

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

Whakaatuhia te Hītori o
te Iwi o Marutuahu me ōna Hāpū
me ngā Taonga o te Whenua.
1850 ki 1880

Let the Story Be Told.
The Iwi of Marutuahu and the Discovery of Gold
1850 to 1880

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Masters
of Art in History at Massey University, Albany

Judith Margaret-Mary Walsh
2006

Kei te rara ā
 Kei te rara a te tai i waho
 Kei te rara a te tai i uta
 Kei te rara a te moana o Tikapa, aue, aue, aue
 Aue e tane, whakarongo, whakarongo
 Moe hau te tupuna maunga i waho
 Tū tonu rā tū tonu
 Ko Tokatea, ko Hauturu, Ko Kaitarakihi
 Tū tonu koutou tū tonu
 Pakirarahi, Taumahurua
 Te Aroha te tūpuna maunga i uta
 Aue tū tonu ra, tū tonu

Ngā puke ki Hauraki
 Ka tarehua, ā
 E mihi ki te whenua
 E tangi ana ki te tangata
 Mai i nga toka o Ngā Kuri a Whareī
 Ki Ahuahu
 Whiti atu ki Aotea
 Huri roto ki te tuawhenua ki Takapuna
 Aa, ko ngā Poito o te Kupenga a Taramainuku
 E tere ana i te takutai moana o Tikapa
 Ko Waihou te awa
 Ko Marutuahu te tangata
 Ko Tainui te waka

Abstract

This thesis is a study of the interaction between Māori and Pākehā in the Hauraki region during the period 1850 to 1880. It examines the role played by the iwi of Marutuahu: Ngāti Maru, Ngāti Paoa, Ngāti Tamatera, and Ngāti Whanaunga in gold mining in the Hauraki region during this period. Three Hauraki goldfields, namely Coromandel, Thames and Ohinemuri, have been chosen as case studies to analysis the economic, political and social impact this involvement had on their lives. It offers a different perspective from what has been written previously about the participation of the tangata whenua of Hauraki in gold mining as it attempts to represent the discovery of gold from a Māori perspective. It looks at the role of the rangatira in distributing and utilizing the gold revenues, and examines at the tension that existed between their role in traditional Māori society and the impact of 'modernization'. It is argued that Māori involvement in these goldfields was primarily of an economic and entrepreneurial nature and it was due to circumstances beyond their control that they were unable to make a financial success of goldmining. This thesis concludes that the Hauraki rangatira who entered into the arrangements with the Crown to open their land for mining did so with the intention of improving the lifestyle of their people and to enable them to reap the benefits from participating in the colonial economy and that at no stage did these rangatira foresee the loss of their land and the damage that would occur to their traditional lifestyle.

Contents

Tauparapara	i
Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
Abbreviations	v
Introduction	7
1. Money Scattered Like Maize To the Fowls	15
2. Let The Gold Be Dug	48
3. The Ugly Carcass of Gold	82
4. Mixed Messages	115
Conclusion	145
Glossary	151
Bibliography	152

Acknowledgements

Grateful thanks is expressed to Professor Kerry Howe and Associate Professor Peter Lineham for their patient guidance, critique and supervision of this work, to the late kaumatua Huhurere Tukukino (Uncle Shu) and Tai Turoa, for the love, support, and self-belief that they gave to a young student of Te Reo Māori me ōna tikanga, to the whanaunga of Ngāti Maru, Ngāti Paoa, Ngāti Tamatera and Ngāti Whanaunga, in particular to Uncle Kemara Tukukino and Uncle Riki Rakena Tukukino of Ngāti Tamatera, and to David Taipari of Ngāti Maru, for their tautoko, and aroha, and for giving their blessing to write about their tupuna and to tell their story, to Waati Ngamane and the Whānau of Matai Whetu Marae for enabling me to reconnect with my pāpākāinga, ngā mihi nui ki a koutou katoa, to Hazel Petrie for her expertise and encouragement, to the dedicated members of the Treasury and the Thames School of Mines for their enthusiastic support of this research, to Joanne and the staff of the Distant Library Service at Massey University Library Palmerston North, to Raniera Kingi and the staff of the Research Centre at Auckland Public Library, to the Principal, staff and Whānau of Baradene College for their tautoko and aroha, and finally to my husband Frank for his support, belief and continual encouragement.

Abbreviations

<i>AJHR</i>	Appendices to the Journal of the House of Representatives
<i>NZG</i>	New Zealand Gazette
<i>NZJH</i>	New Zealand Journal of History
<i>ANZ</i>	Archives of New Zealand
<i>NZPD</i>	New Zealand Parliamentary Debates
<i>ATL</i>	Alexander Turnbull Library

Introduction

Common perceptions of the nineteenth century history of the Coromandel Peninsular offer a portrayal of the white settlement of the Hauraki region and emphasize the importance of the role played by colonial officials and miners in the establishment of the region. There have been many depictions written by Pākehā which describe the story of the discovery of gold on the Coromandel Peninsular. These works have mainly taken the form of regional histories, such as *The Amazing Thames: the Story of the Town and the Famous Goldfield from which it Grew* by John Grainger and *History of "The River Thames"* by A. M. Isdale.¹ Other works were either constructed to act as pictorial guides to the location of goldmines in the area or were written as personal reminiscences about the experiences of family members during the gold mining period. All of these works have been written from a distinctly monocultural perspective and do not acknowledge in any great depth the contribution made by the Tāngata Whenua of the Hauraki rohe in these three goldfields and the consequences that the discovery of gold had on their lives. This thesis challenges some of the misconceptions that have been made about Pākehā and Māori race relations in the Hauraki region during the period 1850 to 1880. For example, the discovery of gold brought equal financial benefit to both Māori and Pākehā in the region, and that Hauraki

¹ John Grainger, *The Amazing Thames: the Story of the Town and the Famous Goldfield from which it Grew*, Wellington: A.H. and A.W. Reed, 1951
A. M. Isdale, *History of "The River Thames"*, Thames: A. M. Isdale, 1967.

iwi were treated as equal partners in the negotiation process for the opening of the goldfields and in their administration.

The role played by the iwi of Marutuahu: Ngāti Maru, Ngāti Paoa, Ngāti Tamatera, and Ngāti Whanaunga in gold mining will be considered in this work. Three Hauraki goldfields, namely Coromandel, Thames and Ohinemuri have been chosen as casestudies to examine the relationship Hauraki Māori had with the Crown and with the wider mining community. This study is primarily concerned with making an analysis of the economic, political and social impact this involvement had on their lives.

The position taken in this work is based on the premise that when Hauraki rangatira entered into negotiations with the Crown representatives they mistakenly thought that though they had ceded the gold to the Crown, they still maintained control over their land. When they discovered that this was not the case they actively discouraged their people from further participation in the negotiation process. This caused a further deterioration in their relationship with the Crown and with the wider mining community.

My study will show that the involvement by the iwi of Marutuahu in gold mining in Hauraki was for the collective good of all iwi, not just for the benefit of individual rangatira. It must be pointed out that some scholars have offered other perspectives implying that Hauraki rangatira became involved in mining for their personal gain and not for the collective good of all their people. It is argued here that the manner in which rangatira distributed and utilized their new wealth was the result of their desire to maintain their traditional mana in their own society, yet encompass for their people all the economic and social benefits that the new colonial society had to offer. The manner in which their new wealth was distributed and used, led to the

misunderstandings, and stereotypical representations of Hauraki Māori, particularly of their rangatira, in the colonial press, artwork and photographs of the period. These representations heavily influenced how Māori were treated by the Crown representatives and the wider mining public.

A textual analysis of English and Māori language manuscripts and newspapers, and a visual analysis of artwork and photographs that were constructed during this period are offered in this work. My perspective on the impact that mining had on Hauraki Māori in the three Hauraki goldfields owes much to the consultation, which occurred with kaumatua and the descendants of Marutuahu. Having access to their whakapapa and traditional waiata enabled me to understand the connections that they have to the land in the rohe of Hauraki and that land in a certain area does not necessarily mean that it belongs to one hāpū or iwi alone. After consulting with descendants of the rangatira of the iwi of Marutuahu, who entered into negotiations for the mining of their rohe, I have their support and blessing to tell their side of the story.

This study has been divided into four chapters. Chapter One reflects on the negotiation process that occurred for the opening of land for mining. The influence and function of the Native Land Commissioners and the impact and consequences of their goldmining policies is also discussed in this chapter. This theme is continued in Chapter Two, as it is the intention of this chapter to look at the economic benefits the discovery of gold brought to Hauraki Māori. It also discusses the various economic and entrepreneurial ventures that they were engaged in. Chapter Three discusses the problems the new wealth caused the iwi of Marutuahu. It also focuses on the role of the rangatira in distributing and utilizing the gold revenues and explores the tension that existed between their traditional role in Māori

society and their role in the new colonial society. In Chapter Four, I consider the wider public assumptions that were made about the involvement of Hauraki Māori in gold mining by comparing how Hauraki Māori were represented in Māori and English newspapers, and examining how they were portrayed in artwork and photography of the period. In this chapter it is suggested that these representations influenced the manner, which the Crown and the wider public related to Hauraki Māori during the period of this study.

The sources used include the direct observations of Māori and Europeans as well as the official records of the period. Preference has been given to Maori sources and translated manuscripts. Particularly valuable sources were manuscripts written in English and in Te Reo Māori, and the correspondence from various Hauraki rangatira which form part of the Donald McLean Collection, held at the Alexander Turnbull Library, and the Hammond manuscripts held at the Auckland Institute and Museum Library. These have been particularly useful as they represented the issues Hauraki Māori were concerned about during the period of this study. Newspapers were another effective gauge of the wider public opinion of the time. A selection of English and Te Reo Māori newspapers has been chosen. The *Daily Southern Cross* and the *Thames Advertiser* were particularly useful because they were daily papers and provided a detailed record of what was happening on the goldfields on a day-to-day basis. Māori language newspapers such as *Ko Te Karere* and *Te Wananga* were also helpful as they were one of a limited number of sources, which were published in Te Reo Māori and directly represented the views of Hauraki rangatira. Maori voices are particularly important here as they offer a counterpoint to the more frequently cited Pakeha understandings of Māori involvement in goldmining from which the popular view of Māori has derived. The most useful official

publications were government files held at Archives New Zealand, and the reports of various Crown officials in the *Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives*. These documents provided a wealth of material and were useful in determining the opinions of key individuals involved in the administration of the Goldfields. The *Parliamentary Debates* also provided an excellent portrayal of the government's intentions, contentious issues and a variety of opinions on every issue concerned with the goldfields.

There are a number of recent and not so recent secondary sources, which also provided useful material. Academic studies such as *This is My Place: Hauraki Contested* by Paul Monin and *A History of Gold Mining in New Zealand*, by J.H. Salmon were used amongst other textual analyses to examine the impact mining had on Hauraki Māori.² Two theses further enhanced my knowledge of the Māori worldview and nineteenth century Māori economic practices. These are 'Troublesome Specimens: A Study of the Relationship between the Crown and the Tāngata Whenua of Hauraki 1863–1869' by John Hutton, and '"For a Season Quite the Rage?" Ships and Flourmills in the Māori Economy 1840–1860s' by Hazel Petrie.

Monin's work was consulted to assess the impact government policies had on the economy of the Hauraki region, and the subsequent dispossession and loss that resulted for Māori from the sale of land in the Hauraki. He contests that Maori became victims only in terms of subordination not in terms of absolute disempowerment and argues that outcomes for Maori were still influenced by their

² Paul Monin, *This is My Place: Hauraki Contested, 1769–1875*, Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2001.

J. H. M. Salmon, *A History of Goldmining in New Zealand*, Christchurch: Cadsonbury Publications, 1996.

decisions and by continuities in their culture.³ This work offers an alternative explanation as it is argued here that the Crown played a major role in the economic disempowerment of Hauraki Māori by creating conditions which hastened the sale of land and by stifling any opportunity Māori had to enjoy economic success. Salmon offered an understanding of the wider political, social and cultural discourses surrounding gold mining in New Zealand during the mid-nineteenth century. His work was useful as it provided background information on the way Māori interacted with Crown officials and the wider mining community on other New Zealand goldfields.

Hutton's study provided guidance on the role of the Land Commissioner James Mackay and the relationship between the Crown and Hauraki Māori. His survey of Mackay's life destroyed some of the popular myths that are associated with Mackay's role in the Hauraki goldfields and is used to support the theory that Mackay utilized his relationship with Māori mainly to further both the Crown's and his own economic situation. Petrie's work enabled me to gain an in-depth knowledge of the economic challenges Māori faced while operating within the colonial world and was valuable in supporting the theory that Crown policy actively discouraged Māori from participating fully in the colonial economy. Petrie argues that the Maori economy flourished while they were free to pursue their business interests according to their own determinants. However, as colonisation proceeded, the pressures of force overwhelmed those of consent in imposing Pākehā hegemony. In the process, Maori lost their political strength and the ideologies of the colonisers had profound effects on their social structures and consequently on

³ Monin, *This is My Place*, p.4.

their economy.⁴ Petrie's work was also an excellent source for furthering my knowledge of nineteenth century Māori society and the importance of Māori customs such as Hakari and Mana. These concepts will be discussed in this work to illustrate how Hauraki rangatira mainly used the revenue they received from the goldfields to maintain their traditional lifestyle. Petrie explains how the ability to ensure optimum food supplies and economic benefits for the community was essential to the political and economic power of the chief.⁵ Petrie's recently published work *Chiefs of Industry* was also consulted in the later stages of this study.⁶

Reference has also been made to the work that has been carried out by researchers on behalf of the iwi of Marutuahu for their historic claims, which went before the Waitangi Tribunal during the period 1997 to 2006. In particular, reference has been made to the work carried out by Robyn Anderson, Russell Stone and W. H. Oliver. Their research provided a greater understanding of the negotiation process that occurred for the opening of the three goldfields, and of the economic, political, and social implications the ceding of large tracts of land had for the Hauraki people.

Words written in Te Reo Māori used in the text are bracketed with an English equivalent at their first appearance and a glossary of such words is included immediately before the Bibliography. Macrons have been used on words written in Te Reo Māori as they appear in the text. However, these are not used in sources quoted in this study, if they were not used in their original form.

⁴ Petrie, p.87.

⁵ Petrie, p.26.

⁶ Hazel Petrie, *Chiefs of Industry*, Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2006.

Overall this work discusses the impact the discovery of gold had on Māori society in the Hauraki region and makes an analysis of the role played by the iwi of Marutuahu in the three Hauraki goldfields, namely Coromandel, Thames and Ohinemuri. It discusses from a Māori perspective the economic, political and social consequences this involvement had for Māori and Pākehā race relations in the Hauraki region. It is suggested here that Māori involvement in these goldfields was primarily of an economic and entrepreneurial nature and it was due to circumstances beyond their control that they were unable to make a financial success of gold mining.

1 Money Scattered Like Maize to the Fowls

Nineteenth Century exploitation of natural resources was based on the premise that unrestricted economic development would benefit the whole community and resources were treated as if their supply was infinite.¹ There is a common theme in the literature, which relates to Māori involvement in the colonial economy during the nineteenth century, namely the struggle for economic control. This struggle lay behind many of the key events in nineteenth century New Zealand. It is argued in this thesis that it was due to circumstances beyond their control that Hauraki Māori failed to achieve the promised financial benefits from goldmining, and that they could not have anticipated their political disenfranchisement and the consequently unequal distribution of financial assistance and commercial support. This chapter will explore the negotiation process that occurred for the opening of the three Hauraki Gold Fields for mining, namely, Coromandel, Thames and Ohinemuri. It also considers the influence and function of the Native Land Commissioners Donald McLean and James Mackay, and the impact and consequences Mackay's Raihana policy had for the Hauraki iwi.

During the 1850s the iwi of Hauraki were in a relatively strong economic and political position. They had to be approached almost as equals by a colonial delegation that was

¹ Jennifer Dixon, 'Coromandel Gold. Conquest and Conservation', in *Mining and Indigenous Peoples in Australasia*, (eds), John Connell and Richard Howitt, Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1993, p.171.

desperate to negotiate access to the gold. Māori remained determined to retain control over their land and resources while the government was equally determined to gain control over the gold. The need for consent by all iwi who were right-holders was recognised by the Crown however, Māori were seen by them as having little choice other than to agree to the exploitation of the sub-surface resources of their lands and the acceptance of Crown management.² Grey, in line with his endowment policy elsewhere in the country suggested that the beneficiaries of gold found on Native land should be the whole of the nation not the tribal right-holders alone.³ Both the government and Māori soon sought an arrangement, which would be beneficial to both parties.

There were two main issues which affected the establishment of the first Hauraki gold field at Coromandel in the early 1850s. These were access to the resource and who was going to benefit from the new riches. The rangatira of Patapata and Kapanga were concerned about the numbers of miners arriving to prospect the land without any formal agreement having been made and about their capacity to swamp the Tāngata Whenua. They were aware of the European need for land and for access to the Koura (gold) and became increasingly opposed to granting them access to it.

In October 1852 Wynyard instructed the Native Secretary, Nugent to go to Coromandel to attempt to resolve the situation. Nugent, having identified Paora Te Putu as the principal right-holder at Kikowhakarere where the gold had originally been found, proceeded to his settlement.⁴ There he delivered Wynyard's address:

² Robyn Anderson, *The Crown, the Treaty and the Hauraki Tribes, 1800-1885*, Vol.4, Commissioned by the Claimants for Wai 100, Paeroa: Hauraki Maori Trust Board, 1997, p.8.

³ Anderson, p.81.

⁴ Nugent to Colonial Secretary, 23 October 1852, Native Affairs Outward Letter Books, MA 41/1, ANZ.

There is a report that gold has been found near Waiau...The white people will perhaps go down to search – but do not be alarmed, there is no harm in their searching – but they will not be allowed to carry much away with them until Regulations have been made by the Government. As soon as it is known that gold has in truth been found on your land, I will come down, and we will hold a committee as to the best means of making the discovery available.⁵

Nugent in his address went on to speak to Māori about the benefits the gold would bring to the iwi if they established a partnership with the Crown, delivering a warning about attempting to deal with the situation themselves, and offered protection of their property. He arranged for a meeting of all iwi with interests in land at Coromandel to be held at Patapata Coromandel, on 18 October 1852 with Wynyard and other Crown officials to negotiate a deal that would allow access to the gold. This meeting, which extended over three days, has been described as surely the grandest, most momentous event in the colonial history of Hauraki.⁶ An estimated one thousand people attended.

There was much debate amongst the rangatira who were present about how they should proceed with the negotiations and what financial benefit they should gain from the mining of the land. All chiefs emphasised in their speeches that the land must remain with them even if they chose to cede rights to the gold. They expressed a general willingness to accept a controlled and limited access to their land for gold mining, while being aware that the resulting economic benefits were likely to come at the expense of reduced control over their lives and resources. They looked to the government to provide for both the regulations of those areas which they consented to open, and the proper protection of lands they wished to exclude from the agreement.

Taraia of Ngāti Tamatera was completely opposed to the opening of the land for mining. He argued that Māori ‘should

Monin, *This is My Place*, p.141.

⁵ Wynyard to Chiefs, 18 October 1852, Inward Despatches from Lieutenant-Governor Wynyard, G8/8, ANZ.

⁶ Monin, p.133.

hold their own and not allow any more searchings'.⁷ Wynyard appealed to Māori to grant the Crown management of the gold field. He assured them that in return their interests would be fully protected 'from every annoyance'. He stated that the miners would come anyway and attempts by Māori to deal with them directly would lead to general disorder and threats to Māori interests. It was Te Taniwha of Ngāti Whanaunga who finally convinced the assembled iwi that the mining should proceed:

Yes. Let the gold be dug. I have seen the gold, it is good that my land, the place of my ancestors, should be the first to produce it. I have lived many days but this is the brightest of them all. I am now content to die.⁸

An agreement was signed that would allow controlled and limited access to the gold whilst the right-holders would remain in total control of their land.⁹ As a result of that meeting Nugent concluded that not all of Hauraki was in agreement about the benefits the mining would bring and realised that the many divisions within Hauraki society might be to the government's advantage. In his report to Wynyard he revealed his frustrations in dealing with the rangatira when he referred to 'the avarice of their character' and 'the fickleness of the native character of Taraia and other Thames Natives'.¹⁰

After the Coromandel meeting Wynyard met with the Executive Council to decide what to do next and how best to negotiate a course between the Crown's right to the gold and the right claimed by the iwi of Coromandel to retain control over

⁷ Heaphy Report, 2 November 1852, 1A 1 1852/2511, ANZ.

Lanfear Report, 6 November 1852, 1A 1 1852/2544, ANZ.

⁸ Speeches of Native Chiefs at a Meeting at Patapata in Coromandel, Relative to an Agreement for Working Gold on Their Lands, Taken Literally, 19, 20, 22 November 1852, G8/8, ANZ.

Tony Nolan, *Historic Gold trails of the Coromandel: Being a Guide for Gentle Travellers Seeking Their Pleasure Amid the Scenic Shorelines and Glorious Goldfields of that Historic and Sun-blessed Peninsula: and Examining how Fortunes were Made in the Wilderness Amidst Pioneering Hardships and Visitations of Disaster: Concluding With a Valuable Account of Methods to be Used in Discovering the Peninsula's Precious Minerals & Gemstones*, Wellington: Reed, 1977, p.48.

⁹ Agreement with Maori, 20 November 1852, *New Ulster Gazette*, 26 November 1852, p.167, ANZ.

¹⁰ Nugent to Colonial Secretary, 23/10/52, Native Affairs Outward Letter Books, MA 41/1, ANZ. Monin, p.141.

their land.¹¹ The Crown resolved that the government would manage the gold field on the payment to 'the native owners of the soil' of a substantial portion of the gold licence fees.¹² Wynyard emphasised in his report to Grey:

the necessity of placing the management of the Gold Field in the hands of the Government, in order that they might quietly enjoy the undisturbed possession of their homes, their customs, and their lands', the 'advantages' of a ready market for their produce, and the 'utter impossibility of keeping peace and good order if left to their own resources in dealing with strangers'.¹³

The actions of Crown officials with regard to the Coromandel gold field in the early 1860s demonstrated a shift away from the spirit in which the Patapata agreement had been signed. Initially promises offered by the Crown, and the expectations which they fostered, continued to focus on consent, partnership and prosperity for the iwi of Coromandel.¹⁴ However, as the decade advanced the government and settlers became increasingly convinced that the only way for them to get access to the gold was to purchase the freehold title from the iwi. Māori meantime resisted such attempts, convinced that: 'if they parted with their land, the rush of Europeans would be so great as to lead to their extinction'.¹⁵ The means employed by the Crown officials during this time to gain extended access to the gold involved a mixture of unceasing persuasion, threats, trampling of tikanga, and deliberate undermining of the principles rangatiratanga (chiefly authority). There was a greater willingness on behalf of the Crown to ignore the stated wishes of right-holders and to give preference to the needs of the miners and the wider community.

In order to gain increased access to the gold, the Crown was obliged to re-enter negotiations with the various right-holders. The Crown initially offered £10,000 for the outright sale of the

¹¹ Anderson, p.79.

¹² Monin, p.141.

¹³ Wynyard to Grey, 25 November 1852, G 8/8, ANZ.

¹⁴ Anderson, p.7.

¹⁵ Stafford, *NZPD*, (1858), p.408.

land or 10s per digger for prospecting rights for one month.¹⁶ Taraia, Paora Te Putu, Riria and other rangatira refused to accept this as they anticipated that a better offer would be made by the Crown and because they wanted to retain control of the land and its resources for themselves. They also were of the opinion that payments for the opening of land to mining should bear a direct relationship to the value of the minerals extracted. Riria finally consented to the opening of the land on 4 June 1862, when Grey intervened and visited Coromandel. During this visit he negotiated with her alone. There was much hostile debate and the situation reached an impasse, but as he was about to leave she relented and agreed to allow mining on her land. Grey returned to Coromandel on 23 June 1862 to complete the negotiations. An agreement was reached with Riria, Tareranui, Karatiana and nine other miners. It was agreed that an annual rent of £500 would be paid as well as £1 for every miner in excess of five hundred miners on the field. Two years rent was payable in advance plus compensation. Riria received £1000 straight away. Te Hira, a rangatira of Ngāti Tamatera, whose iwi were also right-holders at Coromandel, was completely opposed to the opening of the land and was really angry with her for making this agreement. He threatened to bring his iwi down to Coromandel to challenge the agreement. In order to appease him she gave him £600 as compensation.

Over the next decade the Crown continued to isolate the lands of the signatory tribes to the Patapata agreement of 1852. While government negotiations for land purchase were starting to be rejected by iwi, settler and provincial pressure for the opening of auriferous lands was beginning to mount.¹⁷ Donald McLean, the chief land purchasing officer, was instructed by Grey to go to Coromandel. His mission was a very difficult one as he had been

¹⁶ Monin, p.189.

¹⁷ Anderson, p.98.

directed to define inter-tribal boundaries clearly and ascertain the willingness of Māori to come to an arrangement whereby their land could be opened to mining without previous sale.¹⁸

McLean was able to negotiate an arrangement with all iwi who held interests in the Coromandel region which allowed miners access to the gold while still protecting the traditional rights of the iwi to their land. McLean in his report stated that Māori considered the discovery of gold to be:

Beneficial not only to Europeans but to themselves, also, as affording them a readier market for their produce, enhancing the value of their property, and yielding them an immediate revenue, should gold be found in any considerable quantity.¹⁹

Despite the agreement negotiated by McLean and his assurance of partnership and economic prosperity many Hauraki Māori were still against the idea of opening their lands for mining as they were concerned that they would lose the land altogether.

