Moult was. According to Barnes, ‘pictorialists took great care to augment the romantic qualities of [their] subjects.’ A factor that is surely not irrelevant is that many of these images were reproduced as postcards. It is clear from this that, not only did the Gilmour brothers understand and relate to a

---

tradition of European landscapes that could be applied to this Waikato location, they also expected a wider audience – buyers and receivers of postcards – to understand and relate to this conceptual framework. Unlike most of the other images analysed in the course of this study, these photographs were created with the intention of being extensively distributed and circulated. While photographers like Daniel Beere may have wanted to make money from the production of his images, it was the innovation of the postcard boom that created a large market for mass produced images.

These images are some of the approximately 180 photographs attributed to the Gilmour brothers in the William Archer Price Collection of postcard negatives at the Alexander Turnbull Library. The Price Collection contains almost 2,000 negatives and some prints and, apart from Price’s images, the Gilmour brothers’ photographs

---

2 Reference number: PAColl-3057.
are the most numerous.3 Bob and Charlie Gilmour ran the Raglan store Gilmour brothers from 1902, although the family had been in Raglan on and off since the 1850s. The brothers’ father, Robert (sen), had run the first Gilmour’s Store out of the family home.4 Interestingly, several of the other photographers whose works appear in the Price Collection were also store proprietors: for example, Robert Stanley Fleming (owner of the Novelty Depot, Ngāruawāhia); Green and Colebrook (who ran a number of stores throughout the Waikato region); and Jonathan Ltd (general store in Kāwhia).5 It may be no coincidence that ‘the most influential early print advocate of pictorialism was Sharland’s New Zealand Photographer6 which, from 1892, was published in association with the pharmaceutical distribution agency Sharland and Company. Regardless of whether the Gilmour Brothers and the other shopkeepers were familiar with, and/or influenced by, this publication, the trading store connection seems to confirm a commercial purpose for the creation of this collection of these images.

Dating these images precisely is difficult. All of the Gilmour brothers’ pictures and many of the rest of the collection have a date inscribed on the negative, but this is almost certainly not the date the photograph was taken. All three of these photographs and around two thirds of the Gilmour brothers’ images feature the date 1.8.10 (i.e. 1 August, 1910). All of the Fleming and all of the Green & Colebrook

3 It is clear from the numbers on the negatives that this is the surviving remnant of a larger archive. The thirty six Gilmour images dated 1.7.10 range in number from 101 to 158, the 109 dated 1.8.10 range from 179 to 367. The handful of images after this date are problematic with some numbers repeated and/or out of sequence. Two dated 12.2.17 have the numbers 3676 and 3677!
5 Price himself photographed the Novelty Depot in Ngāruawāhia, as well as the Green & Colebrook stores in Huntly and Tuakau. Another photograph in the Price Collection, Regatta at Raglan, 1911, (ref: 1/2-0000615-G) is provisionally attributed to Philip Henry Watkins, storekeeper and postmaster at Te Mata, whose store was the subject of several Gilmour brothers images.
images are inscribed with this same date, preceded by an abbreviation of the photographer’s name and the word ‘protd’, short for protected. While this does not appear to have afforded any legal copyright protection in the modern sense, it is a clear claim to ownership of the image and the fact that it was inscribed directly onto the negative would have made it very difficult for anyone to have used it without acknowledgement. The handwriting on these negatives appears identical, and this, along with the common dates, leads me to believe the inscriptions were made by Price, or someone working for him, and may have been part of the commercial

Fig 7.3 Nicholson’s Bridge, Te Mata, near Raglan
Photograph taken by Gilmour Brothers. Date c. 1910
Ref: 1/2-000089-G, Price Collection, Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington, New Zealand  
https://natlib.govt.nz/records/22312521
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arrangement entered into between Price and the other photographers. Christine Whybrew has demonstrated the advantages for branding and marketing purposes of such strategies for the Burton Brothers.⁷

It is therefore clear that an important intention of the Gilmour brothers’ photography was the production of postcards. Whether this enterprise began before Price’s involvement or was initiated by him is unclear. It is likely that the Raglan postcards would have been available for sale in Gilmour brothers’ store, and they were possibly more widely distributed by Price, who by 1910 was based in Auckland.⁸ This time period coincides with the postcard boom in New Zealand which began early in the twentieth century and peaked in 1912 when 12,255,477 postcards were posted in New Zealand.⁹ Tourists and locals would have purchased and sent postcards whose images in some way represented their memories of, or connections with, a place. The Gilmour brothers may have had a number of motives for recording particular scenes, but an important factor is likely to have been the desire to produce and sell postcards.

**Fig 7.1, Te Mata Road,** depicts a portion of what was then the road between Te Mata and Raglan townships.¹⁰ This road represented Te Mata’s link with the outside world and, although rough and rutted, shows clear signs of significant traffic. The bridge, with its stone abutments and wooden deck and sides, spans the Te Mata Stream. Cows graze to the right, a fence runs up the left side of the road bounding what appears to be sown pasture, a shed or barn shelters beneath a stand of pine trees in the centre middle distance and there is evidence of bush clearing by fire in

---

¹⁰ See **Fig 7.11** below. This road was closed and replaced, probably before 1916.
the background. **Figs 7.2** and **7.3** also feature bridges on the road between Te Mata and Raglan. **Fig 7.3**, *Nicholson’s Bridge*, is unusual in this collection as it includes a human subject (and a dog). All three of these images show a landscape that has been developed within a Pākehā framework, both in the content and the form of the photographs. Farmland has been cleared (at least partially) of native vegetation and sown with grass, formed roads suitable for horse and cart traffic are linked by wooden bridges with stone abutments and separated from fields by post and batten wire fences. In this sense, the land itself has been framed according to the demands of Pākehā commerce and communication using European-style materials and technologies. Not only that, however, but the respective compositions of the photographs, which reference European (particularly British) picturesque and pastoral conventions, place these locations within a European conceptual framework.

The rural scenes in **Figs 7.1-7.3** feature the area around the township of Te Mata, approximately twenty kilometres south of Raglan. In 1910, Te Mata had a store, a school, a hall and a dairy factory, all of which were photographed by the Gilmour brothers. Te Mata was easily accessible from Raglan by the road that is featured in the photographs. In contradistinction to the Beere photographs featured in Chapter 6 (**Figs 6.5, 6.6** and **6.7**), these images do not depict land that has been confiscated or which has passed through the questionable practices of the Native Land Court. Raglan itself, and much of the land in the surrounding district had been freely sold to Pākehā by Ngāti Mahanga chief Wiremu Nera and his allies. Nera’s original name was Te Awa-i-taia—like many Māori, he took a Europeanised name on his conversion to Christianity. Te Awa-i-taia took the transliteral form of William Naylor,

---

11 The bridge pictured still exists, but it is no longer on Te Mata Road which has been shifted 100 or so metres to the east.
Wiremu Nēra (also sometimes Naera, Nera or Nero) in 1833 or 1834\(^\text{12}\). Before his conversion, Te Awa-i-taia had been a renowned fighting chief whose mana rivalled Te Wherowhero’s, his close relation. He was also a close ally of Waharoa, the Ngāti Hauā chief and father of Tārāpīpipi (Wiremu Tamihana).

After becoming a Christian, however, he became closely associated with the peacekeeping work of missionaries such as the Wesleyans William White and John Whitely, and James Wallis by whom he had been baptised. Te Wherowhero reportedly bemoaned the loss of his ‘right hand’\(^\text{13}\) at that point. The careers of Te Awa-i-taia and Te Wherowhero certainly diverged at that time. Nēra signed the Treaty of Waitangi, while Te Wherowhero refused. While they both were concerned about land sales and the relationship between Māori and the Crown, Nēra chose a much more cooperative strategy with governors and government. Notwithstanding this more conciliatory stance and such was his standing that, in fact, Nēra was possibly a stronger candidate for the kingship than Te Wherowhero. He was reportedly offered the position but turned it down, finding it incompatible with his declared allegiance to Queen Victoria\(^\text{14}\). Nēra had been selling land in the Te Mata district to Pākehā since the early 1850s and he continued to support the accommodation of Pākehā presence until his death in 1866.

Therefore, the land which is depicted in Figs 7.1 to 7.3 was not unsettled in the same way as that shown in the Beere photographs in Chapter 6. Not only had the land transactions happened much earlier, but they were genuine deals between consenting parties. Bearing that in mind, it might be argued that the term...


\(^{14}\) Scott, ‘Te Awa-i-Taia, Wiremu Nera’.
‘settlement’ would be better applied here than ‘occupation’. But there remain two major ‘unsettled’ factors that emerge from a close study of these photographs and their context. Firstly, Nēra had made his decision to engage with Pākehā on the basis that this strategy would lead to a better future for himself and his people and yet the outcome of this policy was not as he hoped or expected. While Nēra did not support the creation of a Māori King, and he, in fact, actively supported the British invasion of the 1860s (without actually fighting), this did not mean he was a proponent of Māori subjugation to Pākehā political and cultural authority. The seemingly contradictory status of ‘kūpapa’, Māori who sided with imperial and/or colonial forces against other Māori, has been the source of some debate. At times, they have been considered traitors, or collaborators, who undermined Māori resistance to the imposition of Pākehā control.

However, as, among others, James Belich explains, kūpapa like Nēra were not traitors to a Māori cause because no such single, unified movement existed. Belich has shown how Māori who responded to Pākehā encroachment through engagement, elsewhere called collaboration, did so for similar motives to those whose alternative strategy involved disengagement, or resistance. Engagers, like Nēra, felt that cooperation with the Pākehā state would provide them with an opportunity to influence government policy to their benefit. On the other hand, disengagers, like Te Wherowhero and the Kīngitanga, considered that remaining aloof from Pākehā authority was the best way to retain their independence.

This is not to say that Nēra favoured Pākehā rule over Māori. On the contrary, he argued strongly for a Māori parliament, and while he supported the arrival

---

of a Resident Magistrate in his district, he expressed his displeasure when one
of his people was tried and sentenced without his knowledge or involvement.\textsuperscript{16}
Nēra expected that his cooperation with Pākehā authority would lead to a kind
of partnership with the Crown. But neither engagement nor disengagement was
ultimately a successful strategy. Kūpapa were very important in helping the Pākehā
to overcome the active resistance to their authority exemplified by the Kīngitanga.
Ironically, their success reduced their importance. As Belich wryly points out,
engagement and disengagement declined together as the end of active resistance
reduced the value to Pākehā of active collaboration by kūpapa.\textsuperscript{17} Once Pākehā had
little incentive to cultivate relationships with kūpapa, their needs and demands could
be ignored or suppressed. The deal that Nēra thought had been settled by his selling
of land, including that depicted in photographs \textbf{Fig 7.1 to Fig 7.3}, was not honoured
by the colonisers.

Furthermore, while the sales were mutually agreed, the price paid to the Māori
owners was much lower than the market value. From 1840 until the advent of the
Native Land Court in the mid-1860s, except for a brief time under the governorship
of Robert Fitzroy, the governor controlled land sales under the pre-emption clause
of the Treaty of Waitangi. While the intent and the meaning of this provision have
been disputed, the effect of its implementation by successive administrations was
that all land transactions with Māori were carried out by the Crown. In theory, this
was to protect the Māori land sellers from exploitation by unscrupulous Pākehā
land ‘jobbers’ who might deal unfairly with the less experienced locals. In practice,
however, several aspects of this policy virtually guaranteed that Māori land sellers

\textsuperscript{16} Scott, \textit{‘Te Awa-I-Taia, Wiremu Nera’}.
\textsuperscript{17} Belich, \textit{Making Peoples}, p. 248-49.
would be exploited by the government instead, at least in terms of the price paid per acre. The land depicted in the photographs included here as Figs 7.1-7.3 is very likely to have been subject to this kind of deal. According to Vennel and Williams, eighteen chiefs, headed by Wiremu Nēra, sold 19,680 acres ‘bordering on the southern shores of the [Whāingaroa] harbour’\(^\text{18}\) to the crown on 22 March 1851 for a total of £400, in other words about 5d per acre. Writing in the mid-1970s, Vennel and Williams claimed that the block included ‘most of the present rich farmlands lying between Karioi Mountain on the west and the Waitetuna [river] on the east; the harbour in the north and the Wharauroa Plateau in the south.’\(^\text{19}\) Other transactions are recorded in the same area, such as for the Karioi Block, for as much as 11½d per acre. The same source quotes Donald McLean, the controversial Chief Land Purchase Commissioner, as saying: “You cannot do wrong in acquiring land at prices varying from sixpence to one and sixpence per acre in a part of the country that promises to become such a valuable appendage to the Crown territory.”\(^\text{20}\)

It is interesting to note that, despite the Treaty of Waitangi and the subsequent annexation of New Zealand as a British colony, McLean was under no illusion that this Māori owned land was not yet ‘Crown territory’.

It was clearly, then, good politics as well as good economics that, in addition to extending Pākehā controlled territory, the land promised, and subsequently turned out, to be rich and productive from a Pākehā point of view. In addition, the land was onsold to Pākehā would-be farmers for an impressive profit. One example, given by Vennel and Williams, concerns a block of two thousand acres ‘immediately south of the future town of Raglan’ that was sold to Henry Chamberlain for £920, or around


\(^{19}\) Vennel and Williams, p. 61.

\(^{20}\) Vennel and Williams, p. 64.
ten shillings per acre. This sum was ten to twenty times the amount paid to the original owners of the transactions mentioned above, and more than six times what McLean suggested was the top of the price range where a land purchaser could not ‘do wrong’. This paradoxical policy of preventing the general exploitation of Māori by enabling and encouraging their exploitation by the government—the price difference was also expected as it was a way for the government to raise revenue—was, in theory to be compensated by the gifts of civilisation that would outweigh any monetary loss borne by the tangata whenua. But, as we have seen, the supposed intangible benefits for Māori of such land deals were seldom made good in real terms. From this point of view, the landscapes pictured in Figs 7.1-7.3 may show attempts by Pākehā to portray the land as ‘settled’. However, the questionable legitimacy of this ‘settlement’ means that occupation is the more prominent subject of these images after all.

There is yet another ‘unsettling’ factor that can be discerned in the ambiguous content of the images. As has been pointed out, these photographs share some compositional features that suggest a particular and deliberate strategy of representation. It is unclear, however, whether the images would have provoked a positive or a negative response in diverse viewers who might have received one or more of them in the mail in the form of a postcard. It makes sense that a commercial imperative would have led the photographers to intend to make positive images so that postcard purchasers would be happy to select them to send to friends and family around the world. So the photographers would both have intended to make positive images and expected that their customers would have found them positive in order that they would purchase them. The rustic rural charm of the pastoral scenes may have evoked a peaceful and ‘settled’ landscape and perhaps the intention of the photographers was to provide an opportunity for locals to share this view of
their district. By referencing pictorial conventions that would have been familiar to viewers throughout the Pākehā world, and, in particular the British Empire, the photographers were highlighting the taming of the exotic landscape towards Pākehā ideals and purposes.