The eventual failure of the Coromandel gold field was blamed on the inability of financiers to invest in land that could be closed by Māori, the communal negotiation process that was necessary to occur for access to the gold and on the confinement of mining activity to the negotiated area only.²⁰ Māori in fact were willing to negotiate but still wanted to retain authority over their land.

The impact of the agreement by Ngāti Maru to open the Thames area to mining was far greater than they could have expected. Gold was discovered there in April 1867 by two Māori miners who were prospecting on behalf of Hoterini Taipari, a leading rangatira of Ngāti Maru. In July 1867 gold samples were taken to Auckland for inspection by Mackay and Pollen, the

¹⁸ Anderson, p.99.

¹⁹ McLean to Minister for Native Affairs, 7 November 1861, in *NZ Gazette*, 22 November 1861, p.301. Anderson, p.100.

²⁰ *New Zealander*, 28 January 1857, p.4.

Agent of the General Government. Besieged with immediate applicants asking for permission to go to the Thames, Mackay and Pollen proceeded to the Kauaeranga to 'endeavour to make an arrangement for the leasing lands to the Crown for gold-mining purposes'.²¹ After much hostility and debate amongst the iwi present, Mackay succeeded in reaching an agreement with three Ngāti Maru hapu, Ngāti Hape, Ngāti Rautao, and Ngāti Hauaru.

The resistance among Ngāti Maru to the opening of their lands at Kauaeranga to prospecting was based upon anti-government feeling after the blockade and the war in the Waikato.²² Te Hoterini Taipari, his son Wiropo, Raika Whakarongotai, and Rapana Maunganoa were the first to agree to mining on their lands. A further agreement was signed on 17 April 1868 to extend the area mined whereby Māori consented to 'tukua' (cede) the foreshore between those two points to the Governor for gold mining purposes within the meaning of the Gold Fields Acts of 1866 and 1868.²³ These boundaries excluded Waiotahi and much of Moanataiari that belonged to those hapu of Ngāti Maru who were completely opposed to mining and Crown intrusion on their land, and who wished to retain the area for their own participation in mining activity. Places of residence, cultivations, and sacred sites were excluded from mining operations.²⁴ According to Mackay:

The agreement was carefully read over twice, and explained to them before signing, and they perfectly understood its meaning.²⁵

The area was proclaimed a gold field on 16 April 1868 and the accompanying rules and regulations published in the Auckland Provincial Gazette.²⁶ At the same time Hauraki Māori

²¹ *Daily Southern Cross*, 5 June 1867, p.3

²² Anderson, p.138.

²³ H. H. Turton, *Maori Deeds of Land Purchases in the North Island of New Zealand, 1877-1888*, Microfiche No. 357, Wellington: ANZ, 1983, No. 359, pp.466-467.

²⁴ Kauaeranga Gold Fields Agreement, 27 July 1867, Turton, *Maori Deeds*, pp.462-464.

²⁵ Report by Mackay on Thames Goldfields, 27 July 1869, *AJHR*, 1869, A-17, p.8.

²⁶ Anderson, p.146.

were also expected to contribute to the costs of the administration of the field.

Mackay also signed a prospecting agreement with Makoare, Mohi and Hamiora Mangakahia at Whangapoua; and a deed intended to subvert the wish of those opposed to mining and to keep the government's jurisdiction at the boundaries established by paying over a 'deposit of £2,000 on Ohinemuri to be refunded out of revenues generated by miners' rights when the land opened'.²⁷

According to his 1869 report on the Thames gold fields, Mackay's negotiations resulted in 'five of the principal men signing a memorandum to permit mining on their lands, from Hikutaia and Whangamata on the south to Cape Colville on the north'.²⁸ in exchange for a deposit of £100. The southern boundaries of that claim were disputed by Ngāti Pu and Ngāti Maru, who resided Hikutaia. Mackay, not wishing to stir up trouble, 'took no further action about that portion, being content to take such part as the Ngāti Whanaunga could hereafter substantiate their title to'.²⁹ On 19 November 1869, after a 'hard contest' lasting two days, Mackay obtained Ngāti Maru consent to the mining of Whakairi Block. Again it was decided to 'defer the signing of the final agreement until the whole of Ngāti Maru and Ngāti Whanaunga claims had been arranged'.³⁰

A major change in the negotiation process occurred during the 1860s. The government was increasingly making advances to individual rangatira in order to negotiate the opening of more land for mining rather than dealing collectively with all right-holders. In 1869 there was a growing dissatisfaction amongst the

²⁷ Turton, *Maori Deeds*, No. 346, p.429.

²⁸ Report by Mackay on Thames Goldfields, 27 July 1869, *AJHR*, 1869, A-17, p.7.

²⁹ Report by Mackay on Thames Goldfields, p.7.

Turton, *Maori Deeds*, No. 386, pp.533-534.

³⁰ Mackay Report, 1869, *AJHR*, 1869, A-17, p.7.

Auckland Provincial Government Gazette, 21 November 1867, p.479.

rangatira who had been instrumental in opening the Thames and Coromandel lands to Crown control for mining purposes. The Gold Fields Amendment Act 1868 had given the Provincial government greater powers to change negotiated conditions. The Miners' Rights system was replaced with a leasing system without consulting the Māori owners.³¹ In August 1869 thirteen chiefs of Ngāti Maru petitioned the government to express their dissatisfaction. Mackay, acting on their behalf, urged the government to adhere to the terms of the original agreement.³² His request was rejected. Furthermore, there was a decline in respect by the Crown for the capacity of Hauraki Māori to control the resources of their lands and a further movement away from the former recognition of Māori rights over the foreshore.

Hauraki iwi were now aware that money did not compensate them for the loss of their traditional fishing and cultivation grounds. Ngāti Maru in particular became increasingly distanced from the resources of their land. They were no longer able to maintain exclusive and traditional usage of the natural resources of their Rohe (district). The cultivations, residence reserves and natural coastal resources, of Grahamstown, Tararu, and the Kauaeranga foreshore were being drawn into the requisites of an expanding gold field.³³ Wiropē Taipari sent a series of letters to the Governor in which he complained about the treatment of his people and lamented the Government's policy of legislating without any consultation with his iwi. In 1869 Taipari wrote a passionate plea to Governor Bowen in which he condemned both the leases and the infringement on the mudflats:

We still have the mana over those lands. The mana over the island only was given up to the Queen. Now let the Treaty of Waitangi be carried out. That Treaty declared that the Maoris were to live properly under the protection of the Queen, that she was to protect all their lands, and then places from which they obtained fish, mussels, cockles and birds. Now on the finding of gold at Hauraki it is said the Queen also has land

³¹ Monin, p.215.

³² Mackay Report, *AJHR*, 1869, A-17, p.11.

³³ Anderson, p.169.

here. ... O Friend, be strenuous in reserving those lands and our lands outside the mudflats to us.³⁴

Because of such intense Māori opposition, the Select Committee recommended that:

... until the question of the prerogative rights of the Crown, and of Native claims in relation thereto, over the foreshore and over precious metals in the Colony, are set at rest, it would be inexpedient to legislate upon the particular case of the Hauraki Gulf.³⁵

Ngāti Maru also realized the level of payments they received for their land in the Thames gold fields were inadequate when compared with the revenue that was being earned by their European counterparts. As well as this they often did not know how many revenues their lands were generating, whether they were receiving the right amount or how the revenue system worked.³⁶ Government officials appeared reluctant to provide them with this information. Evidence of this is to be found in the difficulty Wirope Taipari had in obtaining information from the government as to what revenues his land was producing in the form of miners' rights and other fees. He wrote to Crown officials in Wellington to request information about the income being generated from his lands.³⁷ This information appeared to be provided to him with a great deal of reluctance.

During the period 1872 to 1874 there was a dramatic increase in the amount of land that was being offered for sale by Ngāti Maru in the hills behind Thames, just as gold field revenues began to decline. They could no longer afford to hold onto land with valuable mineral resources and to engage in the economic development of them. It may also be suggested that right-holders in the area had been affected by the sudden down-

³⁴ W.H. Taipari to Governor Bowen, 11 August 1869. Papers brought before Parliament and Select Committees, Le 1/869/124, ANZ.

³⁵ Report on the Thames Sea Beach Bill. *AJHR*, 1869, F-7, p.3.

³⁶ Anderson, p.173.

³⁷ Taipari ki Makarini (McLean), 11, 17 Hurae, 1872, Inward Letters in Māori, Donald McLean Papers, 1832-1927, MS 0032-0685B, ATL.

turn in the economy and were selling land in an effort to prevent the sale of their more valuable township and mining lands.

The Crown's attention now turned to lands in the upper Thames Valley, desired for their mineral wealth, their pastoral potential, and their political importance as an area of resistance to government domination. McLean and Mackay met with representatives of Ngāti Tamatera at the Te Whakahaere o Hauraki wharehau (meeting house) in December 1869. All the principal rangatira of Ngāti Tamatera who attended that meeting demonstrated their opposition to the ceding of the land. Raihana Te Tahua firmly reiterated the position of the iwi regarding the ownership of land and minerals:

All I have to say in reference to the treasures under the ground is this:- Omaha is the boundary laid down by the Māori and Pakeha chiefs, from thence right round to the East Coast. That part is for you, the land, the gold and all. This part was set aside for us ... the surface and the underground as well ...³⁸

The government negotiators in return placed the responsibility of peace on Māori. McLean urged the importance of acting in such a manner towards gold mining that 'Te Pai o Hauraki' (peace in Hauraki) was maintained. A 'preliminary' agreement was signed on 19 December 1869 by Te Pokiha and 62 members of Ngāti Tamatera, in which they consenting to hand over all of their Ohinemuri lands to the Governor for gold mining purposes on the same terms that applied to the Hauraki gold fields. The boundaries were left undefined, but it was understood that the agreement had reference only to lands on the north or right bank of the Ohinemuri Stream.³⁹ Mackay secured the offer, paying £500 as a bonus, and an advance of £1,000, to be repaid from the miners' rights once the gold field had been proclaimed.⁴⁰

³⁸ Notes of a Meeting that took Place at Ohinemuri, 9 December 1869.

Puckey to McLean, 15 November 1869, *AJHR*, p.7.

³⁹ Puckey to McLean, 19 October 1869, *AJHR*, 1870. A-19, p.4.

⁴⁰ Report by Mackay, Relative to the Thames Gold Field, 27 July 1869. *AJHR*, 1869, A-17, p.7.

On 23 July 1872 the Crown declared its intention to enter into negotiations with Ngāti Tamatera for the formal purchase of the Ohinemuri as far south as the line running from Ngakuri-a-whare to Mt. Te Aroha. Mackay forewarned in his report of the difficulties that could occur not only between the Crown and Ngāti Tamatera, but between the various hapu involved with negotiating access to this area:

... negotiations for purchase of land ... may cause much trouble and bad feeling between various Hapu of the tribe Ngāti Tamatera and perhaps involve Government in serious difficulty.⁴¹

The Crown negotiators used various divisive tactics to open the Ohinemuri region for mining which included payments to other groups claiming rights in the disputed area and the payment of individuals within Ngāti Tamatera for interests in the areas already opened to the government. Previously in earlier Crown dealings over land it was acknowledged that the consent of all interest-holders should be sought, and the general boundaries of alienation at least loosely established before a purchase could be considered complete. Apprehension about the long term consequences of alienation was developing among those who had previously agreed to the opening of their lands. Mackay returned to the district in December 1872, accompanied by the whole of Ngāti Hura to give support to those members of Ngāti Tamatera who wished to engage with the government.

In purchasing land for the Crown from 1872 onwards Mackay used credit as his standard method of conducting business. This took the form of money or advances of goods from storekeepers against the equity of their interests in land in Moehau, Waikawau and Ohinemuri. This policy became known to Hauraki Māori as Raihana. This system of credit led to Ngāti Tamatera being financially crippled. The impact this policy had on Hauraki Māori will be discussed later in this chapter.

⁴¹ Report to Native Minister, in Statement of the Facts and Circumstances Affecting the Ohinemuri Block, Appendix C, Hauraki Gold Fields Special Block File, MA 13/35(c), ANZ.

The absolute control of the Ohinemuri eventually passed to the Crown under the terms of the Mining Cession Agreement of 1875 which it imposed on Ngāti Tamatera right-holders. By the terms of this agreement Māori were required to give up the right to mine, not only for gold but all minerals in their region. All revenues were to go towards reimbursing the Crown for monies it had paid on the block over the previous three years. For Ngāti Tamatera, this was the worst of both possible models of engagement with the colonial economy.⁴² It no longer guaranteed them the effective protection of the Crown, nor enabled them to engage in the land market on an equal footing with the purchasers.

This agreement heralded another major change in the negotiation process for the opening of land for mining and led to an imbalance in the relationship Hauraki Māori had with the Crown. Previously in the 1850s the government had accepted a certain duty to care for the people of Hauraki, treating them as partners in the negotiation process at least with regard to large investments, whilst in the 1870s they were left to fend for themselves.

Ngāti Tamatera consent to the terms of the agreement was, however, of a most restrained nature and a number of groups immediately attempted to repudiate the cession deed. Te Hira the leading Ngāti Tamatera opponent to the opening of the land argued that they had not known that anything but gold was to be taken, and questioned the Crown's methods in acquiring the lease. Other rangatira such as Tukukino and Te Moananui were equally opposed to the Ohinemuri cession as in their opinion it had failed to halt government agents from buying up freehold interests both within the area which had been opened, and beyond

⁴² Anderson, p.201.

its boundary. They managed to delay the loss of the complete freehold for a few more years.

Crown agents denied the ability of non-sellers in Ohinemuri to prevent the alienation of anything but their own limited interests, and consistently sought to isolate non-selling rangatira and their followers. Rangatira such as Te Moananui who had previously co-operated with the government in the opening of the Hauraki gold field became increasingly disillusioned at the accumulation of debt rather than wealth amongst their people and the failure of government to honour their promises of commitment and partnership. These rangatira also lamented the loss of control over their land. As a result their support strengthened for Te Hira and his supporters who were totally against opening any land for mining.

In March 1875 McLean visited the district to formalise the arrangement. The terms of the Deed of Cession were disadvantageous to Māori, but most of Ngāti Tamatera had little choice by this stage but to accept the arrangement. Te Hira finally gave his consent, under the impression that the land would eventually return to him and his people.⁴³

In negotiating access to the gold the Crown originally dealt directly with all the iwi concerned. It was not until 1860 that land commissioners were appointed to negotiate with iwi on behalf of the Crown. The two principal Land Commissioners who were appointed to negotiate with Māori for the opening of the whole of the Hauraki Rohe to mining were Donald McLean and James Mackay. Originally they pursued a policy of consultation with all iwi who were the right-holders to the land and promised those who cooperated with the Crown continuing benefits and

⁴³ Evidence of Tizard, Petition of Ohinemuri Natives, No. 199, Papers Brought Before Parliament and Select Committees, Le 1/1876/7, ANZ.

partnership. This was soon to change as McLean and Mackay realised that this policy was fraught with difficulties and that pressure could be applied to individuals to grant access to their land.

In 1861 McLean acting as chief government land purchase officer attended the Coromandel meeting at Kapanga with Hauraki iwi. At this meeting he offered immediate and ongoing prosperity for Māori, and made promises of economic partnership. Māori were also given to understand that they had the right to withhold any lands that they wished from European intrusion. McLean outlined to the assembled iwi the aims of the Crown in its policy with regard to mining on Māori land. He declared that just consideration would be given to Māori rights and customs, protective care taken that they would not be harmed by the predicted influx of miners, and that their cooperation with the government would be fully reciprocated.⁴⁴

McLean succeeded in persuading all the principal rangatira of Marutuahu present at the Tokatea meeting to sign an agreement on 9 November 1861, in which they agreed to the extension of the Coromandel Gold Field. He assured them that all the above conditions would be adhered to by the Crown. McLean in his report to the Minister of Native Affairs wrote about his success in brokering a deal he considered beneficial to both Māori and the Crown:

From the disposition evinced by the Natives I am satisfied that as a body, they will not throw any serious obstacles in the way either of prospecting or working the Coromandel Gold Fields, if they are treated with a just consideration for their prejudices and customs, and with an equitable recognition of their rights as proprietors of the soil.⁴⁵

Fulfilling his promise to the iwi present at that meeting he also requested that:

⁴⁴ Anderson, p.8.

⁴⁵ McLean to Minister for Native Affairs, 7 November 1861, *NZ Gazette*, p.301.

Care, however, should be taken that the opening of the Gold Fields which they so readily granted may not involve them in difficulties with Europeans, in the event of a large influx of people to the diggings; and their cooperation with the Government should be fully reciprocated, by affording them ample security and protection against violence or ill-usage to which they might be exposed by sudden contact unacquainted with their language and habits.⁴⁶

Despite promises made to the rangatira at Tokatea McLean found it necessary to change the manner in which he negotiated with the iwi of Hauraki in order to obtain access to further land at Coromandel. Dealing with all right-holders had proved to be time consuming and he was often unable to obtain an immediate result. He invited influential Hauraki rangatira to visit him in Auckland. He accommodated them in boarding houses, provided them with meals and arranged for them to meet with him. During these meetings McLean accepted offers of sale of land and made payments to the rangatira without checking to see if they were actually representing the wishes of all of their people.

By physically separating the Rangatira from their iwi and encouraging them to participate as individuals in the land purchasing process McLean breached Māori protocol. He also broke the promise he had made at the Coromandel meeting for open and collective dealings involving the whole iwi.

McLean also played an influential role in securing the opening of the Ohinemuri region to mining. By this time he had well and truly abandoned his original approach of consultation with all right-holders and stressed in his negotiations with the different hapu of Ngāti Tamatera that each individual with rights in Ohinemuri 'should be allowed to do with their own share as they think best'.⁴⁷ McLean implied that peace could be maintained, and that Māori could benefit from the resources of

⁴⁶ 2 November Agreement, *NZ Gazette*, 22 November 1861, p.302.

⁴⁷ Notes of a Meeting that Took Place at Ohinemuri, 9 December 1869, Puckey to McLean, 15 November 1869, *AJHR*, A19, p.10.

their own land, only by allowing each party to deal with their individual interests.⁴⁸

The Land Commissioner who was to have the greatest influence on and involvement in the negotiation process for the opening of the Hauraki Rohe to mining was James Mackay. Mackay had been appointed as Commissioner for the Hauraki region in 1864. His mission was to persuade Māori to open up the whole of the region for gold mining. He was known to all Māori as Hemi Maki. Such was the relationship that he had with Hauraki iwi that he was considered by many Māori to be 'a European of Ngāti Paoa'.⁴⁹ As a result of his close relationship with Hauraki Māori Mackay often found himself caught in the middle between the Crown and Māori. He had to protect Māori interests and secure new gold fields for the diggers while making do with insufficient government funding. Mackay summed up the difficult position he was in when he informed Rolleston in November 1867, 'I have to satisfy messrs nigger and digger, two as troublesome specimens of humanity, who were ever brought together'.⁵⁰

Mackay had 'the means to both exploit weaknesses in Māori society and to create opportunities for himself and the interests he represented. Paul Monin has referred to him as being 'the very model of a colonial agent able to straddle the two cultures for the benefit of his paymasters'.⁵¹ Mackay was involved in the marathon negotiations to extend the Hauraki gold field district beyond the boundaries established at Coromandel in 1861 and

⁴⁸ Puckey to McLean, 15 November 1869, *AJHR*, A19, p.10.

⁴⁹ Zelma and John Williams, *Thames and the Coromandel Peninsula: 2000 Years*, Thames: Williams Publishers, 1994, p.67.

⁵⁰ Mackay to Rolleston, 29 November 1867, Rolleston Papers, 1858-1903, MS 82-355, ATL.
John Lincoln Hutton, 'Troublesome Specimens: A Study of the Relationship between the Crown and the Tangata Whenua of Hauraki 1863 - 1869', M.A. Thesis in Anthropology, University of Auckland, 1995, p.107.

⁵¹ Monin, p.218.

1862, and at Kauaeranga in 1867. This was a very demanding task as the majority of the chiefs were not willing to allow the search for gold on their land. As a result it was difficult for Mackay to define the areas available for prospecting. At the Kauaeranga meeting the discussion amongst the rangatira present became most heated and some even threatened physical violence against him. Riwai te Kioire argued:

You European slave of the Governor, great is your offence. You are an extremely deceitful man and my liking for you is ended. Turning to the rest of the chiefs, he said, what a perfect reptile this European is not accepting our word.⁵²

Hohepa Paraone failed to see the necessity of extending the field and argued against it:

Mackay your dealing with the Thames field to me is very bad. I have long ago placed all the land in your hands to be at the termination of the land.⁵³

Mackay was also able to see the injustice of the Crown's policy when dealing with Māori. He supported the Hauraki rejection of the 1869 Gold Fields Act which changed the amount the iwi were to receive for and argued on their behalf that the new regulations would reduce the revenue paid to right-holders:

I hope I may be pardoned for stating that in my opinion the leasing arrangements issued by His Honour the Superintendent of Auckland are likely to cause considerable injustice to the Native owners of the gold field, as entailing a certain fall off in the miners' rights fees received, and a consequent diminution in the amount payable to them by the Crown.⁵⁴

It may be suggested that while he appeared sympathetic to Māori injustices, he may also have been acting in self-preservation as he was the one who was dealing directly with iwi and often bore the brunt of their dissatisfaction and frustration with the Crown.

Mackay developed personal relationships with many of the rangatira of Hauraki. In particular he built a firm friendship with Wirope Taipari who he appointed as Native Assessor. In June 1869 Mackay resigned his commission, to go into private

⁵² Primary source unacknowledged, Williams, p.77.

⁵³ Primary source unacknowledged, Williams, pp.70-71.

⁵⁴ Report by Mackay on Thames Goldfields, 27 July 1869. *AJHR*, 1869, A-17, p.13.

partnership with Taipari as a land agent at Thames.⁵⁵ This partnership was did not last however, as he was rehired in the 1870s to purchase lands in the Upper Thames Valley under the jurisdiction of the Immigration and Public Works Act. During this time Mackay attempted to hide the full value of lands from Māori in order to keep the price of acquiring the freehold as low as possible.

The legal authority of Mackay came into question at the Native Land Court hearings for the Kauaeranga blocks. Mackay claimed to have negotiated in his capacity of Commissioner, but during the Weld Ministry of 1865 immediately prior to those transactions, the appointments of all Land Purchase Commissioners had been revoked. Fenton, Chief Judge of the Native Land Court, told the Legislative Council that:

It was doubtful whether Mr. Mackay was at the time a Land Purchase Commissioner, and had a legal right to make the agreements which he did make with the Natives.⁵⁶

Hauraki Māori must have been confused as to Mackay's exact role and in whose interests he now approached them as he wore so many different hats. In his earlier roles as civil commissioner, gold warden, land court judge, legal counsel and social ally, he had established a position of trust.⁵⁷ Mackay appeared to have completely changed his relationship with them and he no longer appeared to act on their behalf. Now he wanted to purchase their land, backed by the resources of the Crown. Mackay was instructed to give general preference to purchasing areas thought to be gold-bearing. This reflected the growing reluctance of the European community to allow Māori any participation in the profits of mineral resources. Mackay endorsed the general European view that Māori had 'greatly

⁵⁵ Anderson, p.197.

⁵⁶ Fenton, *NZPD*, 6, (1869), p.4.

⁵⁷ Monin, pp.234-235.

benefited from settlement since this had increased the value of their land'.⁵⁸

Mackay has been criticized for using questionable tactics in order to secure the opening of the Ohinemuri region for mining.⁵⁹ His strategy was to make advance payments to prominent chiefs whom he judged were likely to be successful in having blocks awarded to them when those lands were brought before the Native Land Court. When the practice of the Native Land Court changed Mackay changed tactics advancing small sums of money to every person he thought capable of selling him land. He originally made these down-payments in order to shut out private parties. Many of the sums paid were for small amounts only, and payments in the form of goods as well as cash were made at tangi and other major hui in a deliberate exploitation of Māori custom. Goods were advanced to individuals on credit. Mackay sometimes guaranteed such advances, with the promise of reimbursement later, when the block had been sold to the Crown.⁶⁰

By March 1872 Mackay had made himself privately responsible for advances on land in the form of goods and stores to the value of £1.367.1.5. Mackay now turned his attention to acquiring land from within Ohinemuri. He was presented with a golden opportunity, the tangi for Taraia Ngakuti, a respected Ngāti Tamatera rangatira, to further the acquisition of land in which Ngāti Tamatera held interests. Mackay requested £2,000 be advanced to him to distribute as required to cover expenses associated with the tangi. He also requested that provision be made for any further sums that might be required to clinch land

⁵⁸ Petition from Hoterini Taipari and Another, Papers Brought Before Parliament and Select Committees, Le 1/1877/5.

⁵⁹ This criticism has come from both historians such as Anderson and Monin as well as the descendants of the rangatira of Marutuahu.