Yet the images are not entirely positive in their depiction of the locality. All three photographs show a road that is rutted and muddy, the bridges seem sturdy but are hardly substantial, the fences appear sound if rather rickety, and the stream banks are overgrown. The effect of these features is to lend the scenes a somewhat dilapidated appearance. The Te Mata area itself was in transition around 1910. The Te Mata dairy factory that had been in operation since 1899, closed in 1911 having amalgamated with that at Kauroa (nearby but closer to Raglan). The Kauroa factory was, in turn, closed in 1915 with the butter making operation moving to a new factory in Raglan.\(^{21}\) This history is not exactly visible in the photographs but a sense of nostalgia may help to account for their apparent appeal. The photos may have been an attempt to capture the region in decline from its peak precisely because this was clear evidence of a Pākehā past. The changes that have been wrought - the forest clearance, road and bridge-building, grass-sowing and fence construction - were achieved by Pākehā hands. The romantic sensibility of the pastoral compositions combines with the used and slightly run-down scenes to evoke a backwards looking aesthetic which emphasises the duration of the occupation. Sixty or seventy years is hardly an indication of antiquity but these images were framed in such a way as to link them with a far older tradition of romantic painting in Britain. Outsiders may have interpreted these scenes as pleasing rural images of a type with which they were familiar. Locals may have also been reassured that the passing of time captured in the
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images may have lent a sense of legitimacy to their presence. The idea that this may have been desirable or necessary undermines the traditional view of settlement, and, as we have seen, this legitimacy was questionable from a number of other angles as well.

Picturesque and romantic pictorialist traditions were not the only European tropes imposed on Waikato landscapes by the Gilmour brothers. The wilderness images which are the focus of the following section required different framing strategies.

**Framing and Taming Wilderness**

The section of this Gilmour brothers’ photographic archive dealing with ‘wilderness’ is substantial. Like the rural scenes explored above, these images can be interpreted differently through the different contextual lenses available. On one hand, they are perhaps evidence of Pākehā attempts to capture and tame the ‘savage’ wilderness by neatly framing it within less threatening rectangular borders. Alternatively, the images may be viewed within the context of the developing ‘scenery preservation’ movement which rued the loss of the natural environment and aimed to preserve remnants for posterity. A third possibility, connected to the other two, is the promotion of tourism to the region through the illustration of its scenic charm. Each of these strategies lays claim to space within a Pākehā framework.

**Fig 7.4 Cave Mouth at Te Uku** is a closely framed view of the entrance to a cave at Te Uku at the upper reaches of Whāingaroa (Raglan Harbour). **Fig 7.5 Wineglass Rock, Raglan Harbour** features one of many distinctive pancake rock formations in the harbour and the wider district. It was taken in the harbour near Te Akau on the northern side. The third image, **Fig 7.6 Blowhole in Mussel Rocks, Raglan** features a
breach in the rocks at Te Kaha Point created by the action of the sea. It is unusual in
the Gilmour brothers’ archive in that it features a scene on the open coast outside the
northern entrance to Whāingaroa. The Gilmour brothers took many photographs
in and around the harbour but few included even a glimpse of the Tasman Sea, and
almost all of these featured this particular spot. This is despite there being numerous
beaches and bays along the coast, some of them now world renowned surfing venues.
Another uncommon feature of this photograph among the ‘wilderness’ images is that
it includes a human figure — possibly the same man in Fig 7.3 above, but not his
dog.

These three images illustrate various strategies of taming wilderness by framing a
scene in such a way as to render it benign by ‘combat[ting] its threatening vastness’ and thus ‘enab[ling] the western observer and potential traveler to enter a scene
safely’. The ‘threatening vastness’ is reduced to a more manageable scale by the act
of enclosure within a the now familiar rectangular frame. Fig 7.4 and Fig 7.6 contain
a frame within a frame — the former the mouth of the cave hints at the unknown
depths beyond, while in the latter the blowhole of the title is given a human scale by
the inclusion of the figure. Fig 7.5 dilutes the strangeness of the geological formation
by naming as well as framing. Not only does the image contain the unfamiliar
within its frame, but by using its Pākehā name, ‘Wineglass Rock’, the photograph
also makes the strange more familiar while at the same time reducing its scale in the
imagination of the viewer. All three images hint at the power of natural forces to
shape the landscape and the action of water on rock to create caves, pancake rocks

and blowholes. Yet this natural power has been constrained by the discursive power of the photographs to control the representation of nature in a way that links to a progressive narrative of colonisation. While controlling the discourse of ‘nature’ is far from being in control of nature itself, the claims to control, and the assumption of the right to control, were important strategies in the implementation of Pākehā colonisation. The effacing of indigenous space and its reconfiguration as ‘white space’ were important discursive strategies to this end.
That these photographs, and the ‘wilderness’ images generally, could be associated with a growing interest in scenery preservation is suggested by the coincidence of their timing. A number of local scenery preservation societies became active between the 1880s and the 1920s\textsuperscript{24} and a Scenery Preservation Act was passed in 1903. The concept of ‘scenery preservation’ stemmed from a fear, on the part of some, that the natural environment which had been so consciously and determinedly transformed by Pākehā bent on progress might be completely and irrevocably destroyed. This concern was a nostalgic reaction to practices that conformed to the more pervasive viewpoint that ‘civilisation’s advance is antipathetic to the presence of forest.’\textsuperscript{25} In

\begin{flushleft}
\textbf{Fig 7.5 Wineglass Rock, Raglan Harbour}

Photograph taken by Gilmour Brothers, [ca 1910]
Ref: 1/2-001085-G, Price Collection, Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington, New Zealand
https://natlib.govt.nz/records/23196506
\end{flushleft}


\textsuperscript{25} P. Star, “Native Forest and the Rise of Preservation in New Zealand (1903-1913),” \textit{Environment and History} 8, no. 3 (August 1, 2002), p. 276.
fact, such ‘progress’ had been made that, by 1910, sixteen and a half million of New Zealand’s over twenty seven million hectares were officially occupied for farming whereas less than seven million hectares remained in forest. Much of this was in remote areas which meant that in many places deforestation was very obvious. The tension between the exploitation and preservation of forest resources intensified as the remnants of the original bush fuelled in some the urgent desire to finish the job, and in others the determination to preserve what remained.

There were not only disagreements about whether or not to preserve forests, but there was not universal agreement among preservationists about why the remnants should be preserved. There were conflicting views as to whether native forests could
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26 Star, pp. 278-79.
be successfully managed for timber production (as opposed to simply being cleared to make way for other uses of the land). Changing attitudes were also influenced by aesthetic factors. The ‘bush’ was increasingly found to be beautiful.\textsuperscript{27} There were two relevant factors at work in the replacement of antipathy by this new-found attraction to the forest. Firstly, as Paul Star points out, ‘beauty was only acknowledged as an argument for protection as the area in forest diminished’.\textsuperscript{28} It was precisely as the bush was being reduced to a more conceptually manageable level that it could begin to be regarded as picturesque. Vast and unrelenting expanses of unbroken forest were dark and fearful places, not to mention inhospitable and an obstacle to farming. Smaller pockets could be seen as welcome relief in what was becoming the monotony of clearance. But it is also possible that this nostalgic response to the potential loss of ‘old’ New Zealand might have the same roots as the search for a local, insider’s identity as described above. Occupiers had to exert their dominion over the natural environment and they transformed huge areas to match their economic and cultural needs and expectations. But by retaining some vestiges of the natural environment which were no longer impediments to progress, they were further exerting control over the actual and conceptual configuration of the environment. The forest scenery that could be preserved had been created by them by the clearing of the rest. It was no longer savage nature but nature that had been tamed. The reserves and parks that were created as a result of this impulse can be seen as trophies, proof of victory and evidence of the legitimacy of their struggle for settlement. Taming natural features by framing them in rectangular photographs was a further strategy for representing and expressing this sense of control.

\textsuperscript{27} Star, p. 282.
\textsuperscript{28} Star, p. 282.
The government that enacted The Scenery Preservation Act in 1903 had more pragmatic and prosaic goals in mind, however. The exploitation of New Zealand’s natural environment for the purposes of tourism was not a new idea but it began to take on a new urgency as perceptions grew of the threat that significant areas of natural beauty might be swept up in the pursuit of progress. Aesthetic and ecological concerns played a less important role than economic ones in the selection of sites deemed worthy of preservation. There was opposition from many for whom the suggestion that any land could be safe from progressive development was anathema. Despite this, the government was prepared to set aside £100,000\(^{29}\) for the purchase of land for this purpose and, not surprisingly, a disproportionate burden of land loss fell on Māori. This was partly because Pākehā opposition to compulsory purchase of their land found more sympathetic ears and partly because, with ultimate irony, much of the remaining undeveloped land was that which remained in Māori hands. Land with greater economic value or potential had largely already been acquired by fair means or foul by the early years of the twentieth century. Māori, who had few cultural incentives, and less access to economic ones, to develop what remained to them, now found themselves victims of the new value that was placed on this land.

Despite the temporary respite afforded by the ‘taihoa’ (wait) policy influenced by the Young Māori Party members of the House of Representatives in the early 1900s, the Liberal government was responsible for the purchase of more Māori land during the 1890s than any other single administration between 1870 and 1920. The pace of Māori land acquisition picked up again in the second decade of the new century.\(^{30}\)
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Whether this land was acquired for scenery preservation or for other purposes, the
effect for Māori was the same. It was Pākehā who claimed the right to classify the
land according to their ideals and agendas and to decide its ownership and use.
Money for the Māori land that was compulsorily acquired under the 1903 act was
paid to the Public Trustee who was responsible for investing it and paying income to
the owners. This was therefore not confiscation, but from a Māori point of view, it
may have been difficult to tell the difference.

Whether or not the Gilmour brothers took their photographs specifically with
the promotion of the district to tourists in mind, some of their images have been
used precisely for this purpose. The aim of E. E. Bradbury’s book ‘The Raglan and
Kawhia Districts, New Zealand’, published in 1915 and part of a series produced for
North Island districts from the mid 1910s through to the late 1940s, was to enable
the ‘beauties and potentialities of this portion of the country [to] become more
widely known throughout the Dominion’.31 The four Gilmour photos featured in
Bradbury’s book include three ‘wilderness’ landscapes with captions highlighting the
beauty of the natural bush scenery of the area. One of the images, entitled The Rapids,
Takapaunui River,32 is captioned ‘This is a typical bush scene at Te Mata, near Raglan.
Many similar beauty spots are to be met with in the region.’ The composition of
this wilderness photograph is remarkably similar to Fig 7.1, which also features a Te
Mata location. In the former, the river is captured on the same diagonal as the road
in the latter. It is interesting to note that in promoting the Te Mata’s ‘beauties and
potentialities’ that an image of ‘natural’ scenery was chosen and not the photograph
depicting the evidence of human toil and progress.

31 E. E. Bradbury, The Raglan and Kawhia District, New Zealand (Auckland: E. Bradbury & Co.,
1915), p. 5.
32 This image is not part of the Price Collection, although it does have the same style of written
label as the Price images.
Another Gilmour brothers photograph features the Waitetuna River and the third of the ‘wilderness’ images is one featuring pancake rocks in Whāingaroa like those in Fig 7.5. The caption remarks on the ‘grotesque’ limestone rock formations found in the harbour. This reference to the grotesque is another strategy of claiming control of space by, once again, taking an image of the unfamiliar, and unsettled, and bestowing it with a known category of description. The term grotesque is the name given to an aesthetic category (like the picturesque). This ‘grotesque’ gets its name from the Italian for grottos (grotteschi) and one of the Gilmour brothers images (Fig 7.4) features a literal connection with the label with its depiction of the mouth of a cave. The grotesque is a category of opposites combining ‘ugliness and ornament, the bizarre and the ridiculous, the excessive and unreal.’ The subject matter and stylistic devices of grotesque images involve the strange and the frightening but in such a way so that ‘comic techniques … diminish the threat through degradation or ridicule’. It is unlikely that the caption writer mentioned above was claiming inclusion of the image specifically into the aesthetic category of ‘the grotesque’, or that these images would fulfil the criteria for inclusion according to most definitions.

However, neither is the use of the term coincidental. The mysterious phenomena of nature were not easily explained and were therefore seen as eerie and frightening. But, like the category of the picturesque, rendering something grotesque was to belittle its harmful appearance or potential. In the case of the grotesque, this was achieved by making something the object of fun, much like a carnival sideshow. Bestowing funny but familiar names on unfamiliar geological formations like
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34 Cornell University Library. ‘The Grotesque’.
Wineglass Rock might be seen as a similar strategy. Photographs (and other images) also had the advantage of reducing the scale of nature to a manageable rectangle. In combination, there appears to be a concerted effort to tame a potentially hostile wilderness setting. By labelling an image grotesque, or by imagining it in such a way, Western viewers and potential travellers could be amused by the quaintness of the unfamiliar and unusual. In other words, these were attempts to impose Pākehā understandings of space onto these locations—to ‘whiten’ the space—as well as strategies of control, not just of the actual land, but also the figurative and ideological landscapes.

**Dividing and ruling**

Another strategy to transform ‘white’ space was mapping. The map Index Map of Raglan County (Fig 7.7) illustrates a multi-layered continuation of the colonising practices of naming (co-opting) and claiming. White (blank) space was designated white (Pākehā) space. Regions were divided and designated according to a variety of objectives, all of which were in support of Pākehā control of the land and its value and uses. Part of a set of maps which represented and delineated New Zealand’s local jurisdictions, this map, dated 1905 encompasses the land between Aotea and Pirongia in the south and Ngāruawāhia in the north (this is the southern part of the county—the northern section was published as a separate map). The west coast and the Tasman Sea form the western edge while the eastern boundary is the Waipā River. Apart from the overall designation of the county, the map is further divided into Parishes and Survey Districts. Within these, land ownership is recorded and blocks are labeled with areas in acres. The map key also suggests the possibility of labelling Ridings, Road Districts and their subdivisions, Town Districts, Drainage Districts.
Fig 7.7 Index Map of Raglan County
New Zealand Department of Lands and Survey 1905
Sir George Grey Special Collections, Auckland Libraries, NZ Map 3601

https://tinyurl.com/ybapptha
and Harbour-Rating Districts, but it is unclear from my copy of the map whether any of these additional layers of land division are featured in this case. All such conceptualisations of the organisation of land into separate administrative zones are assertions of authority as well as practical subdivisions of responsibility.