⁶⁰ D. Alexander, *The Hauraki Tribal Lands, Ohinemuri Block History*, Commissioned by the Claimants for Wai 100, Paeroa: Hauraki Māori Trust Board, 1997. Anderson, p.201.

deals and argued '... the great point in buying land from Natives is to be able to have money at command to take advantage of favourable opportunities like the present'.⁶¹

Mackay had also discovered that the retention of Komata, a valuable gold field which was part of the Ohinemuri region so desired by the Crown, was under serious threat from the activities of private purchasers and needed to act quickly to avoid it being sold to private interests. He decided to deal directly with individuals who were willing to sell as opposed to negotiating with all of the hapu who claimed rights to this land and who had previously placed so much trust in him. In negotiating with these individuals Mackay was able to create a further rift within Ngāti Tamatera society. His actions resulted in the trampling of the mana of the rangatira and a change in their relationship with Mackay. Puckey, the native agent, realized this when he described how

the sale of land within the vicinity of Ohinemuri caused much tribal controversy, and matters had reached a pretty pass indeed as in the present instance, a person of inferior birth ... presumed to transfer on the mana of Te Hira and the Hauhaus.⁶²

This step represented a breakdown in the traditional bindings of Hauraki society.

Mackay's dealings in a private capacity had been 'so closely allied with Government negotiations and payments' in some blocks that his successor as purchase officer admitted that it would be 'a difficult matter to separate them'.⁶³ Puckey took over responsibility from Mackay for the payment of revenues to Hauraki Māori after 1869 and operated the deposit account for Ngāti Tamatera until 1879. Puckey continued the Crown's

⁶¹ James Mackay, Return of Blocks for Which Negotiations Are Concluded but Deeds Not Executed, 24 March 1873, *AJHR*, 1873, G-8, p.12.
Anderson, p.201.

⁶² Puckey to Pollen, 23 April 1874, Komata Special Block File, MA 13/44, ANZ.

⁶³ Wilkinson to Russell and Devore, 26 January 1880, Native Land Purchase Department Registered File, *MA MLP* I 1880/79, ANZ.

strategy of forging alliances with friendly chiefs. As time progressed Puckey became increasingly unhappy about the way the Crown's relationship with the iwi was changing and the division it was creating in Hauraki society. He expressed his concern in his report to the government:

on account of the greed and jealousy of the owners of the land, and their inability to divide their money Mr. Mackay and I did it for them. The disputes and fights between young and old men who could barely totter around were piteous to see.⁶⁴

It may be stated that the financial affairs of Hauraki Māori in the Ohinemuri region between 1867-1875 increasingly revolved around the issue of debt. Advances made by the government solved the immediate problem of mounting debt for Ngāti Tamatera. These advances were to be used against Māori assets should future rents prove insufficient to cover them. Even before the title to their land had been investigated by the Native Land Court, the Crown had already advanced money to individuals against the interests that they held. This policy of advancing credit and money to Hauraki Māori became known as Raihana or Rations.

Previously the Crown had distributed food free of charge to Māori for example, at hakari, the meetings with Crown officials at Patapata and Kauaeranga and to loyal Māori who had fought on the side of the Crown in the Waikato wars, with no expectation that the debt would be repaid. Traditionally Raihana was viewed by Māori as reciprocal gift giving and there was often little obligation placed on the receiver to honour the debt. Therefore it can be argued Hauraki Māori during this period were not able to distinguish between commercial credit and customary social giving⁶⁵.

Under the Raihana system, Māori were given credit on undefined interests in extensive tracts of land. This credit took

⁶⁴ Monin, p.206.

⁶⁵ Monin, p.236.

the form of small amounts of cash and food items such as flour and biscuits which were booked-up at trading stores. These small sums which had been advanced to them rapidly mounted up over the years. Mackay used advances of money or supplies as his standard means of conducting business. Rangatira such as Tukukino, Te Moananui and Te Hira became caught up in his Raihana policy. Mackay distributed goods worth thousands of pounds to them intending to charge them against their lands and in particular Ohinemuri, even though MacKay knew that the leading Ngāti Tamatera rangatira Tukukino and Te Hira were vehemently opposed to giving up the last Ngāti Tamatera foothold at Ohinemuri.⁶⁶ Hauraki Māori later described Mackay as 'having scattered money amongst them like maize to fowls for reasons unclear to them'.⁶⁷ He often bought food and supplies for hakari, tangi and other important hui at his own expense. In some instances, Mackay also personally took over debts arguing that to do otherwise would expose Māori to imprisonment. The trading stores at Kerepehi, Ohinemuri and Whangamata were crucial to him maintaining the Raihana system in the early 1870s. Mackay authorised individual Māori to obtain quantities of goods from these storekeepers. He got them to sign vouchers for the value of the goods received. Storekeepers then exchanged these vouchers for promissory notes from Mackay. The government was expected to redeem these notes.

Raihana also had the capacity to tempt storeowners into dubious practices. Some increased the prices of goods supplied against vouchers and even debited Māori for goods they were never given. Te Moananui claimed that storekeepers were

⁶⁶ Kemara Pirimona Tukukino, 'Evidence by Kemara Pirimona Tukukino on Behalf of the Claimants Concerning the Hauraki Claims', Wai 100, 1997, No.11.

⁶⁷ Rawiri Taiporutu, The Paeroa Meeting, 21 May 1882, Ohinemuri Gold Fields Special Block File, 1882, Maori 13/54a, ANZ. Monin, p.236.

allowed to cook their accounts how they liked.⁶⁸ This accusation was later repeated by W. H. Grace who accused Mackay of inflating the prices for goods when they were charged on order:

The Natives in Thames have received a great deal of money through orders. I know one instance when a native got an order from Mr Mackay, and I went to the store with him, and told him not to produce the order till we knew the price of the goods. We selected the goods and he told us the price. When the Native pulled out the order, the storekeeper said he could not supply the goods at the price he had named on an order from Mr Mackay.⁶⁹

This accusation was hotly denied by Mackay who suggested that the orders on Ohinemuri had been drawn by Grace himself, and that he had redeemed them reluctantly, on the 'earnest solicitation of the Māori concerned.⁷⁰

The Raihana policy was instrumental in the Crown securing the freehold of land north of Coromandel and the eventual opening of the Ohinemuri region for mining. The government regularly paid private agents such as Mackay for the collection of signatures to enable the freehold of land to take place. Mackay used the Raihana policy to acquire signatures to a deed which conveyed the freehold of two large blocks of land at Waikawau and Moehau. By the terms of this deed:

the chiefs and people of Ngāti Tamatera, conveyed all the block to the Crown except for reserves at Te Puru and at Waiomu 'in consideration for the sum paid to them by ... James Mackay ... set out opposite the name of each ..., the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged.⁷¹

Amounts were entered against 25 names of a total 47 signatories to this deed. However, the recipients of the credit on the block comprised only a minority of those who were eventually found to have rights in the area.

While collecting these signatures Mackay must have been aware of the fact that the signatories to the Waikawau deed also

⁶⁸ Thames Advertiser, 6 December 1875, unpaginated.

⁶⁹ Report of Tairua Investigation Committee Together with Minutes of Evidence, 7 October 1875, *AJHR*, 1875, I-1, p.34.

⁷⁰ Statement of Mackay, Laid Before the Tairua Investigation Committee, 7 October 1875, *AJHR*, 1875, I-1, p.45.

⁷¹ Statement of Facts and Circumstances Affecting the Waikawau and Moehau Blocks, Appendix C in Hauraki Gold Fields Special Block File, MA 13/35(c), ANZ.

held interests in Ohinemuri which the Crown was desperate to open for mining. Debts not met by the sale of interests in one block placed Ngāti Tamatera under pressure to agree to the alienation of other areas to make up the amount owed. Thus Waikawau and Moehau were sold by Ngāti Tamatera in order to satisfy debt and forestall the loss of Ohinemuri.⁷²

The Crown controversially made inroads into Ohinemuri as a result of Taraia's tangi in April 1872. His death presented Mackay with a perfect opportunity. The strong desire of Ngāti Tamatera for stores and goods for the tangi enabled him to distribute considerable sums of money and quantities of goods which would allow the acquisition of the Moehau and Waikawau blocks at a low cost. Mackay immediately wrote to various Crown officials about the opportunity the tangi had presented him with to purchase land in these blocks, as well as in the much sought-after Ohinemuri region:

I would point out that the present is a good opportunity for purchasing at a low figure ... the claims of the tribe Ngati Tamatera to the Waikawau and Cape Colville blocks, as the old chief Taraia Ngakuti and the young chief, Paora Te Putu belonging to that tribe, having recently died, and there is a great demand for money to purchase provisions for the great "tangi" which is to take place over the deceased chiefs.⁷³

This tangi was reputed to have cost Ngāti Tamatera 20,000 acres of land at 3s per acre, including £3000 in supplies.⁷⁴ Mackay later reflected on how, as a result of the tangi, he was able to overcome the difficulties he had faced in getting all the parties involved to agree to the sale of the blocks at a lower price, as they desperately needed the supplies for the tangi:

After I was instructed to purchase these blocks, I attempted in vain to get the Hauhaus to treat for the sale of them to the Government. They refused to take 'the Governor's money.' At this time their old and influential chief Taraia Ngakuti died, and ... a very grand feast was contemplated, and although the obstructives would not take money they joined the friendly natives (secretly) in procuring some thousands of pounds worth of flour, sugar, tobacco, tea, bullocks, sheep and clothing.⁷⁵

⁷² Anderson, p.206.

⁷³ J. Mackay, Auckland, to Auckland Provincial Superintendent, 20 March 1872, attached, to Auckland Provincial Superintendent to Colonial Secretary, 4 April 1872, Māori Affairs Head Office File MLP1873/35, ANZ.

⁷⁴ Thorp to McLean, 16 April 1872, Donald McLean Papers, MS 0032, ATL.

⁷⁵ James Mackay Memorandum, 26 August 1875, MA-MLP I 1885/18, ANZ.

Between 20 March and 5 April 1872 an estimated £3,064 was advanced to individuals members of Ngāti Tamatera, and the iwi was drawn into a more extensive alienation of land than they had intended. Some individuals had also discovered that their land had been sold without their knowledge.

Debt had led other Hauraki rangatira, whose land resources were rapidly dwindling, into promoting the sale of land in which they had little direct interest. Not only was much of the money paid on the land without the knowledge of all the right-holders but the right-holders themselves often did not perceive how much debt was accumulating against their interests. There was also considerable confusion over what interests had been signed away, since down-payments were made for undefined areas in huge blocks of up to 200,000 acres.

Despite Te Hira's strong opposition, his iwi continued to hold expensive hakari and incurred further debt. They continued to apply to storekeepers for goods on the basis of their interests in Moehau and Waikawau, and requested that their debts be charged against one or other of those blocks. The debt rapidly escalated. By March 1873 advances in money totalled £14,000 and by December 1874 £26,000, of which only £11,000 was against their interests in Moehau and Waikawau, the remaining £15,000 was against Ohinemuri.⁷⁶

Under continuing pressure from the Crown as well as from the mining community for Ohinemuri to be opened for mining and settlement, Mackay decided to act and insisted Ngāti Tamatera redeem the debt. He demanded Ngāti Tamatera reimburse the government with the money owed or an equivalent amount of land. Faced with such a huge debt, they finally agreed to the

⁷⁶ Monin, p.240.

alienation of their interests in Moehau and Waikawau but not in Ohinemuri. Mackay informed them that their interests in these blocks were inadequate to cover the amount that they owed.

The majority of the rangatira of Ngāti Tamatera now realized they had no choice but to address the issue of the debt and could no longer delay the opening of their land at Ohinemuri for mining. Only Te Hira remained resolute in his opposition to relinquishing his interests in Ohinemuri. Mackay set about isolating him from the rest of his iwi by attempting to gain the support of the younger members of the iwi. Mackay subsequently reported to the Crown that Te Hira would be unable to withstand the pressure of the rest of the tribe for very long.⁷⁷ He believed that opposition had been narrowed down to Te Hira's individual interests, and advised:

if his consent to the alienation of Waikawau was withheld, the claim of himself and his hapu was well-defined and not very extensive, could be easily cut out and reserved for them.⁷⁸

Mackay doubted Te Hira would be able to, 'stand alone against the wishes of the whole tribe' with regard to the opening of Ohinemuri'.⁷⁹

Ngāti Tamatera was presented with two opportunities to discuss the issue of their debt with all the iwi of Hauraki. Firstly in August 1874 Ngāti Paoa hosted a great hakari at Whakatiwai for the uhunga (reburial of bones) of Patene Puhata and Wiremu Hoete from Taupo to Whakatiwai.⁸⁰ All the iwi of Marutuahu attended this occasion. Despite strong opposition

⁷⁷ Memorandum from Mackay to Minister for Public Works, 22 June 1872, NLP 73/37, ANZ. Appendix to Statement of the Facts and Circumstances Affecting the Ohinemuri Block, p.13, Hauraki Gold Fields Special Block File, MA 13/35, ANZ.

⁷⁸ Mackay Memorandum to Minister for Public Works, 22 June 1872, in Statement of the Facts and Circumstances Affecting the Ohinemuri Block, Appendix C, Hauraki Gold Fields Special Block File, MA 13/35(c), ANZ.

⁷⁹ Mackay Memorandum to Minister for Public Works, ANZ.

⁸⁰ This meeting at Whakatiwai was described in great detail in issues of the *Thames Advertiser*, 18-28 August 1874.

from those present a decision was reached that reluctantly the land had to be sold to repay the debt owed to the Crown.

Later that year a further meeting was arranged by Wirope Taipari to which he invited both representatives of the Crown and Ngāti Tamatera rangatira. This meeting was held at his house, Pukerahui, in Thames. It was attended by Mackay, McLean, Te Moananui, Te Hira and other rangatira of Marutuahu. There was much debate with the rangatira present angrily challenging McLean and Mackay. They argued that the goods had been accepted against their lands with little awareness of the ultimate result, and that payments on Ohinemuri had been made without the knowledge of all right holders.

Te Hira repeated his long-held determination to retain Ohinemuri; the rangatira told the government that: 'the people who did deal with the land formerly have none remaining. Let that which I am holding be left with me'.⁸¹ Te Moananui's opposition to the alienation derived from questions of purchase money and price. He expressed his dissatisfaction with Raihana, pointing out the injustice of a process by which Māori resources were given up for so little return. He asked McLean:

From whom did this ration system emanate? Was it from the Queen, or the Governor? or from yourself? or the land purchases agents?' Not until he was shown the accounts did Te Moananui see 'the pit which had been hidden'.⁸²

Accusations were also made by those present that the amounts charged in the accounts were in excess of the goods supplied.⁸³ Mackay denied this and defended the system against Māori criticism, and argued they had 'had signed away their interests in full knowledge of what they were doing'.⁸⁴ He denied that he had actively encouraged the accumulation of debt against Ohinemuri

⁸¹ Proceedings of a Native Meeting Held at Thames on 11 and 12 December 1874, p.13., MS- Papers - 2520, ATL.

⁸² Thames Native Meeting, p.8 and p.17.

⁸³ Thames Native Meeting, p.18.

⁸⁴ Thames Native Meeting, p.25.

and stated this was the sole responsibility of Ngāti Tamatera themselves. He maintained that payment of goods had been instigated at Māori request, whilst Te Moananui argued that they had learnt the system from Mackay.⁸⁵ Mackay then read out a number of applications for goods which had been made by Te Moananui and his family. The rangatira wanted to know how many acres would be taken for those amounts, a question Mackay refused to answer. Te Moananui argued that:

Everyman should agree as to the price to be paid for his land. The price I want is 10/- per acre, if not agreed to, the blame will rest on you ... the land is mine; I should be consulted as to price; it was agreed that the lance was to have been driven into one fish, instead of which it is driven into another. ...⁸⁶

Mackay rejected Te Moananui's suggestion. He argued the responsibility for the loss of their land laid with Ngāti Tamatera, debts having been placed against Ohinemuri at their request.⁸⁷

The accumulation of debt on Ohinemuri had occurred against the explicitly stated wishes of Te Hira who had cautioned storekeepers from advancing goods on that area, warning them that they would get nothing for their money, no matter how large the amount might be. But Mackay now argued that the blame lay with Te Hira for failing to 'manage his people better'.⁸⁸ Te Moananui alleged his people had been overcharged, and stated that he did not know the value of the articles he had received, but that he did not think his land should be paid for by 'damaged flour, coils of rope and boxes of matches'.⁸⁹ Those present at the meeting was unable to reach a consensus and matters were left unresolved until the following year.

Mackay and McLean presented the Ngāti Tamatera rangatira with a Deed of Cession on 18 February 1875, at a meeting held at

⁸⁵ Thames Native Meeting, p.16.

⁸⁶ Thames Native Meeting, p.16.

⁸⁷ Thames Native Meeting, p.8.

⁸⁸ Thames Native Meeting, p.25.

⁸⁹ Thames Native Meeting, p.17.

Te Whakahaere o Hauraki marae⁹⁰. By the terms of the deed if they agreed to open the Ohinemuri to mining they would be allowed to keep their land and after repaying their debt all remaining money from rents, royalties and other fees payable by the money would be their own. Most rangatira who attended this meeting realised that they had no choice but to accept the terms of this agreement. Te Hira finally gave his consent under the impression that the land would eventually return to him and his iwi.⁹¹

In 1876 Aperahama Tupu and 65 others of Ngāti Hako and Whakatohea mounted a challenge to the terms of the Cession as they petitioned the Assembly about the conduct of Mackay in opening the Ohinemuri. They protested that their land had been taken from them to pay for food for other people, and that they had not signed the deed. Mackay blamed the petition on the interference of Europeans trying to overturn the agreement in order to set up their own mining leases in the block.⁹²

Mackay's Raihana policy had many long term consequences for Hauraki Māori. The greatest grievance for Hauraki Māori was not the fraudulent nature of their debt, but the premeditated use of credit to trap individuals over a period of time, and then force them into selling their land. Purchase transactions enticed Māori away from their own cultivations, led them into dissolute habits and introduced them to all the vices of European civilization. They became victims of business exploitation of the purchase agents, storekeepers, publicans and sharp lawyers – the flotsam of the frontier who paved the way for European settlement.⁹³

⁹⁰ Deed of Lease, 18 February 1875, Statement of the Facts and Circumstances Affecting the Ohinemuri Block, Hauraki Gold Fields Special Block File, MA 13/35(b), ANZ.

⁹¹ Petition of Natives Brought before Parliament and Select Committee, Le 1/1876/7, ANZ.

⁹² Evidence of Mackay, Petition of Epiha Taha and Other Natives of Ohinemuri, 18 August 1875, Papers Brought Before Parliament and Select Committees, Le 1/1875/12, ANZ.

⁹³ M. P. K. Sorrenson, 'Land Purchase Methods and Their Effect on Māori Population, 1865-1901', *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 65:3 (1956), p.190.

While the government continued to acknowledge the need to negotiate for consent to mining, there was no acceptance among Crown officials that Hauraki Māori should be permitted to retain control of that area in the long-term. Consequently in Ohinemuri, Ngāti Tamatera was ultimately deprived of any chance to participate in the subsequent development of the mineral and pastoral potential of those lands formerly held by them.⁹⁴ The iwi of the Hauraki Rohe were also perceived by the government officers to have plenty of land left. Therefore there was very little provision of reserves those iwi who opened their land for mining.

This chapter examined the negotiation process that occurred for the opening of the Hauraki Rohe for mining. It explored the influence and function of the Native Land Commissioners and the impact and consequences of the Raihana policy for Hauraki Māori. The rangatira of the Hauraki Rohe entered into negotiations with the Crown representatives for the opening of their land to mining with the intention of maintaining their mana, control over their land and to protect the interests of their iwi. Anderson has observed that the Crown absolutely refused to respect the expressed wishes of those segments of the Hauraki iwi who tried to hold onto their territory for the future well being of their people.⁹⁵ It was not the poor decisions that were made by their tupuna as has been argued by other historians such as Paul Monin, who has suggested that the economic and social outcomes for Hauraki Maori were influenced by the decisions that their rangatira made and by continuities in their culture.⁹⁶

⁹⁴ Anderson, p.280.

Kemara Pirimona Tukukino, 'Evidence', Wai 100, 1997.

Richard Rakena Tukukino, 'Evidence by Richard Rakena Tukukino on Behalf of Ngāti Tamatera Concerning the Tapu Reserve Claim', Wai 100, 1997.

⁹⁵ Anderson, p.282.

⁹⁶ Monin p.4.

The confiscation and sale of land in the Hauraki rohe and the resulting debt impacted severely on the lives of all of the iwi of Marutuahu. They entered into the Agreement they made with the Crown to open their land for mining as equal partners, and with the intention of reaping the economic rewards that were promised. When the initial negotiations took place all rangatira who were present at the hui concurred that the Crown may have the gold while they would retain the land. The first agreements negotiated between the Crown and the iwi of Marutuahu for the opening of their land for mining recognised their ownership of the land and all its attributes, their authority to open it or keep it closed, and their willingness to co-operate in their development of their lands with the help of the government but on terms of equal partnership. However, this consultation process was short-lived when opposition continued among certain sections of the Hauraki people and impatience grew amongst the miners for the opening of more land for mining.

It was due to the influence of the Native Land Commissioners and the impact of their Raihana policy on the iwi of Hauraki that an imbalance occurred in the relationship that the iwi of Hauraki had with the Crown. A final description of the deterioration in the position of the Hauraki people may be left, to the words of one of their own kaumatua as he sought unsuccessfully, in 1935, to regain redress for the way in which they had been led into 'bad bargains', and were refused any real possibility of entering into full economic and political partnership with Pākehā:

There is a saying in the Good Book, which runs like this: 'Where the carcass is there will be the ravens gathered together'; or in other words, 'Where the carcass lie, the ravens will fly.' There my good people, humble descendants of our beloved Marutuahu, lay the misfortune of our forefathers. That ugly carcass - gold laid right here in our very midst. As far back as 1852, the ravens flew to the Coromandel ranges to dig for that carcass of gold. Why! What a curse!⁹⁷

⁹⁷ Hori Watene, Hauraki Gold Fields Special Block File, MA 13/35(c), ANZ. Monin, p.252.

2 Let The Gold Be Dug

Despite the benefits of their economic activities to the colonial economy, Māori in Hauraki were not valued for their own initiatives but in terms of how they might be utilised to benefit the Pākehā economy.¹ Maori were encouraged to invest heavily in a narrow range of commercial endeavours. This chapter considers the economic benefits and financial advantages the discovery of gold initially brought to Hauraki Māori. It discusses the various economic and entrepreneurial ventures that Māori were engaged in, such as goldmining; the leasing and renting of land; and timber milling and explains how circumstances beyond their control eventually led to these enterprises being unsuccessful.

Evidence which can be gleaned from contemporary sources such as Petrie indicate that the rangatira of Marutuahu carefully considered all economic projects that should be undertaken by their people, and it was only after considerable discussion that they entered into any economic arrangements with the colonial authorities.² In order for these economic activities to be successful Māori in Hauraki were very reliant on Crown officials for their expertise and advice. This chapter will show that these officials while appearing to support Māori economic activities

¹ Petrie, p.265.

² Petrie, p.207.

were under Crown instruction not to allow Māori to be economically independent and to integrate them into the colonial society.

Historically the iwi of Hauraki lived predominantly on fertile lowlands along the coast or waterways of Tikapa Moana, close to food sources and transportation routes. The settlement pattern consisted of a main village with satellite settlements and fortified pa on nearby hilltops to which people could retreat in time of warfare.

Often, in times of peace, families would erect temporary lodgings on the coast and live for two or three months at a time with direct access to the resources of the sea. The river settlements of Te Pae o Hauraki and Ngahutoitoi, and the hilltop pa of Totara reflected these former settlement patterns.³

Land sales and a re-orientation of lifestyle in the later half of the nineteenth century disrupted the normal Hauraki social order. The settlement pattern focused on single villages centred on a marae. Satellite settlements appear to have been replaced by families living in a rural setting. Fortified pa were no longer required.

Prior to 1840 Hauraki iwi had already established with European traders. The region's natural resources, especially its kauri trees were much sought after by early traders. This relationship continued when nearby Auckland became the capital in 1840. Local people quickly became aware that desirable consumer goods such as iron goods and textiles were available in Auckland and looked for ways to obtain these new products. Entrepreneurial iwi used traditional co-operative methods of

³ Batterby, 'Summary of Evidence of Dr John Battersby Concerning Gold Issues, in the Matter of the Hauraki Regional Inquiry', Wai 686 and Wai 100, December 2000, p.35.

work to produce food and goods, which they could trade for the European consumer goods they so desired.

Prior to its discovery gold had not been considered to be a taonga in Hauraki Maori culture. On the other hand, land and control of access to land were highly valued. The importance of gold and other minerals in the commercial economy were quickly to become understood to Māori.⁴

The first economic relationship, which Hauraki Māori had formed with the European community, up until the late 1850s, was based on trade. They had deliberately entered into this economic partnership with the settler society looking on the association as serving their interests no less than those of their trading partners.⁵ By 1852 the settler population of the Hauraki region had increased to 10,000. This had a major commercial impact upon the iwi of Hauraki as the settlers living in Tamaki Auckland were now reliant on Māori producers for a variety of food products and for fuel. This trade showed that Māori were capable of putting their resources to good use in the way they responded to the commercial opportunities presented by colonization. Hauraki Māori purchased equipment, flourmills, cutters and iron tools to pursue and improve their commercial interests. It is likely that they expected similar advantages to accrue from the gold and timber exploitation, which lay in the future.

As their commercial dealings with the early colonists demonstrated, Hauraki Māori also displayed a marked capacity to integrate their economic activities with the opportunities

⁴ Hauraki Report Summary, <http://www.waitangitribunal.govt.nz/reports/summary.asp?reportid=A9BC1D-9F0C-49FA-A916-C5FF069E8797.pdf>, accessed 7 August 2006, p.xxix.