This is reinforced by the generic key to the left of the map which indicates that, according to this way of thinking, all of New Zealand can be organised using the same criteria. In this way the Raglan County can be seen to fit into a Pākehā-centric framework of counties, parishes and perhaps also ridings. Furthermore the priorities evident in the choice of categories on the key indicate a positive and progressive Pākehā outlook on the organisation and use of land in the region with its references to agriculture, mining and pastoralism. These economic activities along with the demarcation of roads, railways and, in particular, proposed railways indicate a focus on the development of the region in a contemporary Pākehā sense. Added to this, references to ‘Native Reserves’, ‘Native Land passed the Court’ and ‘Native Land not passed the Court’ indicate these ways of thinking about Māori land are the most pertinent in eyes of the authorities responsible for this map series.

However, the arrangement and depiction of land use and organisation in these ways is only part of the story of the assumption of Pākehā dominance of the region that can be seen on this map. The names given to the parishes and many of the survey districts are Māori names. On the surface this may seem to be an acknowledgement of a local indigenous presence and an inclusive practice of confirming local names. Yet this is another clear example of the appropriation and re-placing of Māori names by the colonisers—the taking of a traditional name and applying it to another place without indigenous meaning. Karioi is a mountain, as is Pirongia, yet both became
Fig 7.8 Index Map of Raglan County
New Zealand Department of Lands and Survey 1916
University of Waikato Library Map Collection
http://digital.lib.waikato.ac.nz/nzb/map/067.html
parishes and survey districts. Pirongia was also a township. The Parish of Waipā was adjacent to the river of that name but also bordered Whāingaroa, a harbour, which was also used on this map to designate a survey district to the north of the harbour and a parish to its south.

In Pākehā naming traditions it is certainly not unheard of to name administrative regions for local natural features like mountains and rivers. This naming tradition was not necessarily compatible with Māori practice, however. The names were based on Māori names but, once again, they were disconnected from their indigenous meaning by appending them to alien land administration divisions. This was a double insult, as revered ancestral names that were inappropriately applied to quite different features served as constant reminders of the loss of autonomy suffered by local people as a result of the incursions of the occupiers. Karioi, for example, is a mountain under whose literal and symbolic shadow the tangata whenua around Whāingaroa lived, and still live. According to Angeline Greensill, Karioi has a fundamental role for her sense of place and identity and that of her people. Karioi is invoked in her tribal pepeha:

Ko Karioi te maunga Whaingaroa te moana Whareiaia te tangata

*Karioi is the mountain Whaingaroa is the harbour Whareiaia the man*

Ko Tainui Awhiro ngunguru i te pō ngunguru i te ao

*Tainui of Whiro grumbles and growls by night and by day*

Karioi is thus inextricably linked to Whāingaroa, the harbour, and the ancestor Whareiaia who, as she writes, ‘links our whanau and hapū to this whenua’.36 Karioi is described as being gendered both male and female ‘depending on which side of the maunga is telling its story’.37 While this level of personification of and identification

37 Greensill, p. 11.
with the natural world is not unusual in a Māori context, it is completely ignored in
the process of Pākehā transformation of the name to represent a parish or a survey
district. As the land itself was being carved up in Pākehā ways, indigenous names like
Karioi were also divided to be recast in foreign shapes and meanings. For Whareiaia,
the tangata, there is no place on the Pākehā map.

**Fig 7.8**, dated 1916, is an updated version of **Fig 7.7** which was made in 1905.
The map frames, titles, scales and legends are consistent with the nature of this series
of maps which, as a set, covered the whole country. The effect of this consistency,
when viewing these two maps side by side, is to highlight the changes from one to the
next. While much of the 1916 map (**Fig 7.8**) is identical to the earlier version (**Fig
7.7**), there is considerably less white (blank) space in the newer depiction of content
of Raglan County. This is most obvious in the region north of the Whāingaroa
(Raglan harbour) in what was deemed in the earlier map Parish of Tainui. According
to the maps, the intervening decade saw the subdivision and closer occupation of this
part of the district. On closer inspection, some important changes occurred south of
the harbour too. Roads have been added and, in at least one case, closed and replaced
by updated transport routes. ‘Closed roads’ is one of the ready made categories listed
Fig 7.10 Waikato County, Tamahere and Cambridge H.D.
Survey Office, Auckland, April 1880
Sir George Grey Special Collections, Auckland Libraries, NZ Map 4227
https://tinyurl.com/yd2czm5n
on the legend for these maps so it must have been recognised that early roads would not necessarily stand the test of time in terms of their location or construction. As noted above, roads were vital connectors of communities and potent symbols of progress. They were also expensive to build and maintain so the perceived benefits of a new road over the old one must have been considerable. In any case, these changes would have taken some time, and identifying this kind of change on maps could be seen as reinforcing the passage of historical time and therefore staking a claim to the legitimising effect for the occupiers of historical action. History was also a blank slate for Pākehā in this location and it needed to be filled and recorded.

One of the closed roads marked on Fig 7.8 is highlighted in the map detail included here as Fig 7.9. The southernmost point of this closed road, almost at the point where it diverges from the new road, is the exact location of the photograph Fig 7.1 Te Mata Road taken by the Gilmour brothers around 1910. The nostalgic nature of this photograph may have been amplified by news of its imminent closure but it is unclear if these events can be connected. As has been pointed out, it is impossible to precisely date the Gilmour brothers image except that it was taken before August 1910. Furthermore, we have also seen that maps did not necessarily record established fact, and this map, Fig 7.8, offers no guarantee that the work to close this section of Te Mata Road and to construct its replacement was completed before the map’s publication in September 1916.

The Pākehā preoccupation with roads and roading is also evident in Fig 7.10 Waikato County, Tamahere and Cambridge H.Ds and Fig 7.11 Index Map of Waikato County. The focus of the former, printed in 1880, is two of Waikato County’s adjacent Highway Districts (the HDs of the map title), Cambridge and Tamahere. By the time of the latter in 1907, the Highway Districts have changed to Road Districts
Fig 7.11 Index Map of Waikato County
NZ Dept of Lands and Survey, Auckland, 1907
Sir George Grey Special Collections, Auckland Libraries, NZ Map 3589

https://tinyurl.com/y8ak66xd
but the Parishes and Survey Districts remain. The hierarchy of names is different—the Survey Districts and parishes are labelled more prominently in the later map. Cambridge Parish, in the south, has become Hautapu Parish, perhaps to alleviate the confusion over names. Even so, Cambridge was still a township, a Survey District and a Road District. The maps are the same scale but Fig 7.11 covers much more ground than Fig 7.10—the whole of Waikato county compared with only the southernmost portion. These maps shows a different part of Waikato space to Fig 7.7 and Fig 7.8 above but the demarcation of this space is very similar. The co-option of local names, like Tamahere and Hautapu, is also featured in this context. Like the Raglan maps, these Waikato County maps show the difficulty (folly?) of overlaying so much information on a single map. The label ‘Hautapu Parish’ is barely legible on Fig 7.11 as it obliterates, and is partly obscured by, competing content. This neatly illustrates the limitations of maps such as these, and highlights the decisions that are often made about inclusion and exclusion. But the need to claim white (Pākehā) space by organising and labelling it so, was not reduced by the decline of white (blank) space on the map.