⁵ R. C. J. Stone, *The Economic Impoverishment of Hauraki Maori Through Colonisation*, Commissioned by the Claimants for Wai 100, Paeroa: Hauraki Maori Trust Board, 1997, p.15.

presented by a commercial market. However, the trade boom of the 1850s was short-lived and some would-be Māori entrepreneurs ran into debt. The early entrepreneurial flair shown by Māori in trade with Auckland and in the beginning of the timber trade illustrated a capacity for adaptation and self-reliance, which, in the event, were to be marginalized, by the drastic effects of later colonization.⁶ An Auckland newspaper remarked in 1853:

As landowners, farmers, graziers, ship owners, and artisans, Māori had shown themselves to be the main prop of New Zealand.⁷

Further evidence of the importance of this trade with Auckland is found in Swainson and Turoa. In his work Swainson provides examples of the type of supplies that were brought to Auckland from within the Hauraki region:

In the course of the year 1852, one thousand seven hundred and ninety two canoes entered the harbour of Auckland, bringing to market by this means alone two hundred tons of potatoes, fourteen hundred baskets of onions, seventeen hundred baskets of maize...⁸

Drawing on oral traditions, Turoa has written of the Crown colony years 1840-1852:

The Hauraki tribes ... documented great tonnages of food, flax and timber which were transported ... around the gulf at first by canoes, which were later supplemented by schooners and ketches, some of Pakeha, some of Maori construction.⁹

Māori trade with Auckland peaked about 1855. Thereafter it fell away sharply.¹⁰

Other changes, which also began in the 1850s, were to lead to the transformation of the Hauraki Rohe within less than two decades. The exploitation of timber, especially kauri, became established. Although much of the trade was in the hands of

⁶ Cited by W. H. Oliver, *The Social and Economic Situation of Hauraki Maori After Colonisation*, Commissioned by the Claimants for Wai 100, Paeroa: Hauraki Maori Trust Board, 1997, p.27.

⁷ J. P. Kalaugher, *Gleanings from Early New Zealand History*, Auckland: 1950, p.36.
Stone, *Economic Impoverishment*, p.12.

⁸ William Swainson, *Auckland, the Capital of New Zealand, and the Country Adjacent: Including Some Account of the Gold Discovery in New Zealand*, London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1853, p.142.

⁹ Turoa, *Ngā Iwi o Hauraki*, Paeroa: Hauraki Maori Trust Board, 1997, p.3.

¹⁰ Stone, *Economic Impoverishment*, p.15.

Pākehā entrepreneurs, with hāpū only receiving royalties and rents, some rangatira became entrepreneurs, felling and selling timber while still working communally.

Hauraki Māori were aware of the presence of gold in New Zealand before the coming of the European but it possessed no value what so ever to them until its virtues in the Pākehā world became apparent.¹¹ The first Hauraki gold rush occurred in the Coromandel area in 1852. The negotiations for the opening of this field showed the resolve of Māori to assert their right to the resources that lay under their land. The agreement reached at Patapata represented a pragmatic recognition of Māori rights over sub-surface resources. At that point in the history of the colony Māori was still in a position of power and operated as equal partners. All rangatira who were present at this hui emphasized in their speeches that this should be a leasing arrangement only:

The property of the land to remain with the Native owners; and their villages and cultivations are to be protected as much as possible.¹²

They desired to maintain control over the land and to reap the economic benefits for their people.

Many among Hauraki Māori who attended the Patapata hui remained opposed to the idea of opening their lands to European for mining purposes, as they feared the ultimate loss of their land. They feared too the threat posed to their rangatiratanga which they saw as extending, inherently, to gold deposits along with other things that the land might contain: rocks, copper, coal, iron, gum.¹³ At the Patapata hui Aperahama Te Reroa summed up their position:

Friends, think of the land that descended to us from our ancestors. They died and left us their words, which were these – ‘Farewell; hold fast to the land, however small it may be.’ And now as gold has been discovered in our land, let us firmly retain it, as

¹¹ Salmon, p.13.

¹² Speeches of Native Chiefs, G8/8, ANZ.

¹³ Anderson, p.100.

we have power over our own lands, lest the management of them be taken by the Europeans. Who made them rangatira over us? No we will ourselves be rangatira.¹⁴

All rangatira present at that meeting agreed that the land should remain with them. Pita Tarurua of Patukirkiri consented that the gold should be given to the Governor but that the land was to be held 'for our selves and our children'.¹⁵ Paraone, in his speech, indicated that Māori assumed that they owned whatever gold might lie in their lands, and Europeans should be allowed a share because of their technical knowledge:

Let not the European take the gold and me too...if we knew how to work the gold, we should reserve it for ourselves. The Europeans understand the working of it. Let them work it, what we promise is that the agreement of the Government is just, we will accede to it. If the arrangement is not just we will not grant it.¹⁶

Paora Te Putu was not satisfied with Wynyard's offer to his people. He argued that the entire licence fee should be handed over to rangatira who would recompense the government for its administrative expenses. He was, however, prepared to tolerate a limited opening of the district, and promised to review his position in light of how well that arrangement worked.¹⁷ Nugent cautioned Te Putu of the danger of Māori attempting to work the gold fields themselves, suggesting that they should instead entrust the task to the Crown.

Paora Te Putu, however, did not see the question of allowing Europeans entry onto tribal lands as one that could be decided by him alone, the individual chief of the hāpū in the area of first discovery. He called for consultation with Taraia, Katikati, and other Hauraki rangatira. The hāpū Te Matewaru remained among the most resistant to the opening of their lands, and again, the government reached its accord with Māori at Coromandel, on the understanding that Koputautaki an area Māori felt was potentially rich with gold remained excluded from the

¹⁴ Statement of Aperahama Te Reroa, Rangatira to McLean, 27 November 1857, Papers Relative to the Probability of Finding Gold at the Waikato and at the Thames. *AJHR*, 1863, D-8, p.3.

¹⁵ Anderson, p.14.

¹⁶ Speeches of Native Chiefs, G8/8, ANZ.

¹⁷ Speeches of Native Chiefs, G8/8, ANZ.

area that could be prospected.¹⁸ This was in accordance with Paora's deathbed wish that this area be reserved for Māori diggers.

Under the agreement made in November 1852 it was agreed that the Coromandel area should be open for three years. It was arranged that the Government was to pay per annum the following sums to Māori:

for less than five hundred men digging £600, five hundred to one thousand £900, for 1000-1500 £1200, for 1500-2000 £1500, and 2s for each licence issued. This was raised to £1.10 per month.¹⁹

Wynyard returned to Wellington and consulted with the Executive Council who decided that Māori could play a limited role in the regulation of the field. They suggested that registered owners should act as constables, helping to maintain order, preventing trespass, and escorting prospecting parties.²⁰ Governor Grey endorsed Wynyard's actions and agreed with his reasons to only permit gold digging to be carried on with the consent of the native owners of the soil, who are to desire some advantage from acquiescing in the search for gold.²¹ Grey anticipated that Māori would be very willingly to engage in the exploration of their territory once they learned what rocks were likely to be gold bearing and how the ground was worked.²² He argued that Māori were incapable of dealing with the potential wealth to be derived from goldfields:

If the gold field under such an arrangement [one-third of the licence fee] should yield gold abundantly and therefore attract large numbers of persons to the 'diggins', the sums paid to the natives would be so large as to be useless to them and the money would be clearly foolishly squandered, and I think that much envy and ill feeling would be excited upon the subject; such an arrangement would also be likely to become so distasteful both to the European and a large portion of the Native population, that the Government would be placed in a most difficult position..²³

¹⁸ Anderson, p.105.

¹⁹ John Francis Downey, *Gold-mines of the Hauraki District*, New Zealand, Christchurch: Cadsonbury Publications, 2002, p.1.

²⁰ Anderson, p.80.

²¹ Grey to Pakington, 9 November 1852, Despatch No.1, Despatches from Governor Grey, No.1, *GEPP* 1854, (1779), p.166, ANZ.

²² Grey to Pakington, 9 November 1852, p.166, ANZ.

²³ Grey to Wynyard, 12 November 1852. 1A 1 1852/2743, ANZ.

The agreement to lease land for gold mining was for a limited term, and, if gold had been found in large quantities, it would no doubt have been remunerative to the Māori landowners. Not only were Māori promised an annual rental, but they were also guaranteed a further £1.4.0 per miner per year, and allowed to dig gold and reap the profit there on their own land free of charge. These terms reflected the strong bargaining position of Māori, as did the decision of Taraia and others to remain out of the Patapata Agreement, and resist further attempts to extend the gold field until the first rental payments were made. Hāpū and rangatira who desired an extension of the goldfield tended to make their own terms and put them to the government.

In the end it was not Maori resistance to mining, which led to the failure of the 1853-54 gold rush. It was the declining enthusiasm among miners to work in the inhospitable conditions and the lack of capital, essential for quartz mining, which appeared to have been the central cause of the decline of mining at Coromandel.

Only a small share of the earnings filtered down to local Maori to compensate them for the social disruption to which they had been exposed. As well no official record was kept of the fees due to Māori and revenues were often left unpaid. This was partly due to the lack of clear initial arrangements, the disruption of the war and the temporary withdrawal of miners from the field.²⁴ The replacement of individual miners by companies employing labourers also meant that less money was paid as revenue to Maori landlords. Whereas, each miner previously had paid for his own individual miners' rights, with the formation of a company, individual leases were replaced. This new financial

²⁴ Robyn Anderson, 'Statement of Evidence of Dr Robyn Anderson on Behalf of the Claimants in the Matter of Claims by Huhurere Tukukino and Others known as the Hauraki Claims', Wai 100, 1997.p.17.

arrangement was much less favourable to Maori landlords. As a result Hauraki iwi received no real economic benefit from the establishment of the first Coromandel goldfield.

The second economic relationship between Hauraki Māori and the Crown began about 1861 and was also based on gold and to a lesser extent timber. At the beginning of 1860 the Auckland Provincial Government began to campaign for further opening of the Coromandel area for gold mining. There was limited Māori support for this initiative.

Grey reached an agreement with Riria, Tareranui, Karaitiana, and nine others on 23 June 1862 whereby mining was permitted in return for an annual rent of £500, to commence from that date. Payment for two years' rent was to be made in advance, and the government agreed also to pay an additional £1 per annum for every miner in excess of 500 on the field. Māori were dissatisfied that the 1852 arrangement had been allowed to lapse without warning and the government was now required to give a year's notice of its intention to terminate the agreement.²⁵

Coromandel iwi had initially enjoyed substantial material benefit from trade with Auckland and from the reopening of the goldfields. Hāpū with high levels of involvement in the European economy also participated in the new Colonial institutions and in the Coromandel goldfield arrangements of 1861 and 1862.²⁶ They acquainted themselves with the European style of money and made deposits in savings banks.²⁷ Williams quotes from a Thames pioneer, a Mrs MacDonald, who wrote:

In 1873 a leading Maori chief who became very well-to-do through the money he received from his share of the goldfields revenue deposited a considerable amount with one of the banks at twelve months' interest. When the deposit became due the chief

²⁵ Despatch of Governor Grey to Duke of Newcastle, 29 June 1862; Despatch of Grey to Newcastle, GBPP 1863 (467), p.155.

²⁶ Monin, p.208.

²⁷ Muriel E. Pritchard, *An Economic History of New Zealand to 1939*, Auckland: Collins, 1970, p.59.

presented the deposit and demanded the gold. This was handed to him and he spent most of the day counting it. When he finished and found it was correct he re-deposited it again for twelve months, only drawing the interest.²⁸

The Coromandel the gold rush of 1862-1863 also failed to produce anything of economic significance for Hauraki Māori. Income Māori expected as landlords was never to reach the promised levels, money paid out as miners' rights revenue, as leases, or as consideration for blocks of land sold, tended to be unevenly spread, often unfairly so, between and even within hāpū.²⁹

During the 1860s the European population of Auckland increased to around 12,000 with almost 10,000 arriving in a single year.³⁰ This new population greatly intensified the demand for land and further stimulated the demand for timber, for mining operations and for building, throughout the colony as well as locally.

For a limited time iwi received small returns of cash from both the gold and timber industries and from the cession and sale of land. Many Hauraki Māori had become expert sawyers, and provided a substantial labour force for extracting timber. However, the economic benefits did not last. The advent of highly capitalized timber companies utilizing steam driven machinery eventually crowded out Māori workers. As steam driven mills took over, Māori tree-fellers were driven out of business as the competition increased.

Timber companies were able to insist that Maori proprietors were not to sell individual trees as in the past, but to transfer by legal deed the right to mill kauri over the entire block. The

²⁸Mrs J. E. MacDonald, *Thames Reminiscences*, Auckland: Observer Printing Works, 1926, p.20.
Williams, *Racing for Gold*, p.39.

²⁹Stone, *Economic Impoverishment*, p.15.

³⁰W. H. Oliver, *The Social and Economic Situation of Hauraki Maori After Colonisation*, p.4.

pressure upon timber bearing land also intensified as a consequence of the sudden population growth. Having leased or sold the bush Māori lost control over conservation and saw their asset destroyed.³¹

According to the Hauraki Report there is insufficient evidence available to judge the fairness of the prices paid to Maori for timber. In addition to prices recorded during the formalisation of the agreements in the 1870s, there were also payments recorded during the period of informal agreements not systematically recorded. Timber merchants also usually paid for the cost of the surveys.³²

Gold mining and timber production, the two main extractive industries in Hauraki, and the most pervasive in their influence, emerged in this period to become capital intensive and machinery-orientated, in particular steam-powered. Since neither capital nor technological expertise was under Hauraki command, Tāngata Whenua as entrepreneurs or labour force were progressively excluded from the productive process.³³ In his work 'Troublesome Specimens', John Hutton provided a revealing illustrative instance of this. He showed how, with the growth of steam mills in the Hauraki region, Māori proprietors were no longer able to insist that they sell only individual trees, but were obliged to transfer the right to mill kauri over entire blocks of land.³⁴

The small earnings accrued by the Tāngata Whenua of Hauraki from the native timber industry involved the devastation of their great taonga (treasure), the whenua. The Te Awhina

³¹ Guy Scholfield, *New Zealand in Evolution: Industrial, Economic and Political with an Introduction by William Pember Reeves*, London: Fisher Unwin, 1909, p.52.

³² Hauraki Report Summary, p.xxxvii.

³³ Monin, 'The Maori Economy of Hauraki', pp.204-205.

³⁴ Hutton, pp.66-68.

Whanau Hau Ora Society expressed the environmental damage caused by the early miners succinctly in a report:

We remember the rights others had to use our lands in the past. We trusted them to use our lands and forests and rivers with respect. Trees were felled and trucked to the market place. Others were crushed and left to rot like the machinery they left to rust. The land was left in a depleted state. The users abused our trust just as they abused our lands. We were left without any lasting benefits. We were left feeling cheated and spiritually bruised. We realise now that those whom we trusted then did not have any genuine interest in us. They had no genuine understanding of our tikanga (values), nor did they care for or respect the land.³⁵

In the decades following the opening of the gold fields in the 1860s, Hauraki Māori became more and more used to and increasingly reliant on the settler economy for their everyday needs. Their need for cash eventually cost them the control over their land and led to a lack of resources to participate profitably in the new economy.

The Thames Goldfield was the most successful in the Hauraki region in the 1860s and 1870s. In terms of population, capital investment and eventually bullion Thames was the centrepiece of mining in the area.³⁶ Revenues were significant for Ngāti Maru from this field and emanated from miners' rights, residential and business site rentals, the sale of Kauri, and other related income, as well as unquantifiable revenue generated from local marketing of primary products, employment and interests in the mining industry. From the early 1860s Hauraki rangatira such as W.H. Taipari actively supported prospecting on Ngāti Maru land with the intention of opening it to mining. In June 1867 Hamiora Te Wana and Paratene Whakatutu made the first official strike of gold on the hillside above Karaka Creek.

The other Maoris thought a gold discovery a rather good idea and happily set up a Long Tom and began washing for gold in the Karaka Creek.³⁷

³⁵ Te Awhina Whanau Hau Ora Society, cited by Jennifer Dixon, 'Coromandel Gold: Conquest and Conservation', p.180.

³⁶ Battersby Evidence, p.35.

³⁷ Isdale, *History of "The River Thames"*, p.30.

A general hui of Ngāti Maru in July 1867 agreed that, while not all were willing to admit miners, those whanau who wished to become involved with mining may do so. Taipari was one of first rangatira to take advantage of this consent and settled miners on his land along the Karaka stream.

From 1867 until mid 1868, the Civil Commissioner James Mackay negotiated a sequence of mining agreements, broadly on a hāpū-by-hāpū basis. Ngāti Maru drove a hard bargain with Crown officials, when they negotiated the opening of their land for mining. They demanded rent be paid for any town site established and a large sum of money to be paid at once. They finally accepted the promise of £1 for each miner on the field, and compensation of 25 shillings for each kauri felled.

Much of the Grahamstown land had been an area reserved for Māori cultivation within the Waiotahi enclave, but the price offered by Graham induced the Māori owners to surrender their rights. In 1867 right holders charged 6s per foot of frontage in the business area of Shortland, and in later years rentals rose to as much as £8 per foot.³⁸

While Hauraki Maori received under the cession agreements payments totalling in the order of £62,000 for the period 1867 to 1880, the value of the gold exported was some £7.8 million over the same period.³⁹ According to the recent findings of the Waitangi Tribunal, payments made to Hauraki Maori during the period of this study were far too low. In their opinion payments should have been based upon royalties and on the quantity of gold extracted rather than upon the scale of fees agreed in the cession agreements.⁴⁰ However, it must be remember that neither

³⁸ Salmon, p.192.

³⁹ Hauraki Report Summary, p.xxxiii.

⁴⁰ Hauraki Report Summary, p.xxxiv.

nineteenth century Crown officials nor the mining industry at that time would have agreed to such an arrangement. As it was, in a situation of high risk, Maori were paid in the order of £6 per acre per year in miners' rights fees, plus other agreed fees, as long as miners were working the field.⁴¹

The Superintendent of the Province used the opportunity offered by the tangi for Wiremu Hoete and Patene Puhata to convince Ngāti Maru of the economic benefits of opening more of their land for mining. The Superintendent, John Williamson, like his predecessors in mining negotiations, stressed the long-term benefits to Māori, and in particular the importance of their partnership with Europeans, in the development of the gold field. He explained how Māori would make money, as producers of supplies, or as landlords earning an income from miners' rights or leases. Williamson became quite lyrical when he depicted the advantages Māori could expect from co-operating in the opening of the Kauaeranga goldfield in 1866:

If we unite together in this way we shall have treasures and riches, become a great people, and have everything that the heart can desire... This requires co-operation, mutual aid and assistance.... Your children will be benefited, our children will be benefited.⁴²

When the negotiations took place for the extension of the field Ngāti Maru rangatira ensured that they negotiated a deal that would benefit their people. They expressed a preference for an annual lease at a rent of £500 with a provision for two year's notice of termination.⁴³ Mackay insisted, however, that payment should be related to the number of licences issued. This would ensure that the government would pay only for a profitable field, but that Māori would participate in the profits of a valuable one:

[B]earing in mind the complaints which had been made by the provincial government against paying £500 per annum rent for that field, for which they received but little on return, we considered it safer for the Government and greater justice to the Natives to

⁴¹ Hauraki Report Summary, p.xxxiv.

⁴² *Daily Southern Cross*, 5 June 1867. p.3.

Hutton, "Troublesome Specimens", p.104.

⁴³ Anderson, p.139.

agree to give the sum of £1 for each miner's right issued for the block. If the number of miners were small, the rent would thus be in the same ratio; and if large and the field valuable, then proportionately greater.⁴⁴

Mackay agreed to the payment of 25/- for each kauri taken, that demand evidently being strengthened by the precedent of payments to Taukaka and Karepe in the Coromandel.⁴⁵

Mackay then went to Coromandel where in November 1867 he negotiated an agreement with Te Moananui and twenty-six others on behalf of the Governor for the mining of their lands – except for residences, cultivations and burial places. This agreement was similar to the deal he made at Kauaeranga. By the terms of the deal:

Those who held interests in the block would be paid £1 for each miner's right issued, and 25/- for each kauri felled. Timber for firewood or mining purposes could also be cut but an additional licence was required by those who wished to cut timber for purposes other than mining. Ngati Maru and Ngati Whanaunga would be paid £1 for each right and licence issued those amounts to be paid quarterly. If a miner moved his claim to land belonging to another tribe, Māori right-holders in the original site would be paid for the period up to the end of the year. Shortland and any Township built in the area would also be left for the Natives.⁴⁶

The government undertook to lease the land and pay over the rent on the same day as the miner's rights and timber revenues. This agreement would hold for as long as the Governor required the land for mining or could be terminated by the Crown on six months notice.⁴⁷

Rangatira in Thames had to overcome the opposition of some of their hāpū to allow further prospecting to occur. Rangatira acceded to requests for the sale of land for roadways and other public works. They viewed the gold rents as dependable income, spending and investing. Around Thames itself, some hāpū became quite wealthy as they owned town site

⁴⁴ Report by Mackay on Thames Goldfields, 27 July 1867. *AJHR*, 1869, A-17, p.5.

⁴⁵ Mackay Report, *AJHR*, 1869, A-17, p.5

⁴⁶ Turton, *Maori Deeds*, No. 359, pp.466-469.

⁴⁷ Turton, *Maori Deeds*, No. 359, pp.466-469.

land, which they leased, and as well as this they received money for miners' rights.

Under the mining agreements reached with Mackay greatly. The miners' rights fees that they were to receive over the first two years were calculated by Mackay to be £18,000. Mackay estimated that the rents from lands that Shortland town stood on started at about £5000 per year. Other sources of revenue included residential site fees, water rights and battery site fees, as well as 25 shillings per kauri tree.⁴⁸ When Mackay finalised the agreements with Ngāti Maru and Ngāti Whanaunga eighty signatures, including that of Riwai Kiore, were attached to Te Mamaku No.2 deed dated 9 March 1868. By this agreement:

the rangatira and people of Ngati Maru and Ngati Whanaunga on behalf of themselves and their heirs' consented to tukua, or release (give over) to Sir George Ferguson Bowen, Governor of New Zealand, and the Governors who may succeed him, a certain piece of land in the district of Hauraki for gold-mining purposes, for himself and his assigns within the meaning of the statute intituled "The Goldfields Act 1866".⁴⁹

The circumstances, which led to the opening of the Ohinemuri region for mining, have been discussed previously in this study. Ngāti Tamatera rangatira attempted to make the best of the arrangement that they had negotiated with the Crown so that their people would receive some financial benefit. When the original negotiations had taken place for the opening of the Ohinemuri for mining Ngāti Tamatera attempted to retain all prospecting rights for their own people. One of their rangatira Te Moananui also wanted to retain all timber cutting rights and kauri gum. Under the arrangement they had made every miner had to pay £1 Miners' Right and every kauri tree cut down had to be paid for at the rate of £1.5.0.⁵⁰ These sums of money went towards liquidating the iwi's £20,000 debt from Raihana.

⁴⁸ Mackay Evidence Given Before the Legislative Council, Native Affairs Department Hauraki Goldfields, MA 13/35c, ANZ, Wellington. Monin p.222.

⁴⁹ Turton, *Maori Deeds*, no. 359, pp.466-467.

⁵⁰ Toss Hammond, *Memoirs*, January 1964, transcribed by G. Dunwoodie March 2004, the Treasury, Thames, p.5.

When the Ohinemuri Field eventually opened Māori prospectors were numerous amongst the throng.⁵¹ There was some aggressive feeling against them from the older miners:

Although there was talk of a party of Pakeha who planned to obstruct the Maori horsemen, everyman was so anxious to be among the foremost that his proposal was never carried out, few of the Maori knew any English, and some violence occurred in their disputes with their European rivals. One Maori was assaulted and his pegs removed from the ground when he tried to stake a claim, but there was little time for racial strife when every prospector had to look to his own interest.⁵²

Hāpū of Ngāti Tamatera realised that they would have to look to other sources of income if they and their whānau (family) were to recover from the loss of their pāpākāinga (homeland). As a result of being reliant on non-work derived income for such a long period of time, Ngāti Tamatera found it difficult to integrate into the settler economy and they were forced to accept jobs as labourers.

During the 1870s as a result of the government's Public Works policy, Hauraki Māori were presented with an opportunity for earning money by working on the building of roads and bridges. The government also decided to construct a telegraph line over the ranges from Hikutaia to Whangamata, which also provided them with work. This route was necessary, as Te Hira had objected to the telegraph line going further south through Ohinemuri.

In the 1870s the economic and social penetration of the region by gold, timber and settlement reached a peak though there was some decline in the volume of economic activity. Hauraki Māori, who had experienced in the 1850s a new colonial economy in which they could participate without loss of autonomy were now subjugated by a more developed form of that economy.⁵³ They continued to participate in this economy

⁵¹ Salmon, p.242.

⁵² Salmon, p.242.

⁵³ Oliver, Social and Economic Situation, pp.5-6.

however, no longer as equal partners, but as people whose options had been narrowed to an opportunistic seizing of short-lived rewards and benefits.

Though timber output rose in 1870, the sale of timber-bearing land resulted in a decline in revenue from gold leases. The only remaining source of cash for Hauraki Māori was from land sales. But much of the return from land sales to many hāpū was already committed to the repayment of debts and advances and to meet survey costs. The advantages were not equitably shared; those, which did accrue to Māori, proved to be short-lived.

In the 1870s and the 1880s as returns to Māori from gold and timber declined, Puckey in his annual report to the government reported Māori discontent at a forty percent fall-off in miners' rights returns in 1875. Rather inconsistently, he complained that his warnings that this income would show a 'gradual decline' had been disregarded.⁵⁴

The falling off of the Native revenue, in the shape of miners' rights fees, during the last twelve months (to the extent of 40 per cent.), has caused a good deal of discontent amongst the owners of the gold field. I have made it my special care to warn them from time to time of the gradual decline of their income.⁵⁵

Gold returns to Hauraki iwi also declined as a result of a change in government legislation as well as a declining output. As this situation progressed, land became the major remaining commodity that could be turned into cash. However, as returns from land sales also declined as less and less land was left for sale.

This situation may be contrasted with the earlier part of this study, when the local Māori economy was booming due to gold and timber returns. During this time competition from a

⁵⁴ Puckey Report, *AJHR*, 1875, G-IB.

⁵⁵ Puckey Report, *AJHR*, 1875, G-IB.

smaller Pākehā population would also have been less acute and when public works jobs were used as an inducement to sell land.

Puckey reported in 1878 that there was a good deal of road and bridge construction in the Thames area using Māori labour. Those taking this work were:

Natives who have always stood by us', they had met with opposition from other Maori who belonged to the 'anti-progress party'. Māori were also at work on the construction of the road south from Coromandel; Puckey believed that opposition to road building was declining.⁵⁶

However, he failed to mention in this report the affects the changes in their circumstances were having on Ngāti Tamatera, preferring to write about their economic integration into the colonial economy.

Puckey reported the following year that Hauraki Māori would not 'settle down to industrial habits' as long as they had land left 'to hypothecate to settlers or storekeepers'. As if to contradict himself he went on to say:

But they do like employment in making roads ... it would be good sound policy to employ them always in forming lines of road ... over their own land. The prospect of work of this kind had been held out at the highest government level: 'I may say they are anxiously waiting for employment on the Thames and Waikato Railway, in accordance with promises made them the Hon. the Native Minister and which have been of material assistance to myself in acquiring the land for the line of the rail at a very reasonable rate.'⁵⁷

This added another dimension to the expectations of shared benefit held out to Māori as an inducement to co-operate with the Crown.⁵⁸

Some Hauraki Māori were engaged in other entrepreneurial pursuits as a result of mining, such as building houses in the mining townships and raupo whare for miners at the goldfields.

My parents got the Mauries [sic] to build a rapu [sic] whare on the Karaka Creek close to Bulls stamper battery⁵⁹

⁵⁶ Puckey Report, *AJHR*, 1878, G-IA.

⁵⁷ Puckey Report, *AJHR*, 1879, G-D.

⁵⁸ Oliver, p.31.

⁵⁹ William Nicholl, *Diaries*, MS 1713-1714, unpaginated.

Early in the 1870s, Puckey had reported that there were signs Māori were becoming more involved in farming. He explained how they were experimenting with cropping, dairying, and stockbreeding, grass sowing and fencing. They had also purchased cows, horses, ploughs and harnesses.⁶⁰ He is not specific as to locality, but it may be suggested that in some places farming was market-related, perhaps in response to the increased goldfields population after the 1867.⁶¹

Once settlement had begun in Hauraki it was certain that a good deal of land would pass from Māori to Pākehā ownership and control, initially because many Māori anticipated advantages from Pākehā settlement. The most revolutionary change for Māori was the appearance of 'unearned income' arising out of financial agreements with either settlers or the Crown. This was the source of the greatest social disruption. Even at the lower end of the socio-economic scale, in activities such as gum digging and road and rail construction, Māori workers suffered from unreliable returns, crippling competition and discriminatory practices.

In traditional Māori society, models of production which resulted in wealth creation such as farming, fishing, food-gathering, building and craft work had been communal in nature, and had relied on co-operative labour of groups discharging kinship obligations within whanau or hāpū and under the direction of rangatira. These labour responsibilities had been, for time the very cement, which bound together Māori society.⁶² Puckey in report of 1875 also explained how reliance on traditional food sources had declined:

⁶⁰ Puckey Report, *AJHR*, F3, 1873, G-D.

⁶¹ Oliver, p.34.

⁶² Stone, *Economic Impoverishment*, p.70.

With respect to the cultivation of the soil and the growth of crops little can be said; for the last year or so the means of obtaining food and supplies of various kinds has been so easy of access to all the natives of the Hauraki tribes, by pledging their land for sale to the Government, that but little attention has been paid to agricultural pursuits generally.⁶³

As Hauraki iwi became locked into the new economy two problems concerned with expenditure came to the fore, rangatira and others were called on to exercise budgetary skills alien to their culture, and Māori became exposed to the attractions of consumerism.⁶⁴ They developed an appetite for alcohol and processed foods such as biscuits.⁶⁵ Their participation in the settler economy required an understanding of its financial structure. Although Hauraki rangatira were experienced in being the kaitiaki of their tribal estate they had only limited experience in dealing with the rigours of European financial systems. Crown officials appeared to take for granted that rangatira would quickly integrate into their economic systems. The only rangatira who managed to understand how the new economy operated was Wiropo Taipari. He took advantage of every economic opportunity that was offered to him and his hāpū.

When gold had first been discovered in Hauraki, all of the iwi of Marutuahu had been at their most powerful, and the Crown had negotiated accordingly, making no clear assertion of a prerogative, and giving what seemed to be an acknowledgement of Māori rights of ownership.⁶⁶ Clearly, in the Hauraki view, the first agreements regarding gold had the status of treaties, recognising their ownership of the land and all its attributes, their authority to open it or keep it closed, and their willingness to co-operate in their development of their lands with the help of the government and Western technological expertise - but on

⁶³ Puckey Report, *AJHR*, 1875, G-IB.

⁶⁴ Stone, *Economic Impoverishment*, p.74.

⁶⁵ Puckey, 9 July 1872, *AJHR*, 1872, F-3, p.6.

⁶⁶ Anderson, p.25.

terms of an fair and equal partnership.⁶⁷ Rangatira entered into these agreements with the intention on enhancing the mana of their iwi and improving their financial situation.

It may be argued that the main economic resource of Hauraki Māori was the land. Monin has argued that Hauraki Māori voluntarily engaged in cultural encounters with Pākehā. He maintains that Hauraki Māori were 'active agents', particularly with regard to economic development, and that in all areas of cultural interaction, Māori "admittance" and European "penetration" worked in unison'.⁶⁸ Monin offers a sophisticated reading of Māori-settler relations, refining the concept of indigenous agency, and arguing for a 'dual agency' approach to settlement history. This view emphasised bilateral 'outcomes' rather than unilateral 'impacts' and responsibility for certain developments, yet this included an acknowledgement that 'dual agency' does not mean that Māori and Europeans always had equal power to determine the course of such developments.⁶⁹

Increased European migration into the Hauraki Rohe led to an increased demand for land and Maori resistance to selling grew throughout the years 1850 to 1860. The process of sale was itself complicated and aided such resistance. Conveniently, many transactions failed to investigate the full dimensions of ownership and customary usage. As a result of the gold rush the Maori of Hauraki became a small minority. For a short time they shared in the temporary prosperity of the goldfield rather than becoming the victims of it. It may be argued in the long term

⁶⁷ Anderson, p.25.

⁶⁸ Giselle Brynes, *The Waitangi Tribunal and New Zealand History*, Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2003, pp.113-114.

⁶⁹ Brynes, pp.113-114.

Hauraki Maori were left with little opportunity to preserve a long-term economic independence.⁷⁰

There was a widespread desire on the part of Hauraki rangatira to secure the results of European enterprise and skill for their hāpū, but at the same time they wanted to retain their own economic independence. When the 1852 Patapata Agreement was signed it represented a practical acknowledgement of their rights. Officials knew that they could not take gold out of the land without Māori consent, or without the danger of provoking armed opposition of all right-holders in the Rohe. The important principles were therefore the establishment of the need to negotiate with owners of the land and of the rights of Maori to receive payment in some form and to withhold their lands if they wished.⁷¹

The discussions surrounding the agreement were also important for they showed what Maori views were on matters of ownership. The Europeans might be allowed access to their land partly because they brought the necessary technical knowledge with them, but in their opinion the quantity of gold removed should be reflected in the monies paid to them as owners.

According to Donald McLean, Hauraki Māori during the 1860s expected an economic advantage to result from their agreement to open the land for mining such as a more available market for their products, an increase in the value of their lands, and immediate revenue if gold was found in payable quantities. It seemed likely that McLean encouraged them, generally, in the expectation:

Holding out the prospect of protection and advantage; that they should be treated with a just consideration for their prejudices and customs and with an equitable recognition

⁷⁰ Allan Ward, *A Show of Justice: Racial 'Amalgamation' in Nineteenth Century New Zealand*, Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1995.p.113.

⁷¹ Anderson, 'Technical Evidence', Wai 100, p.12.

of their rights as proprietors of the soil... and that their co-operation should be fully reciprocated, by affording them ample security.⁷²

Expectations by Hauraki Māori of any chance of economic prosperity were, however, frustrated by the subsequent interpretation given to the mining agreements by the government officials who were responsible for their application. Turton, who held initial responsibility for the administration of the Coromandel goldfield, assumed that Maori rights were subordinate to those of the general 'public good'.⁷³ There were also basic conflicts in interpretation about whether Maori should be paid for all gold taken out and all uses of the field.

After 1850 Hauraki Māori society initially managed to maintain its cultural wellbeing despite extensive involvement in the settler economy.⁷⁴ Their investments in the new economy were based on calculations of cultural as well as commercial advantage, while labour and land were applied and utilised communally. Hauraki Māori had participated in their economic colonisation but had done so within their own cultural boundaries largely untroubled by the colonial state.⁷⁵

For most of the 1860s, the Crown showed no desire to directly purchase the freehold of gold bearing land. There was also a possibility making private arrangements with Pākehā investors which Māori usually preferred, when official ones could not be made. They had quickly perceived the level of payments they received previously from the Crown as being inadequate particularly when it was filtered down to the whole iwi. Crown officials such as Mackay did not approve of these private arrangements and he wrote to the government and

⁷² McLean to Minister of Native Affairs, *New Zealand Gazette*, 22 November 1861, p.302.

Anderson, 'Technical Evidence', Wai 100, p.17.

⁷³ Anderson, 'Technical Evidence', Wai 100, p.17.

⁷⁴ Monin, p.134.

⁷⁵ Monin, p.134.

requested that they impose sanctions to prevent these types of arrangements being made. While Preece reported 'Maori in Coromandel were setting higher demands'.⁷⁶

From 1876 to 1882, there was uncertainty among officials about the effect on mining revenues of Maori selling land to private parties, though this uncertainty was as much about whether the revenues were payable to the Crown rather than the private owners.⁷⁷ There was also evidence of growing resentment by miners; mining companies and local bodies to paying licence fees and rentals that flowed to Maori owners.

Other sources of revenue during this period included residential site fees, water rites and battery site fees. By 1879, however, some Hauraki Maori had begun to sell their land through the Land Court and either to lease or sell land to private parties, although this still went against Crown policy.⁷⁸ There was also a growing awareness among Hauraki people that money could not recompense them for the loss of their tribal lands. Māori found that their rights were treated as being subordinate to that of the 'public good'.⁷⁹ Their sense of dissatisfaction with the arrangements they made later informed Hauraki attempts to ensure that they would participate in township rents and other sources of gold field revenues.

Rangatira were responsible for a large sector of Hauraki economic life and they did so in partnership with their iwi. They owned the land, the tools and the vessels and divided the proceeds of sales in accordance with their custom.⁸⁰ The

⁷⁶ Anderson, p.95.

⁷⁷ Hauraki Report Summary, p.xxxv.

⁷⁸ Hauraki Report Summary, p.xxxv.

⁷⁹ Anderson, p.17.

⁸⁰ W. B., Sutch: *The Maori Contribution: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow, a Paper Prepared as Background for the Address by Dr Sutch to the Tenth Annual Conference of Maori Students at the Victoria University of Wellington*, Wellington: Department of Industries and Commerce, 1964. p.18.

adoption of European technology and the move towards the European way of doing things was in some ways for Hauraki Māori an inevitable consequence which came as a result of their involvement in the settler economy. However, the speed of their adoption and the nature of social change were consistent with their desire to maximise the economic benefits that would accrue for their iwi.⁸¹ Shifts in social mores, the nature of co-operative efforts between groups, the way in which assets were managed and operated, and even the geographic locations of each enterprise were all in accord with this end.⁸²

The actions and responses of Māori entrepreneurs in Hauraki to the economic impact of gold mining clearly demonstrated a need for economic reality. Rangatira carefully considered the mining and business projects they became involved in and ensured that these projects would result in maximise profit for their hāpū. Rangatira organised and coordinated economic activities involving groups of people by utilizing their old hāpū kinship groups to carry out the new economic tasks. Economic decisions were made by the rangatira, and were carried out by the members of the hāpū. Wirope Taipari took many risks on behalf of his hāpū by investing large sums of money in European mining companies and other European enterprise over many years.

It is unreasonable to expect that Hauraki Māori could completely adjust their economic system to that of a commercial civilization in the few years since gold had first been discovered at Coromandel.⁸³ The proceeds from land sales, miners' rights and land rentals were divided in accordance with tribal tikanga.

⁸¹ Sutch: *Maori Contribution*, p.18.

⁸² Petrie, p.184.

⁸³ I. L. G. Sutherland, (ed.), *The Maori People Today: a General Survey*, Wellington: New Zealand Institute of International Affairs and the New Zealand Council for Educational Research, 1940.p.12.

Māori entrepreneurs were heavily reliant on European co-operation with regard to financial backing, skilled workmanship and goodwill.⁸⁴ government assistance to Māori tended to be contingent on their commitment to adopt European conventions and a willingness to make land available for mining. Material assistance was only available to influential rangatira who supported the government and were willing to sell land so negotiations often extended to matters unconnected with mining itself, requiring Māori to make concessions.

Rangatira having primary responsibility for their people's welfare were on the one hand required to distribute wealth they accumulated on the community's behalf, but they were also liable for any related debts. The unexpectedly practical and entrepreneurial Rangatira became stumbling blocks to many ambitions, especially new settlers.⁸⁵

Miners' Rights, leases and the sale of land, all provided non-work related income, which proved socially disruptive to Hauraki Maori. Some rangatira exposed to sudden one-off inflows of unearned income, with no previous experience of this new type of wealth, distributed money unwisely because they had not come from the worked-related sources to which they were accustomed. Having unilaterally introduced a system of revenue collection and distribution with no regard for Tikanga Maori, the obligation was on the Crown to provide a system of checks to ensure Maori interests were protected, in accordance with the Treaty guarantees.⁸⁶

⁸⁴ Petrie, p.167.

⁸⁵ Petrie, p.330.

⁸⁶ Russell Stone, 'Statement of Evidence of Professor Russell Stone on Behalf of the Claimants in the Matter of Claims by Huhurere Tukukino and Others known as the Hauraki Claims', Wai 100, 1997, p.8.

Hauraki Māori could not have anticipated their political disenfranchisement and the consequently unequal distribution of financial assistance and commercial support. Research conducted on behalf of the iwi of Marutuahu for their Waitangi Tribunal claims has identified the links between Māori economic viability and the alienation of their land holding.⁸⁷ European business understandings began to take greater hold. Māori not only adopted new technology but also new devices for operating commercial enterprises from written records to the concept of the joint stock company which facilitated successful participation in new capital intensive enterprises without disruption to the current social order.⁸⁸

The social and economic conditions of Hauraki iwi varied enormously. Ngati Maru received about £2000 a year in miners' rights and a similar amount in rents, but possibly as much as fifty per cent of this went to Wirope Taipari who employed European surveyors to lay out a town on his land and built a large English-style house overlooking it, while Ngati Tamatera was sinking further into debt as a result of the poor financial decisions they had made.

Hauraki Native Agents in the 1870s complained continually that hāpū habituated to income from rents, had neglected their plantations and were pledging their land for sale usually to government agents.⁸⁹ As Hauraki Maori moved away from their traditional occupations, there was insufficient colonial style labour available to provide them with alternative employment.

It can be argued that one of the most significant factors behind the rise in Māori disenchantment and decline of their

⁸⁷ Petrie, p.332.

⁸⁸ Petrie, p.219.

⁸⁹ Stone 'Evidence', p.9.

economic predominance was the shifting of the Māori - Pākehā population balance to favour Pākehā. The mining population in Hauraki was not as transient as on an alluvial field. It consisted largely of wage labourers working on company mining leases and then settling in the district. Hauraki Māori were not only demographically overwhelmed by the mining population but also displaced by it in the local economy. For example, settlers began growing food crops such as potatoes and corn, which Māori had previously traded with them.

The decline of the Māori economy was due in part to upheavals in long-established social systems. Written contracts were one aspect of European business practice that Māori increasingly found necessary, but, these being an unfamiliar tool, entrepreneurs frequently sought assistance from trusted Pākehā such as Mackay and M^cCaskill.

Māori and Pākehā concepts of proprietary rights each emanated from their respective codes of commercial law and morality. British law was based on Christian principles as Māori law was based on Māori spiritual values.⁹⁰ Nevertheless despite attempts to manage their situation by maintaining relationships with both Māori and Pākehā allies, rangatira such as Wirope Taipari of Ngāti Maru found it increasingly difficult to fulfil both customary obligations of distribution and new responsibilities for debt incurred under English law. This has resulted in much scholarly criticism of him and the role that he played in the establishment of the Thames goldfields.⁹¹ Other iwi members benefited from increased opportunity and decreased obligation but traditional leadership was disadvantaged at every turn.

⁹⁰ Petrie, p.246.

⁹¹ For example, Monin, *Hauraki Contested*, pp.227-228.

Opportunities for individuals to opt out of the communal economy under the protection of a nationally democratic British system resulted in many changes within Hauraki Māori society. These changes had implications for leadership and social cohesion that would adversely affect their ability to maintain their economic dominance. Although communal ownership continued throughout the period of this study, the community itself was shrinking and losing its strength. As more and more people opted to take advantage of new economic opportunities the apex of the society, the hereditary rangatira was losing its foundations. Rangatira such as Te Hira of Ngāti Tamatera found themselves increasingly isolated and their mana diminished after the opening of the Ohinemuri fields. The younger men of his iwi had become eager for their own individual wealth and a share of the new economic wealth.

In 1940 on the occasion of the MacCormick Inquiry, the iwi of Marutuahu had come to recognise that their real source of grievance against the Crown was not only the shortfall in revenue from gold mining or timber rights, inexcusable though that was, but the loss their taonga the land was the irreparable injury.⁹² This report was the first report to consider outstanding grievances of the Hauraki Māori. It arose out of two petitions presented to the government by Rihitoto Mataia and others of Ngāti Tamatera It and Ngāti Maru and Hoani te Anini and 501 others.⁹³ MacCormack dealt with the petitioners claims under three main issues: the matter of the accounts in respect of the mining revenues received by the Crown; the effect in law of the deeds of cession or mining agreements; and the circumstances relating to the subsequent purchase by the Crown of some the

⁹² MacCormack Commission Report, *AJHR*, 1940, G6A.

⁹³ Stone, p.77.

blocks within the Ohinemuri and Hauraki Districts affected by the deeds.⁹⁴

Judge McCormack in his report found that there was neglect by the Crown agents in their account keeping over the years but the best he could offer the petitioners was to recommend 'the advisers of the Crown might well consider favourably the making of an *ex gratia* payment for the benefit of the natives'.⁹⁵ This report was extremely inadequate in addressing the claims of Hauraki. Judge MacCormick went on to remark:

Assistance to the Māori of Hauraki on account of economic conditions is not a matter for me to deal with ... it is no use addressing them to a Native Land Court Judge whose jurisdiction is limited.⁹⁶

During the second half of the nineteenth century Hauraki Māori became drawn into a cash economy within which they were seriously disadvantaged participants. The returns from gold cessions, timber licences and land sales had been in good measure retained by a small number of individuals; insofar as there was an element of trickle-down, the gains proved temporary as well as meagre. Most had to rely on traditional food gathering and their remaining land for small-scale cropping, and, for an irregular cash income, upon whatever work they could find on the roads and other public works the farms and the gumfields.

It has recently been acknowledged by the Crown in the Hauraki Report that where Maori requested reserves to be set aside for urupa or wahi tapu, its fiduciary obligations required the Crown to do so. Because many of the early Crown purchase deeds did refer to reservation of wahi tapu, and some oral agreements to that effect were made after that time, it is likely that Maori vendors commonly assumed that sales of land to the

⁹⁴ McCormack Commission Report, *AJHR*, 1940, G6A, Appendices, A1, A3. Stone, p.77.

⁹⁵ McCormack Commission Report *AJHR*, 1940, G6A, Appendices, A2.

⁹⁶ Minutes of the Hauraki Goldfields Inquiry, Thames, March 1939, encl., MA13/35, G3-4, ANZ.

Crown did not necessarily mean the loss of control over wahi tapu. However, the nature of freehold titles, especially when held by private parties, meant that only where wahi tapu were pointed out and specific requests made for their reservation did the Crown offer protection.

The State did too little to assist Hauraki Maori and also created economic conditions which worked against them. Particularly with the system of land law, which facilitated sale; did not include good management structures for land in multiple ownership; and divided communities in a sequence of deals over individual or sectional interests in what was traditionally community land. In many respects, gold proved a curse rather than a benefit, particularly in the way it led to auriferous land being targeted for purchase, with Maori then losing access to mining revenue.⁹⁷

This chapter discussed the economic benefits and the financial advantages the discovery of gold initially brought to the iwi of Hauraki. It also examined at the various economic and entrepreneurial ventures that Māori were engaged in and explained how circumstances beyond their control eventually led to these ventures being unsuccessful.

When the Patapata Agreement was signed in 1852 Hauraki Māori were initially optimistic that they would receive a share of the wealth that was promised by Wynyard. They were equal partners with the Crown in a new economic venture and were eager to make it work. They welcomed the European presence in their Rohe and could see the benefits of securing material wealth, having an advantage over tribal rivals and participation in a wider world. They tried to control their relationship with

⁹⁷ Hauraki Report Summary, p.xlvi.

Europeans and make it work to their advantage. The early entrepreneurial flair demonstrated by Māori in trade with Auckland and in the beginning of the timber trade illustrated a capacity for adaptation and self-reliance, which, in the event, were to be marginalised, by the drastic effects of later colonisation.

Iwi received income in the form of rents, miners' rights, water rights and timber cutting rights. This income went to the rangatira who distributed to his iwi or invested it on their behalf. In practice only a small share of the winnings filtered down to local Māori to compensate for the social disruption to which they had been so rapidly exposed. Unaccustomed to receiving non-work related income people struggled to maintain their traditional lifestyle and became increasingly reliant on the new settler society for their everyday needs. They neglected food production in favour of store-bought goods.

Some rangatira such as Wiropo Taipari were investors in gold and timber companies. They accepted the revenues, which flowed from these agreements. Taipari attempted to fully engage in the colonial economy with his investments in mining companies and ownership of rental properties in Thames.

The sale and subsequent confiscation of large areas of land led to the eventual economic impoverishment of Hauraki iwi. For without their land they had no economic basis to enable them to improve their economic situation. Without the land the Māori would have no sustenance, no home, no friends, no society, no life, and no future.⁹⁸ 'Whatungarongaro te tangata, toitu te whenua' ('Man perishes, but land remains').

⁹⁸ W. B. Sutch, *The Maori Contribution*, p.9.

The loss, to such an extreme degree, of this economic base [the land] was not accompanied by the opening of reliable additionally economic opportunities. The proceeds from land cessions, leases and sales proved to be transitory and delusive. Even at the lower end of the socio-economic scale, in such activities as gum digging and road and rail construction, Maori workers suffered from unreliable returns, crippling competition and discriminatory practices.⁹⁹

Economic activities such as goldmining and timber milling brought only temporary, and ill-distributed, prosperity to the iwi of Marutuahu. The ease, with which Māori land, including specified reserves could be converted into individual interests and then into cash to enable participation by Māori in this new and seductive consumer society, precipitated a downward spiral of asset loss and eventual tribal poverty. Both Petrie and Lian have argued that 'the chief's influence relied greatly on their ability to control manage and redistribute surplus amongst their followers'.¹⁰⁰ Their position was unstable. Opportunities to gain or maintain influence through effective control, management and redistribution of surplus stimulated efforts to maximise economic benefit.

⁹⁹ Oliver, p. 58.

¹⁰⁰ Kwen Fee Lian, 'Settler Colonialism and Tribal Society: Maori-Pakeha Relations in the 19th Century', Ph.D. Thesis in Sociology, Victoria University of Wellington, 2003, p.58. Petrie, p.5.

3 The Ugly Carcass of Gold

The Gold Mining Agreement signed at Patapata in 1852 is considered by present day Hauraki Māori to be the most important arrangement they made with the Crown in the nineteenth century. In their opinion it was even more significant than the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi by their tupuna.¹ They regard the Patapata Agreement to be a momentous issue, which affected their lives in very significant ways and unknowingly caused immense problems for their future well being. In their opinion this was the point at which the whole structure of the Crown-Hauraki relationship with regard to the Hauraki goldfield was established.² As Hauraki iwi became increasingly involved in the new colonial economy they faced many problems. These problems would prove to have severe consequences for their everyday life and impacted on their traditional values.