An important change between Fig 7.10 and Fig 7.11 is the addition of two settlements on the later map—Fencourt Settlement and Karapiro Settlement—which were situated adjacent to the confiscation line towards the southern end of Waikato County. In addition, Whitehall Settlement is also shown to be located in neighbouring Piako County. On the 1880 map, Fig 7.10, these locations are principally shown as white (blank space). In fact, they were already well-established and important Pākehā settings, especially Fencourt. Much like at Eureka and Tauwhare (Tawhare) mentioned in the previous chapter, these lands had been surveyed and allocated to Waikato Militia soldiers but had been bought up and
consolidated by Pākehā of means. Initially William Buckland, and then Every MacLean were responsible for what became Fen Court, and subsequently Fencourt. By 1874, MacLean was living at Fen Court and he established pedigree cattle and sheep studs that were ‘famed throughout the colony’. In June 1879, the Governor Sir Hercules Robinson visited the estate where it was reported that one of his party ‘knocked over a brace of pheasants before breakfast.’

MacLean joined with John Williamson and Thomas Russell, whose notoriety was featured in Chapter 6, to form the Auckland Agricultural Company which acquired large land holdings in the region at this time. Like those of the Waikato Land Association, the Auckland Agricultural Company’s holdings—and those of the Thames Valley Land Company dominated by Josiah Firth—proved unprofitable and they ended up in the hands of the New Zealand Loan and Mercantile Agency Company, the mortgage holder on behalf of the Bank of New Zealand. The cabal of Thomas Russell and his colleagues managed, initially, to shield themselves from financial losses by transferring the liability to the Bank of New Zealand which almost collapsed as a result, and would have if not for government intervention. In 1890, the Bank of New Zealand responded to the deteriorating situation by consolidating these land holdings in the Bank of New Zealand Estates Company. This was a temporary measure as it did not solve the problems the bank was experiencing and when the government learned of the severity of the situation, they stepped in and propped up the bank with funds. They also created an Assets Realisation Board to prepare the land for sale. This arrangement, while causing a great deal of consternation at the time, actually, in the end, served the government quite well.

38 ‘Death of Mr Every Maclean,’ Waikato Argus, 13 August 1901, p. 02 <http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/newspapers/WAIGUS19010813.2.13> [accessed 31 May 2017].
Concurrent with this crisis was the ongoing policy of the Liberal government to break up big estates, mainly in the South Island, and to provide land and opportunity for men (and some women) to become small farmers. The Lands for Settlement Acts of 1892 and 1894 and supporting legislation, such as the Advances to Settlers Act of 1894, were aimed at promoting closer settlement and preventing monopolistic land ownership practices. These were seen as moral as well as practical imperatives—the egalitarian ideal of a working man’s paradise was in danger of being subverted by old world evils of poverty and lack of opportunity for the hard-working poor on the one hand, and of excess and greed by land monopolists on the other. According to Tom Brooking, Pākehā colonists were imbued with ‘attitudes variously described as “the yeoman ideal” and “egalitarianism” [which] reinforced[...] “ruralist” notions concerning the need for a vibrant, closely settled countryside.’

Brooking sets out the political and moral rationales for the Liberal land policy innovations during the 1890s in his biography of John McKenzie, the Liberal Minister of Lands and chief proponent and architect of the programme. He also makes it clear that clamour for closer settlement and the subsequent debates about tenure were completely Pākehā-centric. Māori had no voice in this process, whether in the Waikato or elsewhere. Traditional Māori land practices and tenurial arrangements were dismissed as ‘communism’ and rejected by politicians and settlers alike. They were seen as ‘a backward and inefficient system that had been thoroughly superseded by “individualism” and should be cast into the waste bin of history.’

Closer Pākehā settlement was achievable through the break up of large South Island estates, but, in the North Island, this objective put increasing pressure on such
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41 Brooking, *Lands for the People?*, p. 86.
Fig 7.12 Karapiro Settlement situate in Cambridge Survey District
NZ Dept of Lands and Survey, Auckland, September 1898
Sir George Grey Special Collections, Auckland Libraries, NZ Map 4426
https://tinyurl.com/y9mzdzno
land as remained in Māori ownership. The voracious buying up of Māori land by the Liberal government in the decades either side of the turn of the twentieth century has already been noted above. Richard Boast is correct in arguing that land purchasing was not undertaken for the purpose of ‘dispossessing Māori for the sake of it’. This was not some random or spiteful act, but part of a considered strategy to dispossess Māori for the sake of progress. ‘Savage’ nature and natives were to be replaced by ‘civilised’ Pākehā improvements. Boast’s point that Māori land and other rights were collateral damage of Pākehā imperial evangelism rather than the actual target is likely to be small comfort to those affected. In any case, this kind of argument is untenable. The dispossession of Māori was deliberate, and the implications for Māori were well known by the Pākehā responsible. The expansion of white (Pākehā) space was a systematic programme that necessarily encroached on Māori lives in practical as well as discursive ways.

With most Waikato land already in Pākehā hands due to confiscation or the predations of the Native Land Court, the failure of the Waikato land companies offered the government a limited opportunity to address their closer settlement objectives in the region. The Karapiro Settlement, illustrated in Fig 7.12, comprising eleven sections and 2,141 acres, was offered for sale under The Lands for Settlement Act’s provisions in October 1898, followed by Fencourt (thirty four sections, 7,047 acres) in March 1900. By 1910, the government was administering twelve estates in the Waikato that had been acquired under The Lands for Settlement Acts. The earlier settlements, like Karapiro and Fencourt, were offered under a form of tenure
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43 A further Lands for Settlement Consolidation Act was passed in 1900.
called Lease in Perpetuity. This involved a 999 year lease with a fixed rental and no right of purchase. This kind of leasehold tenure was a compromise between those, in the government as well as the wider Pākehā community, who believed that the government should retain all land, and those who saw freeholding as a benefit and a right. The Lease in Perpetuity had the benefits of providing security of tenure while having a low entry threshold in terms of capital for would-be farmers.

Despite these advantages, these arrangements were not universally popular. In fact, Tom Brooking, in his biography of Premier Richard Seddon, claims that the freehold versus leasehold debate ‘split his [Seddon’s] party and, indeed, the whole colony more than any other except Temperance.’44 These arguments were heated because they were conducted at an emotional level, as well as often pitting rural against urban interests. Despite this, according to Brooking, there was ‘broad-based consensus over objectives and goals.’45 This consensus included the idea that only those who farmed the land according to Pākehā standards deserved to own it. This unanimity was, of course, largely confined to the Pākehā occupiers. Māori communal tenure combined a number of unacceptable elements but mainly suffered from not being Pākehā. In any case, Lease in Perpetuity did not last. A system of shorter renewable leases was implemented in its stead from 1907 and many of the original Lease in Perpetuity lessees eventually freeholded their properties.

Sections in the Waikato settlements were selected and, if necessary, balloted. The descriptions of Karapiro and Fencourt Settlements in their respective booklets of particulars, terms and conditions were similar, despite the almost two years that separated them, in that they focused on the benefits of the locations and amenities

45 Brooking, Lands for the People?, p. 93.
that awaited occupiers. Access to neighbouring towns by well-formed roads and further afield by road and rail was emphasised. The accompanying maps, such as Fig 7.12, a copy of which was included in the Karapiro booklet, reinforced these links.