This chapter will examine the effect the discovery of gold had on traditional Māori society in the Hauraki region. It considers the political, economic, and social challenges the new wealth brought to their lives. The chapter also focuses on the role of the rangatira in distributing and utilizing the gold revenues, and explores the tension that existed between their

¹ Kemara Pirimona Tukukino, 'Evidence', Wai 100, 1997, Para 3.

² This opinion was expressed on two occasions: firstly at an informal meeting with Kemara Tukukino and Riki Rakena of Ngati Tamatera in April 2005 and secondly at a hui held with David Taipari of Ngati Maru in November 2005.

position in traditional Hauraki society and their role in the new colonial order.

The experience of first contact with the settler economy was initially positive for the iwi of Hauraki and their rangatira. They remained in charge of their economic affairs and applied many of the innovations of the new colonial society to their own society. They traded extensively with the settler economy in Auckland and had many canoes and coastal schooners transporting goods from fields in Hauraki over to Auckland for sale to the settlers.

The subsequent discovery of gold impacted greatly on the lives of the iwi of Hauraki and brought with it many associated problems. At the original Patapata meeting in 1852 the Crown promised partnership and opportunities for all of the iwi present and indicated that if all went well both Hauraki and the Crown would benefit greatly from the economic arrangement and relationship. Initially the tupuna of Ngāti Tamatera Ngāti Whanaunga, Ngāti Paoa and Ngāti Maru tentatively agreed to participate in the new colonial order established to administer the fields, as they could see the benefits that it would bring them but they were still very cautious. They agreed to a limited engagement to test the Crown before agreeing to a wider long term relationship. The rangatira were to receive payment for all negotiated miners' rights, compensation for the erection of buildings on their land, and for any kauri trees felled for buildings or other purposes. These revenues went directly to Hauraki rangatira who were responsible for distributing the money amongst their people. It has been suggested, too, that the

revenues received by rangatira were a poor reflection of the actual value of their sub-surface resources.³

Although all gold revenue received by Hauraki iwi may be regarded as having been for the collective good of all of the community, the manner in which it was distributed and used led to a change in the traditional relationship rangatira had with their hāpū. This change occurred as a result of the private arrangements the Crown attempted to make with individual rangatira. Crown representatives attempted to isolate rangatira by inviting them to Auckland. They did this to hold private negotiations with rangatira in which they tried to convince them that they held the individual title to the land and of the personal benefits they would receive from opening their land for mining. Most rangatira resisted the temptation to be seen as the individual proprietors of the land but found it necessary to incorporate the trappings of individual European wealth, such as cars and timber houses and European dress into their traditional society in order to maintain their mana in both worlds.

Rangatira, acting on behalf of their people, also invested in expensive European capital assets such as flour mills and schooners which they leased back to the Europeans. Money was also invested in timber houses. While many Coromandel rangatira were receiving significant payments from their gold leases, several hāpū including Ngāti Paoa were feeling the affects of sinking further into debt. This was due to them experiencing the 'inflationary spiral of vigorous commercial enterprise, extravagant investments, mounting debts, and growing alcohol consumption'.⁴ For these hāpū their investments in European commodities such as flour mills and schooners proved

³ Robin Anderson, 'Goldmining, Policy, Legislation and Administration', Rangahaua Whanui Series, (working paper: first released), Waitangi Tribunal, 1996, pp.45-46.

Anderson, p.14.

⁴ Monin, 'The Maori Economy of Hauraki 1840-1880', p.202.

to be a financial disaster as they were now incurring heavy expenses from their participation in two worlds and inevitably some hāpū were living beyond their means.

The hāpū, Patukirikiri of Kapanga, in particular, began to spend more extravagantly across both societies. They provided the first passenger, freight and postal service between Coromandel with their fleet of three schooners operating during the period 1852-62. They also held a huge hui to discuss the Taranaki war, one of many hui which were held in Hauraki at that time.

It was a sumptuous affair to which local settlers and the missionary Lanfear were invited, doubtless in a bid to reinforce friendly relations with Europeans via gifting, as well as to assert hapu mana in the age-old Maori tradition.⁵

One explanation that may be offered for the change in economic circumstances for Hauraki Māori is the productive Māori economy after 1850 in the Hauraki rohe gave way to one substantially dependent upon non work-related income. This was a concept which many hāpū found difficult to deal with. With the onset of substantial non-work derived wealth, interaction between some European and Māori set in motion internal processes which were extremely disruptive to Hauraki society. A reason for the change in circumstances among the resource selling Coromandel hāpū centred on the new factor in the culture-contact situation, money for no work.⁶ It may be argued that the driving force behind Māori industry during the nineteenth century was not material benefit and self - interest, but rather a complex of social motivations.⁷ Work apart from securing survival, enabled the reciprocal distribution of goods and displays of hāpū wealth which was essential to Māori society. Suddenly these became possible without work and hence

⁵ Monin, 'The Maori Economy of Hauraki 1840-1880', p.202.

⁶ Monin, 'The Maori Economy of Hauraki 1840-1880', p.204.

⁷ Raymond Firth, *Economics of the New Zealand Māori*, Wellington: Government Printer, 1972, p.175.

the social motivations for work were suspended in proportion to the new payments received. Equally important was the fact that the promises of ongoing and shared prosperity that were originally made by Crown officials at Patapata were no longer being actively adhered to.⁸ Expectations of participation in commercial development were largely frustrated rather than fostered by government agencies. Crown representatives such as Wynyard were of the opinion that Māori did not possess the skills to properly manage the gold revenues they would receive. Wynyard was unwilling for Māori to receive monies on an 'uncontrolled basis' as this would 'lead to idleness tending to vice and disease' and reported to Grey he had decided against the Council's recommendation of paying out a third of the licensing revenues to them since this sum would fluctuate and could not be spent judiciously by Māori.⁹

Once the Crown had secured the agreement of Hauraki rangatira and their iwi to allow mining to go ahead on their land, they introduced legislation to distance Māori from being directly involved in the administration of the goldfields. Regulatory powers introduced included: control over the mining tenure under which the land was worked; the structure of licences, rents, and leases generating the revenues to which Māori were supposed to be entitled; authority to sell trees and to alter watercourses on their land; and the introduction of a special system of justice under a goldfield's warden. Hauraki Māori were directed 'to register themselves, and point out their boundaries to the government'.¹⁰ Subsequent gold leasing arrangements offered an opportunity to discharge these debts or refinance loans without ceding the title to land. It appears that the land was being transformed from a taonga protected by kaitiakitanga (guardians)

⁸ Anderson, p.14.

⁹ Wynyard to Grey, 25 November 1852, G8/8, ANZ.

¹⁰ Anderson, p.85.

into a commodity open to wholesale exploitation.¹¹ Rangatira appeared to have little control over what was happening to their land and were unable to prevent this exploitation. As a result of this legislation, it may be argued that in many ways Māori were no longer treated as equal partners in the gold fields' development and consequently they effectively lost all control of their land and resources. However, the Crown did make one concession as they recognized that Māori had the right to work their lands without the payment of a fee.

Rangatira expressed dissatisfaction with the arrangements that they had been made with the Crown and rapidly developed an understanding of the potential for financial profit that they were being deprived of as a result of the opening of the Coromandel field. Rangatira such as Pita and Makoare who had failed to receive any revenues in the first years of the field attempted to charge ground rent for tent sites and for the removal of all timber from their land. Further economic and political problems occurred for Coromandel hāpū as a result of leasing and selling land for gold mining. These problems included the preponderance of government officials for dealing with only a few rangatira to achieve purchases; attempts to obscure the potential mineral value of lands from the owners by officers chosen for the trust Māori placed in them; and the failure to provide adequate reserve for the future needs of the hāpū who were selling, even though some communities were clearly showing signs of economic and financial stress.¹² An example of this failure may be seen in Preece's report to McLean concerning the rangatira Paora Putu:

Paora Putu is in difficulty and I think he will not be able to get out of it without sale of land. [H]e will I believe endeavour to get a loan from the Government but I should strongly recommend that he should not receive any.¹³

¹¹ Monin, pp.206-207.

¹² Anderson, p.8.

¹³ Preece to McLean, 6 May 1858, McLean Papers, 032-0516, ATL.

Usurping all of these factors, however, were the effects of massive European economic expansion into Hauraki from 1862, which was until then frustrated by Māori opposition to the large-scale sale of land and resources.

The opening of the Thames area for mining may be seen as the result of the government's renewed determination to gain control of gold lands, a goal achieved by means of individual dealing and rewarding friends, backed by an implicit threat of force. By this agreement the:

chiefs and people of Ngāti Maru and Ngati Whanaunga on behalf of themselves and their heirs' consented to tukua, or release (give over) to Sir George Ferguson Bowen, Governor of New Zealand, and the Governors who may succeed him, a certain piece of land in the district of Hauraki for gold-mining purposes, for himself and his assigns within the meaning of the statute intituled "The Goldfields Act 1866."¹⁴

Hauraki people at Thames found that their authority was diminishing in ways which they had not contemplated when they entered into this agreement with the Governor to cede their lands for mining purposes. Instead of being treated as an autonomous people exercising rangatiratanga over their lands, they were consistently cast in the role of supplicants, forced to ask for revenues to be handed over, the reasons for delay in payments or more information on the working of their land, and to protest legislation which ignored their rights under cession agreements and the Treaty of Waitangi. With the added weight of a huge influx of European population, the balance of power shifted towards the government. In effect, all of their political control passed into the hands of the government even though the land remained under native title.

It also appears likely that Hauraki iwi were not receiving what was owed to them financially as a result of the discovery of gold. Problems arose over the payment of rents and miners' rights among the various right-holders. No mechanism had been

¹⁴ Turton, *Maori Deeds*, No.359, pp.466-467.

set up for the distribution of these revenues. The township of Thames was established under a system of settled rents, as a result of agreements that had made with the hāpū Ngāti Maru. The rent payable to the Māori owners was 6s a foot. Initially with the returns from their land and miners' rights at £1 each the rangatira were pleased with the income that was being generated for their people. Kauri trees brought a further return of £1.5 each and there was also a payment per footage for any buildings erected in the main street.¹⁵ The money given to Ngāti Maru was not a large amount when distributed amongst three hundred people at this time. The return would have been about £50 per person. By comparison a miner at Thames in 1869 earned about £100 per annum.¹⁶ The rents were collected by Crown officials on behalf of the iwi and they were treated as being at the disposal of Crown whose representatives then distributed the money to the iwi. The resulting income from the gold revenue for Ngāti Maru amounted to at least £10,000 per year, over the peak years of the Thames goldfield, 1867 to 1872.¹⁷

Iwi, instead of receiving active protection of their rights, found themselves in constant dispute with Turton, the Crown's representative. Turton continually refused to countenance Māori efforts to participate in the profits being generated. Questions arose over issues such as the payment of miners' rights; prospecting licences and timber cuttings; the reservation of kauri; the prospecting of boundaries of those owners who refused to allow the entry of miners on their lands and provision for tapu places. Further evidence of this may be gathered from the various reports written by James Mackay who was in the best position to interpret the understandings made with Hauraki iwi and to assess the impact regulatory changes had on their

¹⁵ Williams, *Thames and the Coromandel Peninsula*, p.70.

¹⁶ Anderson, p.105.

¹⁷ Mackay Memo, MA 13/35c ANZ.

revenues. According to Mackay, it was arranged with the Superintendent of Auckland that the Provincial Government would share certain administrative costs including that of 'native meetings for negotiating for the cession of Gold Fields'.¹⁸ These costs were deducted from the money that was distributed to Māori. Mackay stated in his annual report:

As there was a large sum received for miners' rights fees, which was not immediately required, [Mackay] was told this might be employed temporarily for paying the departmental expenses...¹⁹

This money was to be recouped from the gold duty revenues. In early August 1868 Mackay notified the Native Minister that the miners' rights fees for the June quarter had not been paid to Māori.²⁰ No money had been remitted to them because the General Government had impounded the gold duty against Provincial liabilities.²¹ Not only were the rangatira dissatisfied with the failure to pay over rents but the miners were almost completely unregulated and often encroached on the rangatiratanga of iwi by attempting to 'rush' land they did not have permission to enter.

In 1869 the Crown made several amendments to the Goldfields Act. These changes resulted in the bypassing of the annual system of negotiating the renewal of miners' rights with Māori and the interposition of long-term leases in order to meet the requirements of large-scale capital investment by the Crown.²² The introduction of this new form of mining tenure represented yet another unilateral change of the arrangements by which Hauraki Māori consent to mining had been originally sought.

¹⁸ Anderson, p.148.

¹⁹ Report by Mackay on Thames Goldfields, 27 July 1869, *AJHR*, 1869, A-17, p.13.

²⁰ Mackay to Native Minister, 4 August 1868. Papers brought before Parliament and Select Committees, /1869/133.

²¹ Mackay Report,, 27 July 1869, *AJHR*, 1869, A-17, p.13.

²² Anderson, p.156.

Rangatira acting on behalf of their iwi constantly had to defend their entitlements under the cession agreement, and were forced to petition the Crown for proper payment. In August 1869, thirteen chiefs of Ngāti Maru, Ngāti Whanaunga, Ngāti Paoa and Ngāti Tamatera, who had been party to the Kauaeranga agreement to open the Thames goldfields, petitioned the government. Their principal complaint was that registered Māori owners had only received a few of the payments which had been due to them for miners' rights and for rent owed on leased land. They also complained about three aspects of the Gold Mining Act of 1869. Firstly, the schedule which outlined the jurisdiction of the Act omitted to mention reservation of lands for residence, cultivation, and burial grounds from the mining agreements; secondly, Williamson had not consulted with them about the proclamation of leasing regulations and that this action could reduce their revenues without their agreement; and thirdly, no formal acknowledgement of their right as owners to receive a portion of the rents from lands leased for mining purposes had been made. They stressed that they were willing to abide by the original understanding, which had been negotiated, and to encourage economic development, but insisted on their right to full payment and to be consulted over their lands.²³ The Public Petitions Committee was unconvinced. They reported that they:

failed to discover how there [could] be any real grounds for the apprehensions expressed in the Petition.²⁴

By 1870 there were signs that the rents from township sections were not dependable income for Ngāti Maru. Shortland businesses shifted to Grahamstown as the premises were cheaper. Puckey tried to persuade rangatira to reduce the agreed rent for town land. In 1871 income received from miners' rights also

²³ Petition of Certain Natives at Hauraki and Evidence Relative thereto given by Mackay, 5 August 1869, Hauraki Gold Fields Native Revenue Treasury Statement, Relative to Hauraki Gold Fields Special File, MA 13/35(c), ANZ.

Anderson, p.154.

²⁴ Petition of Certain Natives at Hauraki.

began to fall. After only three years the new income of Thames Māori was in steep decline. Many chiefs were now living beyond their means and entered into ill-considered credit arrangements against their property in the hope of a recovery in gold rents. Once in default debts were called in with backing of the Native Land Court.

In 1876 Te Moananui and Taipari further petitioned the government that miners' rights fees at Thames were overdue.²⁵ Pollen in whose name the account continued to be jointly held, denied that any malpractice had taken place, or that monies were being kept back. He stated before the Native Affairs Committee:

Maori had not received any revenues in the last quarter because, previously, overpayments had been made through the misplaced kindnesses of Mr Puckey.²⁶

Māori unable to work their own resources and facing increasing pressure from those keen to do so, were selling land wholesale. By the mid 1870s the financial situation had badly deteriorated for Hauraki rangatira and their people. After only three years the new income of Thames Māori was in steep decline. Many Māori were now living beyond their means and entered into ill-considered credit arrangements against their property in the hope of a recovery in gold rents. On the other hand mine owners and shareholders prospered and the miners and tradesmen were in a sound financial position. Once in default debts were called in with backing of the Native Land Court. Those Māori without work were in dire straits, forced into selling meagre possessions such as blankets, clothing, and boots to pawnbrokers for just a few pence in order to eat.

The following decade saw the introduction of steam technology in all of the region's extractive industries: timber,

²⁵ Te Moananui and 60 Others, Complaining of Money Due to Them and Irregularity of Payment of Miners' Rights Fees, *AJHR*, I-4, p.5.

²⁶ Evidence of Pollen, 26 July 1876, Papers brought before Parliament and Select Committees, 1876/7. Anderson, p.168.

gold and flax for which considerable amounts of capital were needed. Unable to marshal such capital or command such technology, Hauraki iwi were inevitable sidelined from any future economic profitability. Where in a less capitalized economic environment they had enjoyed the initiative and competed on equal terms with Europeans, they now found themselves very much at a disadvantage and steadily relegated to a subject labour force. Pollen blamed Māori extravagance for their distressed situation, and argued that they had ample opportunity to become aware of and understand the whole matter 'if they chose to take the trouble'. He condemned Puckey's practice of making payments in advance so that Māori could meet their liabilities as misguided.²⁷ The Native Affairs Committee accepted that no wrong doing had occurred but acknowledged that Māori had no way of knowing whether accounts were being kept correctly and recommended that the government allow the books to be inspected by a Māori appointee.²⁸ The problems of making sure that fees and rents were properly collected, properly assessed in each block, and distributed to the correct owners resulted in Māori taking on much of the burden of payment for the overseeing of agreements, but without gaining any real control or understanding of the process.

Pressure for the opening of Ohinemuri to gold mining intensified after Mackay had arranged the cession of the last of the west peninsula blocks in 1868. Over the next decade the government sought to gain control of the Thames Valley, and to undermine opposition to the Native Land Court and allegiance to the Māori king. Frustrated by the lack of response from Crown officials concerning their opposition to the opening of their land for mining, Ngāti Tamatera became more politically aware and became aligned with other Waikato iwi in order to gather

²⁷ Evidence of Pollen, 26 July 1876.

²⁸ Report of Native Affairs Committee, *AJHR*, 1876, I-4, p.5.

strength for their fight against the Crown. Officials negotiated with 'friendly' Māori, by giving gifts and then bargaining for their interests in blocks, before official determination of title, before competition from other purchases pushed up the price of the land, and before the consent of opponents had been won.²⁹

By the 1860s, Tukukino along with Te Hira and Taraia and declared their support for the Kingitanga. Taraia and Tukukino were two Ngāti Tamatera rangatira who were particularly suspicious of the Crown. These men were chiefs of the old school. Only ten years earlier, Taraia had attacked, killed and partaken of his Tauranga whanaunga (kin) as utu (revenge) for earlier wrongs committed by Tauranga iwi against Ngāti Tamatera. These were not men who thought in European ways. These were men who thought in the old ways. They were motivated by traditional ways and they understood the interaction with the Crown in a truly Māori way. They were the embodiment of mana.³⁰

The actions of Marutuahu rangatira only a couple of decades previously can be used to illustrate their perspective on life and their embodiment of Tikanga Māori. In 1842, while leading a force of forty Marutuahu including the chiefs Tukukino, Potiki, Takanini and Mokena Hou, Taraia descended upon Te Whanake and his people at Ongare. Some of the people of Te Whanake were killed and eaten, while the remainder was taken back to Hauraki as captives. To commemorate their success, the Ngaki Mate (avengers) distributed portions of the slain to the Marutuahu chiefs. After this event, Marutuahu determined the land around Ongare/Katikati and beyond to be tapu. Rahui were put on the area by Taraia and Marutuahu as all the land from Ongare to Waihi was tāpu. In placing these tāpu

²⁹ Evidence of McLean, Report of Tairua Investigation Committee, *AJHR*, 1875, I-1, p.10.

³⁰ Kemara Pirimona Tukukino, 'Evidence', Wai 100, 1997, Para. 5.

and rahui (embargo) over the land, Marutuahu were operating under Tikanga Māori and maintained and exercised their rights of mana-whenua (customary right) over the land.

In Taraia and Tukukino's opinion the Queen's officials could not be trusted. They felt they were concerned only about the interests of the settlers. Tukukino was vehemently opposed to land sales and to the introduction of government infrastructure such as roads and telegraph into areas subject to Ngāti Tamatera's mana. Tukukino refused to allow the Thames-Tauranga road to pass through Ngāti Tamatera land at Komata. Nevertheless the Crown used other measures to acquire the land. When the Komata field eventually came before the Native Land Court, Tukukino did not attend the hearing. Like most Kingitanga supporters, he refused to acknowledge the Court's jurisdiction. As a result the Court awarded him only a minor interest in the Komata land. Fearing that his mana would be significantly diminished, he applied for a rehearing. He was refused. Consequently Tukukino was reduced from the position of being the leading rangatira in the Komata area, to just one of many right-holders. Ngāti Tamatera individuals were freed to trade in pieces of paper representing individual title to their land. This was a grievous breach of their tikanga.³¹

This is why the issue of the goldfields and the way the people were treated has burned so brightly as a grievance in the hearts of the people from that time until today.³²

At Omaha Te Hira, Tukukino and their followers attempted to introduce an aukati, (boundary line) beyond which Hauraki would retain full autonomy over their lands. Mackay responded by visiting Ohinemuri in an attempt to stop Ngāti Tamatera from handing their lands and those of friendly natives to the kingites but he 'found it quite impossible to do anything towards the

³¹ Kemara Pirimona Tukukino, Evidence, Wai 100, 1997, Para. 10.

³² Kemara Pirimona Tukukino, Evidence, Wai 100, 1997, Para. 13.

cession of the district owing to the opposition of Te Hira's party'.³³

Unfortunately for Ngāti Tamatera, the Crown, in ignorance of their customs, misunderstood or ignored a lack of permanent physical presence as evidence of a lack of right to the land. The Crown's focus upon individual interests in its purchase activities also had the direct result of undermining chiefly authority over Ngāti Tamatera lands including Waikawau and Moehau. The Raihana system minimized the standing, authority, and mana of their rangatira.³⁴

Many of the land dealings between the Crown and Hauraki Māori became the subject of dispute and conflict. Terms and conditions of the mining agreements were not adhered to, leasehold land was converted to freehold land and some gifted land was subsequently sold for purposes other than the original gift. Some areas set aside for cultivation or residence were targeted for mining and various tactics and threats were used to gain unwilling consent to open up the land for mining.

A particular need that ought to have been evident to the Crown was the provision of adequate coastal lands so as to ensure the hāpū of Marutuahu continued access to their taonga Tikapa Moana (the Firth of Thames) and to their kaimoana (seafood). The loss of control over the Thames foreshore in 1868 impacted heavily on the traditional lifestyle of Hauraki iwi. The Crown failed to make allowances for this and as a result denied iwi a traditional right. Their actions denied Hauraki iwi the immediate coastal access that they had previously enjoyed since time immemorial. Hauraki rangatira petitioned the government to complain about the infringements of their rights

³³ Report by Mackay on Thames Goldfields, 27 July 1869. *AJHR*, 1869, A-17, p.8.

³⁴ Closing Submissions, Wai 100, #Y1, para 253.

over the foreshore. Their objections were fully communicated to both the Select Committee and to the House.³⁵ On 5 August 1869 Te Moananui petitioned the government on behalf of Ngāti Maru, Ngāti Tamatera and Ngāti Whanaunga:

The word has come to us that you are about taking our places from high-water mark outwards. You, the Government have asked for the gold of Hauraki; we consented. You asked for a site for a town; you asked a lot that the flats of the sea off Kauaeranga should be let; and those requests were acceded to and now you have said that the places of the sea that remain to us will be taken.

Friends, it is wrong, it is evil. Our voice, the voice of the Hauraki, has agreed that we shall retain the parts of the sea from the high-water mark outwards. These places were in our possession from time immemorial; these are the places from which food was obtained, the time of our ancestors even down to us their descendants. ... It was thought that the taking of land by you ceased at Tauranga and other places; but your thought has turned to Hauraki...

Friends, our hands, our feet, our bodies, are always on our places of the sea; the fish, the mussels, the shell-fish are there. Our hands are holding onto those, extending even to the gold beneath. The men, the women, the children are united in this, that they alone are to have the control of all the places of the sea, and that the Europeans are to have nothing to do with them. ...³⁶

Hauraki rangatira in later years petitioned the Native Affairs committee, to complain about European 'strangers' removing oysters and other shellfish 'in great quantities, to the manifest injury of the Māori people, and asking that the government protect them in their exclusive right of use of the foreshore.'³⁷ The Crown in its response denied the significance of the earlier agreements made with Hauraki rangatira, in which reserves had been established and they did not make any further provision for the protection of the right of Hauraki iwi to fish and gather seafood in their traditional manner. The iwi of Marutuahu eventually lost their traditional access to the seabed and to their kaimoana.

With the discovery of gold at the Thames the resulting population growth combined with the sudden flow of money, severely impacted on Ngāti Maru society and caused many social and cultural problems due to the changes caused to their lifestyle

³⁵ Report of the Select Committee on the Thames Sea Beach Bill, *AJHR*, 1869 F-7, App. E, p.18, *NZPD*, Vol. 6, (1869), p.902.

³⁶ Petition of Te Moananui, 5 August 1869, Report of Committee on the Thames Sea Beach Bill, *AJHR*, 1869, F-7, App. E, p.18.