The descriptions of the properties for sale followed the trend seen in the previous chapter of not being entirely accurate or honest. Fencourt, for example, was said to be ‘well supplied with natural watercourses. Water can be obtained anywhere by sinking.’ This was no doubt true, but it was not the whole truth. Obtaining water did not turn out to be quite the problem that getting rid of it was.

According to a submission made in September 1905 to the Auckland Land Board—their nominal landlord—the Fencourt lessees ‘had laboured under very great difficulties indeed, because of the want of sufficient drainage.’ In addition, for ‘a great portion of the year a large area was under water and rendered non-productive and useless.’ The submission requested the support of the Land Board for an application to the government by the newly formed Fencourt Drainage Board for a loan to address this ongoing issue. The drainage problems that afflicted large areas of Waikato land that had been reclaimed—or partly so—from swamps were seldom noted on contemporary maps. This constituted another kind of white (blank) space, this one intentional rather than through ignorance.

Conclusion

The white spaces (both blank and Pākehā) featured in these occupier images were not completely white after all, even at the end of the period under examination. Attempts to transform space in ways that suited Pākehā attitudes and practices were not entirely successful and, like a palimpsest, the images created by the occupiers did not always manage to completely efface traces of the original inhabitants or landscapes. The Gilmour brothers’ photographs of rural Te Mata romanticised picturesque landscapes while recording geographical change over historical time. Their ‘wilderness’ images tamed grotesque natural features by containing their unfamiliarity in manageable frames. At face value, these photographs could be read as the benign artefacts of a settled community. But, not far beneath the surface and not completely obscured, the destructive impact of colonisation on indigenous people and landscapes is visible. The maps featured in this chapter feature less and less white (blank) space as Pākehā obtained more knowledge of, and claimed closer control over, the places depicted. Māori names continued to be appropriated—or re-placed—in support of Pākehā practices of land use and organisation. These Waikato spaces were never as white (blank), or became as white (Pākehā), as the occupiers would have liked or tried to contend.
CONCLUSION

The Waikato re-framed

Past, present and future spaces in the Waikato’s history

In using a spatial history approach to reframe colonisation in the Waikato through a colonisation lens, this thesis has addressed two important goals. First, I have prioritised visual evidence in such a way as to drive, rather than merely illustrate, the historical narratives. By focusing on the spatial occasions represented by the maps and photographs selected for analysis, I have re-viewed, as well as providing a new way of viewing, the Waikato’s past. An examination of these images reveals that the discursive claims of rightful control of Waikato spaces by Pākehā scouts, invaders and occupiers ran ahead of, as well as alongside, attempts to impose this control on the ground. Second, I have reframed this historical context by focusing a colonisation lens on it in order to highlight problematic Pākehā intentions and practices which question the inevitability, and also the legitimacy, of Pākehā colonisation in the Waikato.

In the course of the thesis, I have argued that Pākehā planned, asserted and implemented intrusive power in three phases of colonisation. During the reconnaissance phase Pākehā began to view the Waikato from the decks of their ships as Cook, Banks and others imagined the region transformed in the image and service of European expansion. The west coast harbours were sounded and charted with growing precision, as safe and effective communication with the rest of New Zealand...
and the rest of the world was established. The scientific reconnaissance, embodied by Dieffenbach and Hochstetter, walked and gazed at the land in pursuit of a better understanding of the potential of the region's resources from a Pākehā point of view. They created a catalogue of colonisation with the benefits, and the inevitability, of further incursion firmly in mind. Discursive and military invasions followed as envy and fear on the Pākehā side, and a lack of expected deference to Pākehā superiority on behalf of Māori, made the Waikato a target. The discursive and military invasions mutually supported each other, and, although the guns and bullets proved decisive in the battles for political control, the discursive invasion was longer-lasting and further-reaching, but also less conclusive. Military and civilian occupation followed invasion as the landscape itself became the focus of Pākehā attention. Settlement was the aim but, I argue, this was undermined both by the illegitimacy of the invasions and by the landscape itself. Imaginary histories and geographies were arrayed in support of settler identities as Pākehā occupiers sought an authentic and legitimate presence in the region.

This thesis has also proffered a rationale and methodology for a more sophisticated, and in my view more satisfying, use of visual historical sources. The methods I have used are widely applicable in other New Zealand or international contexts where images with a known pedigree exist. I have shown that such images can be seen as powerful repositories of identities and ideologies, but also that this important feature can easily be missed by unwary observers. ‘Recognition’ is the way that we discern resemblances to our expectations or experiences, and this apparent familiarity often influences our interpretation and understanding of visual information. This faculty plays a significant role in the way that historical images have often been used by historians to illustrate their narratives. I have also shown that
other contextual information such as captions can direct us to particular meanings, which do not necessarily correspond to the actual content of the images. Images can drive powerful emotional connections which aid engagement and understanding. But this distortion of meaning would not be deemed permissible for other kinds of sources. I argue that visual sources used in this way are not only potentially misleading but are, in addition, underexploited. Through strategies such as excavation and deconstruction, historical images can be interrogated to provide much richer and more important information than by using recognition alone. These techniques focus on the investigation and consideration of the discursive contextual circumstances of the creation and distribution of these images. Pictures can tell a story, but not the whole story, and they do not speak for themselves.

In this thesis, excavation has meant considering photographs as part of an archive where multiple images in a collection or album have been available for scrutiny. The lives and work of Bruno Hamel, William Temple, Daniel Manders Beere, and the Gilmour brothers—the photographers whose work is featured in this thesis—have provided important contexts for the photographs. Scientific expeditions, military photography, the picturesque, and postcards are among the specific contextual frames that influenced the creation of the images considered in this thesis and my reading of them. Deconstructing maps has revealed complex and overlapping strategies of claiming. Diverse and sometimes contradictory intentions have resulted in maps that have served multiple purposes. Coastal and riverine charts, thematic and cadastral maps illustrate landforms and spatial relationships but these are not simply benign records of knowledge. I have shown that maps are claims to the primacy of particular knowledges. They represent not just the land, but the ways that land ought to be represented. Particular practices of land use and organisation
are prioritised and normalised. Scientific charts and maps, such as those created by Cook and Hochstetter assessed and categorised Waikato landforms according to Pākehā priorities. Indigenous knowledge about the land was available, but ignored or suppressed. Invasive maps, including some made by actual combatants such as Charles Heaphy, provided military as well as discursive support for the invaders. Cadastral maps organised land according to Pākehā principles but did not necessarily reflect the reality on the ground. I acknowledge that this information is incomplete and, furthermore, that a different story could be told with these or other images. This is an important point and reminds us that the choices made by historians influence the nature of the historical account. This is true of all sources, not just visual ones.

The use of images to form the narrative frame of this thesis has resulted in what to some may be an unsatisfying outcome. There is no overarching narrative to replace 'progress', and the Waikato, as a whole, has not been extensively examined or reported on. As a result, this thesis is episodic—connected thematically but not linearly. This is, in fact, a strength of the spatial history approach I have employed here, however. This focus on the spatial occasions of the circumstances of the creation of these images, allows this history to be decoupled from the constraints of such a linear narrative. The three phases of colonisation that I have identified—reconnaissance, invasion and occupation—may be seen to imply a chronological frame to this thesis and, to some extent, this was unavoidable. However, these phases do not have fixed start and end dates, and overlap between them is considerable, especially where the Waikato as a whole is concerned. Nor am I implying that these phases played out in the same way across the region. Some, for example, were physically reconnoitred only as they were being invaded. Still others may remain technically unoccupied. On the other hand, in a discursive sense, colonisation seems to have operated around
the hinge of invasion. Conceptually, they were parts of the same process as Pākehā colonists projected themselves into ‘savage’ space and imagined themselves settled as a result.