³⁷ Reports of Native Affairs Committee, *AJHR*, 1879, Session 11, I-2, p.16, and *AJHR* 1882, I-2, p.27.

and traditions.³⁸ Towards the end of the 1860s some hāpū ceased to be independent in food and became dependent on the Europeans for their basic supplies. Hauraki iwi were able to readily assimilate money only so long as it was earned through work. Once it was received without work it became economically and socially disruptive.³⁹ The free flow of money in the form of payments for timber, gold, miners' rights, town rents and raihana, as equity against future entitlements and payments for land took a double toll on Hauraki iwi and unsettled their social fabric.⁴⁰

With the establishment of trade and the discovery of gold they became increasingly reliant on European foods and commodities as time progressed. This resulted in their new wealth being spent on everyday European items such as flour, sugar and alcohol. Consequently the transition from investment to consumption spending and the decline in work having already taken place at Coromandel, spread to Thames and alcohol consumption soared. Alcohol consumption would have accounted for much of their debt. A bottle of whisky was equivalent to at least two acres of land. Reverend George Maunsell complained in his letter to the Church Missionary Society:

...a sad amount of drinking, there being three public houses in a district containing less than 150 Maori and some 20 Europeans.⁴¹

His views were further endorsed by a correspondent to the *Evening News* who wrote:

It would be a gross exaggeration to assert that the Maoris are reduced to poverty in this portion of New Zealand. In a state of sobriety they offer many articles of food for sale. Yielding a little to the seductions of waipera they indulge in occasional playful though frantic gestures, and in untranslatable language. We cannot expect all Maoris to be patterns; and the vast majority are driving a steady trade making the living of the Pakeha cheap, and are themselves behaving quite as well as if not better than many Europeans.⁴²

³⁸ Monin, p.243.

³⁹ Monin, 'The Maori Economy of Hauraki 1840-1880', p.210.

⁴⁰ Monin, 'The Maori Economy of Hauraki 1840-1880', p.210.

⁴¹ G. Maunsell, Annual Letter, 21 December 1877, *Church Missionary Society Archives*, C1/063, ATL.

⁴² *Evening News*, 12 March 1868, p.3.

The social impact the discovery of gold at Coromandel and Mercury Bay had on iwi was also noted by the various Crown officials. Turton reported:

Waiau and Mercury Bay natives having lately received much Government money in payment of their land have been over to this side two or three times have been well supplied with liquor.⁴³

Coromandel Māori, he suggested, were in a 'declining state'.⁴⁴

Lawlor the resident magistrate at Coromandel declared:

Christian worships have been almost totally discarded and a general thirst for spirituous liquors prevails and in some instances industry has given way to gambling and pilfering.⁴⁵

Their health also suffered immediate setbacks as the open sewers and the high density living of the instant township were breeding grounds for diseases such as typhoid and whooping cough. Petitions to parliament stated:

Some of us were ill with the new diseases of the Europeans ... we could not proceed to the Court at that distant place Matamata.⁴⁶

European vices such as drink and prostitution became major problems for Ngāti Maru as well as for the European miners. Their participation in European vices was the result of the small sums individuals received from the distribution of the rent monies and also resulted in the loss of land which was sold to cover these minor debts.⁴⁷

Missionaries such as T. S. Grace and Reverend George Maunsell were scandalised. In his annual letter of 1868, Maunsell wrote about the pain he felt in seeing, almost every time he went into town:

⁴³ Turton to Minister of Native Affairs, 12 September 1862, BACLA 208/634, ANZ.

Turton to Pollen, 17 June 1862, BACLA 208/688, ANZ.

Anderson, p.95.

⁴⁴ Turton to Minister Native Affairs.

⁴⁵ H. C. Lawlor, Alphabetical List of Prominent Natives of the District of Coromandel, *Raupatu Document Bank*, Vol. 107, 41190-41193, ANZ.

Monin, p.207.

⁴⁶ Meha Te Moananui, and Others to Brown, 30 March 1869, Legislative Council Papers, LE 1/1869/133, ANZ.

Hutton, 'Troublesome Specimens', p.144.

Monin, p.222.

⁴⁷ Monin, p.224.

the spectacle of some wretched man reeling under the influence of spirituous liquors... Gambling is also another vice to which some are addicted... Prostitution is likewise said to be common.⁴⁸

Further evidence of prostitution was reported in the *Daily Southern Cross*.

The young Maori women were much in demand and were soon the focus of attention among miners eager to spend their hard earned wages. Many of the newly rich, intricately tattooed, young men, now dressed in European fashions joined in the festivities with gay abandon.⁴⁹

As a result of the new wealth generated by their gold revenues traditional cultural obligations such as Tangi and Hakari became more competitive, frequent and expensive for Hauraki iwi to stage. Feasting accompanied every major event in the lives of the highborn of Hauraki. On occasions of importance to the whole iwi much larger numbers of guests attended, and the highlight of the visit for both Tāngata Whenua and Manuhiri (guests) was the quantity and quality of the food distributed. The most lavish feasts were those provided purely for competitive purposes. These were held to enhance the prestige of the Tāngata Whenua by outdoing all previous feasts held in the rohe. Hāpū also became increasingly reliant on European provisions as a means to demonstrate their increased wealth and to further enhance their mana amongst other hāpū.

From 1867 onwards the costs associated with staging a hakari assumed inflated proportions for iwi against the income they received. Hakari were often held when someone died and the status of the person who had died often reflected the amount spent. These extravagant hakari obligations caused Hauraki Māori to become further indebted. The following is an example of hakari expenditure:

March 1867 Rapana Maungaroa and Hotereni Taipari hosted a hakari at Parawai at which provisions comprised 50 tons of flour in 50lb bags, 3 tons of sugar, 80 boxes of biscuits, 12 tons of potatoes, besides eels and several bullocks and pigs.⁵⁰

⁴⁸ G. Maunsell Letter, November 1868, *CMS Archives*, CN/063, ATL. Monin, p.223.

⁴⁹ Primary source unacknowledged, Williams, pp.73-74.

⁵⁰ *Daily Southern Cross*, 16 March 1869, p.3.

Hakari held upon important occasions such as tangi and political hui provided an important opportunity for Hauraki iwi to discuss political and economic issues relating to gold negotiations, as representatives from different hāpū were often in attendance. They were also used to distribute money to other iwi that held interest in the land. The 1874 Hakari at Whakatiwai was the last celebration of Hauraki Māori as a people of substantial property and independence. Never again would the people of Hauraki be in a position to entertain guests on such a grand scale and to discuss issues of such political and economic significance. The Whakatiwai hui also appeared to have fascinated the newspaper correspondents of the day who wrote in great detail about it over several weeks, covering every aspect of the meeting.

The influx of Maoris to Shortland as been felt to a most appreciable degree, and nearly every storekeeper has been doing a good trade, the tastes of the natives when they have money to spare ranging over a great variety of articles. MR. Howell Williams, draper, states that for several days he was scarcely able to keep up a supply equal to demand for shawls and blankets, while he had a run upon many other articles which appeared to catch the notice of the natives. Shortland people would like to see a native meeting every month.⁵¹

A return feast in July 1876 was hosted by Te Hotereni Taipari and his people.⁵² Both hakari involved extravagant displays of gifts and food which neither hāpū could really afford it, when the financial difficulties and pressure both iwi were under is considered.

While costs associated with tangi, uhunga and political hui assumed inflated proportions, these hakari did provide opportunities for the celebration of culture and identity in the face of looming European dominance.⁵³ In circumstances ushering one world out and another in, occasions for hakari in Hauraki were manifold. Death was quickly claiming the old leadership, whose mana demanded great tangi and uhunga.

⁵¹ *Evening Star*, 6 June 1874.

⁵² Williams, *Thames and the Coromandel Peninsula*, p.94.

⁵³ Monin, p.206.

Political meetings were needed to determine the way forward, to discuss tribal policy and strategy towards Pākehā designs on Māori land and resources.⁵⁴

In traditional Maori society, rangatira were considered to be the agent of general, tribal-wide distribution of revenues and goods. As a result they derived great prestige from their generosity and in turn their prestige permitted them to exercise control over social processes. Consequently this argument may equally be applied to the position of the rangatira in traditional Hauraki society. His status was largely dependant on his control and supervision of communal land and labour, and his role in the distribution of food. Both of these functions were closely related. The performance of these tasks had wider implications in terms of the source of traditional authority of the chief and influence and prestige he was able to command over members of the community.⁵⁵ Despite the greater access chiefs had to material resources and their better economic position, the fixed wealth of the chief was not much greater than that of an ordinary tribesperson. The difference lay in the larger quantities which continually passed through his hands.

The prestige and influence of a rangatira were bound up with the judicious use of wealth, particularly food. This inevitably involved its redistribution, which discouraged personal accumulation. Rangatira were channels for expenditure on communal undertakings such as hakari and tangi.⁵⁶ These social functions were essential for maintaining the reciprocal links with other hāpū and iwi which was integral to Māori society and therefore were not squandered.

⁵⁴ Monin, 'The Maori Economy of Hauraki 1840-1880', p.206.

⁵⁵ Lian, 'Tribe, Class and Colonisation', p.392.

⁵⁶ Monin, p.224.

The effects of non-work derived wealth, such as from rents and miners' rights, on Māori motivations for work have already been discussed; however, the implications for Māori society of its distribution and usage were equally fundamental. Money became a culturally destabilising factor after 1850 for many Hauraki rangatira due to the tension that existed between their role in traditional Māori society and their role in the new settler economy. The payments for miners' rights and land leases brought immense riches to some Hauraki rangatira and complex problems to others and with it a complete change of lifestyle for the whole Māori population of Hauraki. Petrie argues that as the rangatira held the authority to allocate rights of use pertaining to land under his mana and with the concurrence of his people, so he was equally responsible for distributing the proceeds of communally owned resources or communal activity. The method of allocation needed to be transparent and to meet his people's expectations of fairness.⁵⁷

It may be suggested the Māori economy of Hauraki was not cohesive during this time due to the fact that Hauraki rangatira were all independent decision makers.⁵⁸ The economies of individual Hauraki hāpū differed significantly in levels of investment, dependence upon the new European food, and varying levels of debt. Many rangatira were concerned about encroachment upon the interests of their individual hāpū should a collective agreement be reached. They were worried about how payments were to be distributed, and expressed the wish that this be done at a public gathering, where each person present would receive his or her entitlement in hand.⁵⁹

⁵⁷ Petrie, pp.212-213.

⁵⁸ Isdale, p.30.

⁵⁹ Monin, p.143.

The longstanding role of the rangatira as trustee of tribal property and channel of tribal wealth was challenged in the new economic circumstances by that of the chief as individual proprietor.⁶⁰ The way money was spent by some rangatira was also questionable, for example certain rangatira negotiated land sales, received payments, and registered schooners in their own name while others bought cows and horses. These had little direct benefit for their people. It is unclear how they viewed their traditional responsibilities as custodians and distributions of hāpū wealth.⁶¹ Subsequently several Māori families became wealthy by selling or leasing land and by embracing the advantages of the European lifestyle. They also adopted both the style of dress and some of the habits of their European neighbours. Māori who accumulated wealth and assets, and who publicly adopted European modes of behaviour and dress, were held up as role models for the rest of the Māori community.⁶² Not all Hauraki rangatira engaged in this type of economic and social activity. Most generally acted in the best interests of their hāpū and sought to improve the economic fortunes of their people.

Rangatira, as well distributing the new wealth amongst their people, also spent it on items, which maintained their personal mana amongst their own people as well as other iwi. These included timber houses with all the appropriate fittings. These houses normally only provided accommodation for their immediate family, although their use by Pākehā Manuhiri would have added to their hāpū's mana. They also spent money on cars, race horses and European dress. Many were enthusiastic about these new mana-enhancing possessions and often had portraits

⁶⁰ Monin, 'The Maori Economy of Hauraki 1840-1880', p.206.

⁶¹ Monin, p.133.

⁶² Rosemary Killip, *To Find a Fortune: Women of the Thames Goldfield 1867-1893*, Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington, 1995, p.25.

and photographs taken of themselves dressed in European clothing.

This type of spending greatly accelerated the shift away from traditional wealth distribution and propelled them towards the European concept of individual ownership. Rangatira as well as spending money on possessions which enhanced their own personal mana also spent money on goods and services which directly benefited and enhanced the mana of their whole iwi. An example of this was the money gifted by Ngāti Maru to Ngāti Awa after the construction of the meeting house Hotunui. Although no financial payment had been expected by the Ngāti Awa tohunga (priest) and carvers who constructed the meeting house, Hotereni Taipari provided them with a koha (gift) of £1000 on behalf of his hāpū. This koha would have maintained the reputation of Ngāti Maru amongst other iwi for being generous people.

Although the hospitality of Ngāti Maru was all that the builders and carvers would accept in return for their work, Hotereni felt concerned that his tribe had not sustained their ancient name for generosity. He sent his grandson's wife Mereana, with a bank order to travel overland day and night to intercept the men at Tauranga where, with the bag of money from the bank Mereana presented the koha of £1,000 in single bank notes from their grandparent Hotereni Taipari.⁶³

Although this type of spending may be seen as a further drain on Ngāti Maru resources it was deemed necessary in order to maintain their mana amongst other iwi.

While the actions of some Hauraki rangatira have been criticised as being self-serving and extravagant, it is argued in this work that their spending on European commodities and their apparent show of wealth was necessary in order for them not only to maintain their mana in their own traditional society, but for them to gain respect in the new colonial society. Wirope Hotereni Taipari, a rangatira of the Ngāti Maru iwi, is one such

⁶³ Williams, *Thames and the Coromandel Peninsula*, pp.101-102.

Hauraki rangatira who has been described as a chief who apparently put his own personal interests before that of his hāpū when he negotiated the opening of the Thames region for mining. It is asserted in this work that many of his actions were designed to enable his iwi to compete with the massive Pākehā population, which lived on the lands around Shortland and to maintain their traditional lifestyle as well as their ties to their land. His power was tied to an extremely fickle colonial industry, gold mining, and with all probability, legislative changes denied him much of the wealth he expected his hāpū to receive. He should not be underestimated nor dismissed as being a rangatira who had his own personal interests as his main objective when he interacted with the colonial society.⁶⁴ He was fiercely protective of his people's rights and constantly wrote letters to Crown officials in Wellington, in which he demanded that the Crown honour all agreements made with Ngāti Maru. He also petitioned the government on many occasions to seek better conditions not only for his own people but for the other iwi of Marutuahū.

Taipari, did however, sometimes act against the wishes of his father, close relations and his entire hāpū. They were initially not in favour of opening up their land for mining as they could not see the financial benefits it would bring them. They owned the Karaka block, the location of Shortland in the township of Thames, and the richest seams of gold.⁶⁵ They also had extensive cultivations and farms and supplied food and provisions to the Auckland market and the expanding European population in the Hauraki region.

Eventually Taipari obtained his hāpū's permission to employ Pākehā prospectors to explore the ground. The men hired by Mackay on his behalf were unsuccessful but Taipari employed

⁶⁴ Hutton, 'Troublesome Specimens', p.169.

⁶⁵ Monin, 'The Maori Economy of Hauraki 1840-1880', p.205.

two Māori diggers to prospect the Karaka block. He arranged for prospecting by Paratane Whakautu of Ngāti Rarua and Hamiora Te Nana of Ngāti Paoa, who had experience on the Collingwood gold field. They struck gold on a hillside above Karaka stream. Taipari also saw an immediate advantage in associating with James Mackay, and was soon appointed as a Native Assessor. His alliance with Mackay enabled him to open lands to which he had a strong claim for gold mining. The relationship between Taipari and Mackay stimulated that quest. Each man strove to match the other's achievements in property and political influence.⁶⁶

Taipari in due course managed to gain the support of his people to open further lands. Through the receipt of miners' rights, a considerable income from rentals for the Shortland township, his personal investments and other trading ventures, he was able to support a considerable network of alliances for his iwi. Over the boom period of the goldfield Taipari spent his money on a home furnished with every European comfort and luxury to match that of the Land Commissioner James Mackay's. He mimicked wealthy European in clothing and entertained in style.⁶⁷ He invested in flour mills and employed Europeans to run them. He invested £2000 in the Tokatea gold mining company in 1869.

Taipari used wealth to impress other Māori as well as wealthy and powerful Pākehā. He pursued mana across the two societies. Elaborate dress, calling cards, weatherboard houses were not only new currencies of rivalry with fellow Māori; they were also means of attention and respect in Pākehā society.⁶⁸ He would sometimes lend his house for a dance and as well as that

⁶⁶ Monin, p.227.

⁶⁷ Monin, p.224.

⁶⁸ Monin, p.227.

girls were brought from Auckland for the occasion. Taipari, whose prestige like that of all rangatira was bound up with the free use of wealth, found himself, as one of the prominent residents of Shortland. He adopted many of the symbols of European 'civilization' such as a large house, horse racing, churches, education, and public works.

At one time Taipari hosted Governor Bowen and the leading members of the settler government to lunch. Bowen later wrote about the visit:

He had built for himself an excellent house 'furnished with every European comfort and luxury', where he dined colonial eminences including Governor Bowen "in English style, with good wines, and well chosen plate, glass linen and other accessories', demonstrating to his guests 'the capability of Maories for civilization.'⁶⁹

Having enjoyed Taipari's assumed class status Bowen later reflected that 'he was a perfect example of the benefits of civilization'.⁷⁰ The Anglican priest Reverend Vicesimus Lush also partook of Taipari's hospitality on several occasions and commented on the grand European manner in which he entertained his guests:

I walked to the Mackays where I found Martin was surprised to see a large 'gathering of Natives, Wiropo Taipari having invited near four hundred to a Christmas dinner. Just behind Mr. Mackay's house Taipari had a huge marquee put up and long tables erected and there the Natives were assembled enjoying a thoroughly English Christmas dinner; Turkeys, Roast beef, puddings and as far as I could see all had silver (plated) [p.46] forks and glass tumblers – in fact the table seemed well appointed and the (rich) chief had engaged a band of musicians (Europeans) who kept playing all dinner time, to the gratification of the feeding Maoris. What extremes!⁷¹

Taipari gifted land for churches, hospitals, parks and other public purposes. He formed the Thames Native Volunteers, which he equipped with a rifle range, and appointed himself as the commanding officer. He also invested in flax mills and employed European overseers and labourers to run them. Towards the end of 1870 when the initial gold boom had reached

⁶⁹ Bowen Dispatch, No.8, 15 January 1870, Native Assessor, G25-12, ANZ, Monin, 'The Maori Economy of Hauraki 1840-1880', p.202.

⁷⁰ Hutton, *Troublesome Specimens*, p.169.

⁷¹ Alison Drummond, (ed.), *The Thames Journal of Vicesimus Lush 1862-82*, Christchurch: Pegasus, 1975, p.45.

its peak work was less plentiful and a great many Māori who were not involved in the ownership of land were suffering hardship. Wirope Taipari was deeply conscious of their suffering and in an effort to alleviate hardship he employed some men to tend the large gardens by his residence above Rolleston Street. He also recruited a full company of both Māori and Europeans for the Hauraki Rifles.⁷² The local council also worked with Taipari, Nikorima and Riwai Te Kiore for permission to build a much-needed road from Thames to Kopu. Taipari and Nikorima both gave their consent but Riwai Te Kiore was adamant that there would be no thoroughfare without his agreement and that of the whole tribe. After protracted negotiations the project proceeded but with the proviso that only Māori labour be employed.

Some years after the death of Wirope Hotereni Taipari, an extraordinary race was organised to commemorate his death. The bulk of his fortune had already been spent at his tangi and those in charge of the race pinned the remaining cash to shrubs and bushes. The people raced for it and stripped the trees bare. On 27 August 1880 a large assembly of Māori gathered in Thames for the hakari held on the unveiling of his headstone at Totara cemetery. He had left £1000 for the cost of the occasion and the steamer *Enterprise II* had brought from Auckland supplies of: twenty tons of flour, five tons of sugar among other goods. Biscuits, bread, tea, meat and other goods were purchased to cater for the people who would stay in Thames for some ten days. The great feast would be recalled for many years by those who had attended.⁷³

Although Wirope Taipari was to all appearances a proprietor of individual wealth, he never lost sight of his

⁷² Williams *Thames and the Coromandel Peninsula*, p.91.

⁷³ Williams, *Racing for Gold*, p.54.

traditional responsibilities as the custodian of communal wealth. Many of his economic ventures may be seen as efforts to form relationships with the colonial society and to promote roles for Māori within it, rather than as striving for personal aggrandizement and as evidence of cultural renunciation.⁷⁴

Other Hauraki rangatira who played an important role in the distribution and utilization of the gold revenues included Taraia, Te Hira, Te Moananui, and Tukukino of Ngāti Tamatera. The role played by these four rangatira when contrasted with Wirope Taipari was quite different. They all had significantly differing personalities and style. For example, Te Moananui of Ngāti Tamatera attempted to remain true to the old traditions when he dealt with the gold revenues his iwi received. He preferred to 'hand everything perhaps but £1 to the iwi, and left them to divide it amongst themselves'.⁷⁵

Taraia Ngakuti of Ngāti Whanaunga was perhaps one of the most of famous of all of the Hauraki rangatira. He was present at the original Patapata meeting in 1852. Like Wirope Taipari, he was in favour of the opening of Hauraki for mining as he realized the benefits that would come his people's way as long as they were in control of their lands. He was, however, someone with whom most European officials found difficult to deal with, being staunchly independent. He refused to sign the Treaty of Waitangi and was regarded as being a Māori of the 'old school' and, politically, always played a 'double game'.⁷⁶ In the last years of his life his influence appeared to have waned. Despite his great mana among Hauraki iwi and his involvement in political discussions, many of his opinions seemed to have been ignored by the Crown, especially when he tried to assert his will

⁷⁴ Monin, 'The Maori Economy of Hauraki 1840-1880', p.206.

⁷⁵ Hutton, 'Troublesome Specimens', p.170.

⁷⁶ Hutton, 'Troublesome Specimens', p.170.

in situations which required more delicate political solutions. In 1869 a journalist wrote:

it is evident that he is a Māori of the old school, and a thorough conservative. This is at once shown by the simplicity of his dress and manners. Though of a good age he shows no sign of feebleness, and his frame, short and thick set, indicates a power that in his more youthful days must have made him appear a very splendid specimen of manhood, and that even now shows great strength. Were it not for his tattooing and for his colour, his face would seem of an English type, his jaw being very full, ... At the time of my arrival he was engaged in fashioning and smoothing a paddle for a canoe, and I am informed that he occupies a great part of his time in pursuits of this nature, in making fishing nets, in fact following such modes of life as were common amongst the Maoris many years ago.⁷⁷

Te Hira of Ngāti Tamatera was perhaps the most politically active of all the Hauraki rangatira. He wanted his people to maintain their old traditions and beliefs and was strongly against the opening of the Ohinemuri rohe for mining. He dedicated much of his energy to the continuation of Hauraki control over their resources and social organization. Between 1865 and 1869 Te Hira refused to see any Europeans connected to the government although he was happy to talk with John White and C.O.B. Davis, two competent Māori speakers. By the end of the 1860s Te Hira carried out the wishes of many dead rangatira and had the support and confidence of the Māori King. He even liaised with some of Te Kooti's followers. This gave him immense power, which government agents worked to systematically undermine. His politics were to maintain both his and his people's independence and strength, perhaps the only option he could see in the face of the colonial process. Te Hira informed Ohinemuri settler J.W. Thorp in 1870 that:

he would take no money as an advance against gold rights in Ohinemuri because he had seen the foolishness of the Thames Maori.⁷⁸

Upon his death in 1883, the government agent for the Thames region reflected:

he considered more the benefit of the Maoris as a race than that of individuals, always that the two were of such a different nature, that what was beneficial to one was detrimental to the other, hence his idea of the necessity of keeping them as far apart as possible.⁷⁹

⁷⁷ *Daily Southern Cross*, 30 August 1869, p.4.

⁷⁸ Thorpe to MacLean, 15 February 1870, *MacLean Papers*, MS Papers 0032, ATL.

⁷⁹ Reports from Officers in Native Districts, AJHR 1883, G 1, p.13.

Te Moananui also of Ngāti Tamatera initially offered to sell land to encourage settlement and leased land for gold mining. He worked with government agents to broker peace in Hauraki. Nonetheless, he kept to his own political agenda and refused to open lands at Ohinemuri. At times he supported Māori who opposed the colonial process. It is possible that he envisioned a social and political balance in Hauraki with the Pākehā being able to mine and settle to the north of the Thames, while the Tāngata Whenua retained a stronghold around Ohinemuri. In the late 1850s he is reported to have used alcohol, a habit, which he abandoned when he began to lose land through indebtedness in 1869. Te Moananui also traveled between the numerous lands he and Ngāti Tamatera had claim to. His place of residence changed as Pākehā increasingly moved into Hauraki. Te Moananui reflected that he moved around Hauraki, which he called his house, watching it be submerged by a flood of European migration and commented that he could no longer find his tūrangawaewae (a place to stand).⁸⁰ In later years he tried to work with the government but found himself pursued by Pākehā moneylenders, land sharks and government agents.⁸¹

Tukukino Te Ahiataewa was one of Te Hira's most important supporters. He was a great rangatira in his own right. From the early 1860s he gave considerable support to the King Movement, was a follower of Pai Marire, and had a reputation among government officials as being one of the most violent of the Kingite party of the Upper Thames.⁸² Tukukino was prepared to oppose Europeans by force, if necessary, something which Te Hira seemed to have neutralized. His opposition to gold mining on Ngāti Tamatera land was maintained into the 1870s and

⁸⁰ Hutton, 'Troublesome Specimens', p.171.

⁸¹ Hutton, 'Troublesome Specimens', p.171.

⁸² Hutton, 'Troublesome Specimens', p.171.

through the 1880s when he took the mantle of leadership from Te Hira.