There is also a real possibility that the main aims of this thesis are incompatible. There is a paradox inherent in trying to undermine Pākehā-centric versions of New Zealand history while, at the same time, focusing on Pākehā actions and intentions. It is impossible to write a Pākehā history without referring to Māori but it is also impossible for a Pākehā historian like me to write with an authentic Māori voice. This is the postcolonial dilemma. Moreover, recognising the pitfalls of postcolonial approaches is not the same as avoiding them. I am concerned that I have made the standard postcolonial error of co-opting the Māori voices that I have tried to include rather than presenting authentic perspectives. This dilemma brings home to me the challenge of writing about New Zealand’s past (or present for that matter) from a monocultural perspective. It occurs to me that decolonising Pākehā history is something that Pākehā historians cannot do on our own.

What this thesis seeks to do differently from postcolonialism, however, is to explicitly reframe colonisation as central to the Pākehā experience. This is my response to Nēpia Mahuika’s challenge to ‘close the gaps’ between Pākehā and Māori understandings of New Zealand’s history. If Māori are seen as mere spectators or obstacles to the development of the nation led by industrious Pākehā, this underplays the complexity and diversity of both Māori and Pākehā experiences and is therefore limited in its explanatory capacity. The colonisation lens, on the other hand, can accommodate multiple focus points. More complex relationships, as well as positive and negative actions and outcomes, are in the frame. Colonisation is not the only lens through which to view New Zealand’s past (or present), but from a Treaty partnership
perspective, it is the most important. The Treaty of Waitangi has never had higher status in law and custom in New Zealand than it does at present, although the meaning(s) of the Treaty of Waitangi itself (themselves) continue to be contentious. In this thesis I do not engage with this debate. Rather, I accept that the Treaty principles oblige New Zealand historians, including myself, to seek a more inclusive historical practice which reflects the diverse experiences of both Māori and Pākehā. This thesis does not provide a bicultural solution, but it anticipates that possibility.

While this thesis is directly focused on the Waikato, and to some extent on New Zealand more generally, it also contributes significantly to international scholarship in several ways. The methods used and the approach taken in this thesis have a wide applicability. An increased prioritisation of the use of visual sources will enhance many historical studies. I have shown that images like maps and photographs can drive historical narratives and that to merely append them to existing histories is to forfeit the added richness they can provide. My interest in maps and photographs has led me to focus on these forms, but other kinds of visual sources are likely to respond to this kind of analysis. Furthermore, spatial history is relevant to any colonial context. I have shown that focusing on space can undermine potentially teleological and deterministic chronologies. Limiting, but pervasive, narratives of progress and nation-building can be de-powered in the process. Colonialism is not the only unbalanced power dynamic that infects histories, moreover. Spatial history allows for a more considered and reflexive approach to particular historical actions and events without the constraints of correspondence with a known outcome or destination. The result is more ambiguous, contingent and, in my view, liberating.

In the introduction to this thesis, I described my early connection to Frontier Road. The conception and movement of the ‘frontier’ has also featured in my
Invasion and Occupation sections. At the conclusion of this enterprise I have reached another frontier. The space beyond this frontier, where I now cautiously go, is what I envisage to be the future of Waikato’s past. This thesis has made a conscious step towards the decolonisation of New Zealand’s history. This is by no means an attempt to write away colonisation in the past, but an effort to eliminate colonising tendencies and practices in the construction of history in the present. In reframing the history of the Waikato through a colonisation lens, I have placed myself in the uncomfortable position of occupier. In doing so, I have reached the edge of my frontier. This step is small compared to what is now needed, however. Mahuika's gap remains wide. Further development is required if it is to be closed in a meaningful way. I am interested in the potential for compatibility between spatial history and Kaupapa Māori approaches. My own understanding of Te Reo Māori and Tikanga Māori is too limited for me to have more than a superficial knowledge of Kaupapa Māori. Education for New Zealand historians in these aspects is urgently desirable.

I am also interested in the extent to which Māori images are responsive to the kinds of analysis highlighted in this thesis. Perhaps Māori historians may see some value in raising the status of non-documentary sources. It seems to me that Kaupapa Māori is the only plausible means of investigating this, or of even determining whether it is a legitimate subject for investigation. The kinds of information required to provide the necessary contextual background for historical Māori images are not available to Pākehā historians using traditional methods. Relationships need to be developed. A collaborative approach is needed, although, from a Māori point of view, collaboration may retain a dangerous connotation.

This thesis has been a kind of reconnaissance. I have investigated possible pathways and strategies for the historical invasion to follow. This future invasion will
be resisted by those who would prefer to see the gap remain. Histories are seldom settled, and to aim for the settlement of the history of the Waikato is probably unrealistic, and in some ways counterproductive. I have used the, by now, familiar strategies of naming, claiming, norming and framing to occupy this space in relation to the history of the Waikato. Our occupation of this space will remain, as it should be, open to scrutiny.
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Glossary of Māori Words

aukati  border, boundary

hapū  tribe, clan, sub-tribe, also pregnant

ìwi  tribe, extended kinship group, also bone

kahikatea  tall coniferous tree, white pine

kāinga  village, settlement, home

kato  flowing, flood, also to pluck

kaupapa  topic, agenda

kaupapa Māori  Māori approach

kāwanatanga  government, coined by missionaries from a transliteration of governor

kino  bad, evil, sin

kūpapa  collaborator, a term that came to be applied to Māori who sided with the imperial/colonial forces during the Land Wars

mana  prestige, status, authority

manga  branch of a river or tree

manuhiri  visitors, as opposed to tangata whenua (locals)

Māori  indigenous inhabitant of Aotearoa/New Zealand
| **marae** | courtyard in front of a wharenui (meeting house), also the complex of buildings around the marae |
| **marino** | calm, tranquil |
| **maunga** | mountain |
| **nikau** | a native palm |
| **Pākehā** | non-Māori New Zealander, usually of European descent |
| **pātaka** | storehouse raised on posts |
| **pepeha** | saying, proverb |
| *(pēpeha pā)* | |
| **pō** | darkness, night |
| **rangatira** | chief |
| **rangatiratanga** | chiefly authority, often now used to mean sovereignty |
| **raupatu** | confiscation |
| **raupō** | bullrush, often used in construction and decoration |
| **rimu** | tall coniferous tree, red pine |
| **reo** | language, sometimes a shorthand for Māori language |
| **rohe** | region, territory |
| **taihoa** | wait |
| **tangata** | person, a people |
| *(tāngata pā)* | |
| **tangata whenua** | locals, people born of the whenua |
| **tauā** | war party, army |
tauīwi  
foreigner, sometimes used to refer to all non-Māori

Te Reo Māori  
the Māori language

tikanga  
correct procedure, custom

tūpuna/tipuna  
ancestor
(tūpuna/tīpuna pl)

waka  
canoe, also the kinship group descended from occupants of a particular migrating waka (eg Tainui)

whakapapa  
genealogy, lineage

whānau  
extended family, also to be born

whanga  
bay, estuary

whare  
house

whenua  
land, also placenta/afterbirth
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