All Hauraki rangatira faced momentous challenges in maintaining their mana in their own society and at the same time acting in the best interests of their iwi in the new colonial economy. They tried to control their relationship with Europeans and make it work to their advantage. When this proved not to be possible, most rangatira appeared to have regretted the decision they made to agree to mining on their land, as they failed to reap the promised financial reward. The Land Commissioner Hay reported:

They exclaim that they never have anything to show for their land after it is sold, as – except in the case of one or two influential men who may retain large sums – the mass of the payment is divided amongst the tribe in trifling sums, which are spent, perhaps, immediately, and in a few months they regret having ceded their land.⁸³

This chapter examined the effect the discovery of gold had on Māori society in the rohe of Hauraki. It considered the political, economic, and social challenges the new wealth brought to the iwi. It also focussed on the role of the rangatira in distributing and utilizing the gold revenues, and explored the tension that existed between the position of rangatira in traditional Māori society and their role in the new colonial order.

The discovery of gold impacted greatly on the lives of Hauraki iwi and their rangatira and brought much social and economic change to their communities. The interconnectedness of the economic, social and political change that occurred during the period of this study, for the iwi of Marutuahu, is undeniable. The decline of the Maori economy in Hauraki was due in part to upheavals in its traditional social systems. All political, economic and social outcomes for the iwi of Marutuahu were ultimately influenced by the decisions they made and by their desire for the continuity of their culture and traditions. The

⁸³ Hay to Chief Commissioner, 31 August 1858, in Turton, *Epitome*, C 332.

rangatira of Marutuahu faced many economic and social challenges. Rangatira such as Wiropé Taipari and Te Hira while differing considerably in their philosophies and relationship with Europeans acted in the best interests of their people when distributing and utilizing the gold revenues that the new wealth generated.

Petrie has concluded that the Maori economy flourished while they were free to pursue their business interests according to their own determinants. In the process, Maori lost their political strength and the ideologies of the colonisers had profound effects on their social structures and consequently on their economy.⁸⁴ Hauraki rangatira desired to participate in the new economic order as equal partners with the Crown however, processes were set in motion over which they had little control or understanding, and in the end could not be held responsible. At all costs they wanted to avoid their absolute disempowerment and the economic impoverishment of their people.

⁸⁴ Petrie, p.87.

4 Mixed Messages

An European representation of Māori owed more to other European representations, visual and verbal, than it did to the actual Māori people, or the Māori activities, customs, events from history or legend to which an image or a title might refer. These images were made for the scrutiny, the 'reading' of Europeans. What might be seen to be straightforward, 'direct' portraits of Māori, were constructed to be records of ethnological fact or reproductions of scenes and events from daily life, in which the artist was capturing a sense of likeness, or resemblance to the actual. These portraits were and are inevitably loaded with social and cultural significance.¹

During the period 1850 to 1880 newspapers, artwork and photography influenced how Maori were regarded in the Hauraki goldfields and influenced the way the wider public engaged with them. Although Pākehā controlled them, newspapers written in Te Reo Māori, provided the iwi of Hauraki with a median in which to debate and discuss issues that were of concern to them. However, the manner in which Hauraki Māori were represented in the newspapers, artwork and photographs of the period often caused mixed messages to be given to the wider public about the impact that the discovery of gold was to have on their lives. This chapter will consider the wider assumptions that were made

¹ Bell, Leonard, *Colonial Constructs: European Images of Maori, 1840-1914*, Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1992, p.3.

about Hauraki Māori involvement in gold mining and the impact that this involvement had on their lives, by examining how the iwi of Marutuahu were portrayed in Māori and English language newspapers, and how they were represented in the nineteenth century artwork of Charles Heaphy and Gottfried Lindauer and the photography of the Foy brothers of Thames.

Māori language newspapers published during the period 1850 to 1880 may be considered to be an important source for looking at issues which were of concern to the iwi of Hauraki as well as the wider Māori community. Journalists who wrote for these papers attempted to present these issues from a Māori perspective as well as inform Māori about what was happening in their world. However, these journalists often had their own agenda and their portrayal of Māori was often quite biased.

During the period of this study there were various newspapers, which were published in Te Reo Māori and provided Māori with a voice to express their opinions on issues that concerned them. Most Māori language newspapers were edited and owned by Pākehā and as a result these papers were still quite similar in style and format to the settler press of the period. They often contained many articles written by European journalists, which had been translated into Māori. As the majority of Māori language newspapers were owned by Europeans only a few were publishing their articles solely in Te Reo Māori with no English translation. The majority of articles were published in Te Reo Māori using the format of one half of the page appearing in Māori with an English translation on the other half of the page. However, there was quite often little direct correlation between the original Māori article and what was written in English. Articles were also sometimes published directly from the local settler newspapers with no Māori translation. This could have been due to a lack of time translate

the article into Māori before publication, the shortage of space in the paper or because the Editors felt that Māori should have been able to understand their context without providing a translation.

At the time of the discovery of gold in the Hauraki region there were several Māori language newspapers, which wrote published articles and letters that were of concern to the iwi of Hauraki. These papers included *Te Waka Māori o Niu Tirani*, *Te Wananga* and *The Maori Messenger - Ko Te Karere Maori*. Various topics were covered in these papers, that related to Hauraki iwi and the impact the discovery of gold had on their lives. These articles included the initial report of the discovery of gold; the coverage of meetings between government officials and the iwi of Marutuahu; depictions about specifically Māori events such as tangi and hakari which had been held in Hauraki; obituaries which announced the death of Hauraki rangatira, such as the obituary for Taraia written by the Ngāti Tamatera rangatira Te Moananui; and in later years an in depth coverage of the important issue of Raihana.

The newspapers *Te Wananga* and *Te Waka Maori o Niu Tirani* may both be considered to have been the mouthpiece of the government as they both appeared to directly represent the views and policies of the government when they reported issues associated with the Hauraki goldfields. They published the findings of Select Committees on subjects such as petitions by Hauraki Māori, which dealt with their concerns about miners' rights and land confiscations. For example, they both published the same announcement on the Select Committee's findings on the petitions by W. H. Taipari and Te Moananui about how miners' rights revenues were not being correctly paid to their hāpū.²

² *Te Waka Maori o Niu Tirani*, 13 Pepurere 1877, p.28.

Articles written in Te Reo Māori to announce the discovery of gold in the Hauraki region were quite factual and were written in a style similar to the settler press of the period. A local Pākehā correspondent often wrote them and it appeared to have been translated from English into Māori. Articles were often taken directly from the *Thames Advertiser* and the *Daily Southern Cross* often with no Māori translation. No evidence was found during the course of this study of Māori correspondents reporting on issues which concerned their people.

Hauraki rangatira often wrote letter to the papers to express their opinions on issues, which concerned their people. Their letters were similar in style to a whaikōrero (speech) as they all were written using direct speech and were written as if they were addressing the editor in person. When *Te Wananga* was originally established, Hone Nahe was nominated to represent Hauraki viewpoint in the paper. However, other Hauraki rangatira such as Wiropo Taipari of the hāpū Ngāti Maru also wrote letters on behalf of the iwi of Marutuahu. He was a prolific letter writer who often wrote to *Te Waka Maori o Niu Tirani* 'on behalf of Ngāti Maru and himself so that his words would be seen by all'.³ Taipari often published letters that he had already written to government ministers. He was quite political motivated as he also publicly gave his support for the Māori king.

There was a general dearth of information available in early Te Reo Māori newspapers, which made reference to the part played by Hauraki hāpū in the opening of the Coromandel goldfields. Only a brief mention was made in *The Maori Messenger - Ko te Karere Maori* of the initial discovery of gold at Coromandel.⁴ This could have been due to a lack of

Te Wananga, 8 Hune 1878, p.293.

³ *Te Waka Maori o Niu Tirani*, 7 Pepurere 1872, p.44.

⁴ *The Maori Messenger - Ko Te Karere Maori*, 31 Oketopa 1859, p.5.

correspondents to cover the issue from a Māori perspective and the fact that only a few Māori newspapers existed at this time.

A report published in *The Maori Messenger - Ko Te Karere, Maori* described a visit to Coromandel by a local correspondent.⁵ His report was more concerned about the benefits of European civilisation had brought to Māori than the impact gold mining was having on the hāpū and was quite preachy and moralistic. He commended a rangatira for being clean and regarded him as being a role model for other Māori. The report by this correspondent was an example of the assumptions that were made about Māori in Hauraki and was in-sync with what was being published in other Te Reo newspapers of the period. On several occasions Māori had been advised to continue doing work such as sowing crops and raising cattle rather than just relying on income from the lease and selling of their lands. The report advised them to be industrious so that they could obtain all of the benefits of a European lifestyle. This edition of *The Maori Messenger - Ko Te Karere* also reported on the death of the chieftain Taarua Te Tawaroa who was present at the Patapata meeting to open the Coromandel area for mining. Rather incredibly for a Te Reo Māori newspaper, it described her in English as 'being an old witch yet as someone who commanded great respect amongst Māori as well as European'.⁶ *Te Manuhiri Tuarangi* also reported on a hui, which was held at Coromandel to discuss whether Hauraki iwi should support the Taranaki war.⁷ It described in great detail the hakari which took place. *The Maori Messenger - Ko Te Karere Maori* was of the opinion that Māori were not strong enough to dig for gold.⁸

⁵ *The Maori Messenger - Ko Te Karere Maori*, 31 Oketopa 1859, pp.5-6.

⁶ *The Maori Messenger - Ko te Karere Maori*, 30 Noema 1859, pp.5-7.

⁷ *Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, Maori Intelligencer*, 15 Apereira 1861, pp.5-6.

⁸ *The Maori Messenger - Ko te Karere Maori*, 30 Noema 1859, p.4.

Te Waka Māori o Niu Tirani of 12 Noema 1873 reported the visit by Governor Grey to Thames and his subsequent meeting with Wiropu Taipari at his wharenuī.⁹ The correspondent was concerned with making assumptions about Pākehā and Māori race relations and reported every aspect of the Governor's visit and quoted extensively from Grey's speech. He took care to report Grey's desire for racial unity and his desire to pass laws, which would make land sales easier to occur. Variations on the word 'friend' were used quite often in this report, for example 'held a friendly meeting', and 'his old friends'.¹⁰

It should be noted that during the course of this study there were only a limited number of reports found in any Niupepa Māori, which discussed the discovery of gold at Thames and the impact that this discovery had on Hauraki iwi. It was not until the public debate over Ngāti Tamatera refusing to open their land for mining occurred that mining received any significant coverage in Māori language newspapers. When a meeting was held at Shortland in 1873 between Crown officials and Hauraki rangatira to settle the question of the opening of Ohinemuri, the journalist who was present at this meeting reported the views of the rangatira who was present at the meeting.¹¹ His coverage of this meeting was quite unusual as he reported what each chief had to say using direct speech. The English translation of this report is also considerably shorter than the Māori report and written in a style similar to the local press during the same period. The English version was extremely critical of Hauraki Māori, even though it appeared in a Māori language newspaper. It appeared to have been published to explain the actions of the government in the Hauraki region to a wider Māori audience.

⁹ *Te Waka Māori o Niu Tirani*, 12 Noema 1873, pp.151-152.

¹⁰ *Te Waka Māori o Niu Tirani*, 12 Noema 1873, pp.151-152.

¹¹ *Te Waka Maori o Niu Tirani*, 18 Hune 1873, pp.63-64.

Te Waka Māori o Niu Tirani and *Te Wananga* both carried reports about the impasse concerning the opening of Ohinemuri for mining but from quite different perspectives.¹² *Te Waka Māori o Niu Tirani* explained the government's position on Raihana, while a long article in *Te Wananga*, which was written in both Māori and English, questioned why Māori were treated differently to European when they sold their land. It was also extremely critical of MacKay's Raihana policy:

This is the work of the Government Land Purchasers here, viz., giving rations to the Maoris. If a low-born Maori goes to them and says, give; they will give, and if the same Maori wants clothes provisions or spirits, they will give him an order, and he will take it to the storekeeper who will give him all that is mentioned in the order. There is a difference in the price of some things, but the storekeeper raises the price. How is this to end this work will go on for some time, and then the Government men will go to the relations of these Maoris, and say, so and so has had so much money, give us land as payment.¹³

This edition of *Te Wananga* was also unusual as it published letters to the Editor written by settlers. These letters were supportive of Hauraki Māori and were possibly taken from the settler newspapers of the period. *Te Waka Māori o Niu Tirani* did however; attack McLean for neglecting his duties under the conditions of the Treaty of Waitangi and for failing to protect the interests of Māori.¹⁴

A long article in the *Te Wananga* explained why Ngāti Tamatera did not want to open up their land for mining.¹⁵ This article did not have an English translation. This edition of *Te Wananga* also provided coverage of a meeting held with Mackay and other Crown officials at Te Pae o Hauraki Marae. A correspondent who was present at the meeting wrote about it.¹⁶ Like the previous article it was also written in Te Reo Māori and did not have an English translation. It dealt with the amount of

¹² *Te Waka Maori o Niu Tirani*, 18 Hune 1873, pp.63-64.

Te Wananga, 28 Mei 1875, p.92.

¹³ *Te Wananga*, 28 Mei 1875, p.92.

¹⁴ *Te Wananga*, 25 Maehe 1876, p.147.

¹⁵ *Te Wananga*, 11 Mei 1876, pp.196-197.

¹⁶ *Te Wananga*, 12 Pepuere 1875, p.31.

land that was being taken by the government and asked for the government to compensate Ngāti Tamatera.

The editor of *Te Waka Māori o Niu Tirani* was, on a couple of occasions, extremely critical of the policy of the government with regard to Ohinemuri, particularly the actions of the Native Minister Sheehan during his visit to the area. He launched quite a personal attack on Sheehan and questioned his ability as a Minister of the Crown.¹⁷ A journalist also commented on the necessity to correct reports in the settler press about the Ngāti Tamatera rangatira, Tukukino refusing to meet Sheehan. In their opinion the opposite was true and the only reason they did not meet, was that it was not convenient for either party to do so at that particular time. There was also a long article in *Te Waka Maori o Niu Tirani*, which dealt with a land dispute, that had become violent.¹⁸ This article was once again extremely critical of Sheehan and his inability to resolve the situation in a peaceful manner.

After the dispute to open the Ohinemuri region was resolved the only other mention that it received in Niupepa Māori was as a result of a hui was also reported in *Te Wananga*.¹⁹ This hui was held in Thames to discuss Te Hira's attitude towards public works being carried out to enable a road to go through Ngāti Tamatera land. Other rangatira present at this hui appeared to disagree with his stance as they felt the building of the road would benefit all the hāpū of Hauraki.

The discovery of gold was widely reported in both the national and local settler newspapers of the period. Various papers wrote about this issue including the *New Zealander*, the

¹⁷ *Te Waka Maori o Niu Tirani*, 6 Hepetema 1879, p.530.

¹⁸ *Te Waka Maori o Niu Tirani*, 6 Hepetema 1879, pp.529-532.

¹⁹ *Te Wananga*, 27 Apireira 1878, pp.192-194.

New Zealand Herald, the *Daily Southern Cross* and the *Thames Advertiser*. The approach taken by these papers was completely different to that of the Te Reo Māori newspapers of the same period. The settler press was more concerned with reporting the economic consequences Māori involvement in mining would have for both the Crown and the settler population and with attacking government policy. These papers all provided an in-depth coverage of the events that led to the opening of all three fields in the Hauraki region. It is suggested here that the views expressed in the settler papers reflected the views of the wider public and indirectly influenced the way in which Crown officials interacted with Hauraki Māori.

There are several issues that these papers had in common when they reported the discovery of gold and the impact this discovery would have on both Hauraki Māori and the settler population. They all wrote about the various meeting that were held to discuss the opening of the fields. They also examined the attitudes of the different Hauraki iwi towards the discovery of gold; the part played by the various government officials in negotiating the opening of the area for mining and they described the legislation that was passed to administer the three goldfields.

When negotiations took place at Patapata for the opening of the first field at Coromandel, it received coverage in not only the local newspapers, but was also covered in the *New Zealand Spectator* and *Cook's Strait Guardian*. Correspondents from these papers who were present at Patapata reported everything that took place over the three days and quoted not only from Wynyard's speech but also from the speeches of every rangatira who was present. The paper also provided a copy of the Mining Agreement. The settler press at this time was very sympathetic towards Hauraki Maori and critical of the Crown. They appeared to be unimpressed with the rental fee that had been negotiated

with Hauraki Māori. The *New Zealander* declared it to be 'unfairly and even ridiculously low'.²⁰ However, as the *New Zealand Spectator* and *Cook's Strait Guardian*, noted this was 'only part of - and by no means the chief part - of the payment'.²¹

There was a slight change in attitude in the manner in which the negotiations, which took place for the reopening of the Coromandel field in 1862, were reported in the colonial press. Both the *Daily Southern Cross* and the *New Zealander* reported on the signing of an agreement in 1862 with the rangatira Riria for the reopening of the field. They were more interested in capturing what was unusual about the manner in which the agreement was signed, rather than concentrating on the political significance of the signing. For example, they concentrated on describing in detail Riria venturing into the sea to ask Grey to return to the negotiations. These papers often attacked the integrity of leading Hauraki rangatira. The Ngāti Tamatera rangatira Te Hira was usually portrayed as being obstructive and difficult. Correspondents wrote about how Te Hira would react to the signing of these negotiations without bothering to interview him. According to the *New Zealander*:

...the agreement had been signed by all except Te Hira, who as we had stated, was not present; enough his mind it is said, is known to make it certain that, whilst he might have been resisted obstinately the alienation of the land, he will be found passively consenting to the terms which Lydia and the others had made.²²

In fact, Te Hira was extremely angry with her making this arrangement and as stated previously in this research he had been prepared to wage war against her hāpū if she had not been able to appease him by gifting him some money. The *Southern Cross* described some of the proceedings from this meeting, in particular the presentation that had been made to Grey in honour of the occasion:

²⁰ *New Zealander*, 1 December 1852, p.2.

²¹ *The New Zealand Spectator and Cook's Strait Guardian*, 19 January 1853, p.3.

²² *New Zealander*, 25 June 1862, p.3.
Battersby, 'Evidence', p.14.

After the natives had consented to accept Sir George Grey's terms, they brought a mat, and laid it at his feet, in token of handing over to him the territory. This was the identical mat, which the Waikatos had sent down to Coromandel natives, signifying their right to that territory, by virtue of the act of Te Hira and the Thames natives, handing it over to them at the great Piako meeting. His Excellency had the mat brought with him to Auckland.²³

There was also a further deterioration in the manner in which the settler press reported the discovered in the Thames region and the part that local Māori would play in this field. The *Daily Southern Cross* was initially rather sceptical about whether the Māori owners would grant European miners permission to mine the area. It was of the opinion:

According to their notion the Thames was to be an exclusive Maori diggings, and their countrymen have some remarkable stories about the results of the working. As, however, no gold has been brought to the people of Auckland will do well to be sceptical in the meantime.²⁴

This newspaper was also quite concerned with whether Te Hira of Ngāti Tamatera would grant permission for miners to be able to enter Ngāti Tamatera land to mine and devoted several months to debating this issue. Rather surprisingly, when the Kauaeranga hui took place to finalise details for the opening of the Thames region the *Daily Southern Cross* was quite sympathetic to the needs of Hauraki Māori. They stated that in their opinion it was important that Māori got a fair deal from the Crown during this negotiation process.

The native runanga resumed the subject of the Thames goldfield boundaries yesterday ... Riwai fought to the last, and I could not listen without feeling sympathy for the old man when I heard him urge the Upper Thames natives to retain their hereditary rights to the soil.²⁵

Despite this, they continued to attack key rangatira who were against any further land being opened for mining, in particular Te Hira. The local Thames papers used every opportunity given to attack Te Hira for his strong anti mining stance and his support of the 'Kingites'.

²³ *Southern Cross*, 28 June 1862, p.3.

Battersby 'Evidence', p.14.

²⁴ *Daily Southern Cross*, 13 July 1867, p.5.

²⁵ *Daily Southern Cross*, 2 August 1867, p.3.

After the negotiations for the opening of the Thames area for mining were completed, the local press devoted much space to covering the daily administration of the fields, and provided comment on the role played by Mackay in the administration of these fields. They were particularly interested in his relationship with local iwi.²⁶ Te Hira, and his refusal to open up the 'Upper Thames' for mining provided much editorial comment, of a mainly negative nature. For example,

We have now a word of advice to offer the natives themselves and especially Te Hira and his followers. If they wish to keep the balance of their lands, they will at once open Ohinemuri.²⁷

Editions of the Thames newspapers from 1868 onwards were devoted to agitating for the opening of the Ohinemuri fields. Correspondents covered this issue from every perspective. They attended the various hui and public meetings held to discuss the opening, interviewed the key players in the negotiation process, and both papers criticized and praised Mackay for the manner in which he handled negotiations with Māori.²⁸

For almost a decade from when Mackay first attempted to negotiate the opening of this field these newspapers reported almost daily on the need to open the 'Upper Thames' or Ohinemuri region for mining. In the early stages of the negotiation process the Thames newspapers were generally unsympathetic towards the plight of Hauraki iwi. As far as the press was concerned, Māori were deliberately hampering the negotiation process. It was reported in the *Thames Advertiser*:

It was noted on September 3 1870, that the Maoris of the Upper Thames were sticking together to get their own price for land. "The Maoris are petty wide awake here." On September 30 it was noted that Te Hira's sister, Mere Kuru "and her amazons" were "ruling the roost" in the Ohinemuri against losing land, and keeping a kind of sanctuary, into which the chief Te Moananui found it expedient to retire when pursuing his bailiffs.²⁹

²⁶ *Thames Advertiser*, 24 August 1874, p.2.

²⁷ *Thames Advertiser*, 24 August 1874, p.3.

²⁸ For example, *Evening Star*, 18 August 1874, p.2.

²⁹ *Evening Star*, 3 September 1870, p.2.

Evening Star, 30 September 1870, p.2.

Louis Dihar, Manuscript, Thames School of Mines, (date unknown), p.11.

The *Thames Advertiser* continued its attack on April 1 1874:

As far as the Ohinemuri has been concerned, he (Tukukino) has been a bugbear for some considerable time, but the Government have lacked the will or the courage simply to take proceedings to open the country.³⁰

Finally in May 1874 reports emerged in the press of a planned meeting, which was to be held at Whakatiwai of all the iwi of Marutuahu. In the opinion of the press this meeting was mainly being held to consider the land question, in particular the opening of the Ohinemuri region for mining. This hui, was in fact, being organised to enable a return hakari to take place in order to repay other iwi for their generosity to Ngāti Maru as well as to hold a uhunga for their tūpuna who had recently passed away. Press reports indicated that it would likely be the largest hui that had been held in the North Island for a considerable period of time:

Preparations are now going on for a great native meeting at the Thames, on the shores of the Firth, nearly opposite Shortland. This meeting is likely to be the largest that has been held in the North Island (says the Auckland Star) since the great gathering at Remuera after the signing of the treaty at Waitangi. It is expected that upwards of three thousand natives will be present including two hundred from the King country. The meeting is promoted chiefly by the Ngati Paoa, Ngati Whanaunga and the Upper Thames tribes.³¹

Correspondents for the *Thames Advertiser* and *Daily Southern Cross* were present at Whakatiwai as the preparations took place. They all had their own agenda in the manner in which they depicted this hui, choosing to write about it in a mainly negative manner. They made various observations about what was happening:

The place of meeting has been chosen on account of its proximity to flax land, affording shelter and also because of the large quantities of shell fish obtainable from the beach in the vicinity. As a preliminary the women of the various tribes have both shipped to make the necessary preparations the erection of tents, manufacture of kits, drying offish &c. One hundred tons of flour and fifty tons of sugar in addition to grog, fish and other regular Maori fare, are already on the ground. The chief object of the meeting like other similar gatherings is of course feasting and a sociable reunion to break the monotony of Maori everyday life, but some matters of importance are likely to come up for discussion – the sale of lands at the Upper Thames being the number. Baron Charles DE Thierry, in compliance with an invitation intends to avail himself of the opportunity for explaining the principles of Good Templary and establishing Maori

³⁰ *Thames Advertiser*, 1 April 1874, p.2.

³¹ *Thames Advertiser*, 26 May 1874, p.3.

Lodges. The meeting which is likely to prove and interesting one, commences early this month.³²

One correspondent from the *Thames Advertiser* managed to interview James Mackay. He questioned MacKay about the topical issue of Raihana:

...Mr Mackay states (and I guarantee the correctness of the statement, from my own personal knowledge) that in a great many cases he does not give orders to the natives to get the goods, but that the natives procure them for themselves, and give orders on him to pay the money.³³

Eventually the press became impatient with the length of the preparations and they questioned the validity of the meeting. They reported:

The great native meeting is on, but nobody seems to know what it is on for. Whether the Maoris know themselves is doubtful, but everybody credits James Mackay junior, with being the prime mover and instigator of the meeting. All that appears to be known outside Maori and Pakeha-Maori circles is that the ostensible purpose for which the Maories (sic) assembled –the scraping of the dry bones of their ancestors with a view to preserving them from the desecration of the white man is not the real one. It would appear to be a native fair or feast for the consumption of the good things provided by a liberal and paternal government wishing to honour (sic) the natives and pander to their gourmandising propensities. A few white men will probably make a good thing out of it – that it if the Maories have any money; and possibly those natives who haven't got any money may be seduced into a little kite flying, in order to satisfy present wants at the expense of future necessities. The results are likely to seen when the Lands Court opens in Shortland, the time for which is not far distant, when it may be proved that the present feeding business has not been altogether unsuccessful.³⁴

An attempt was also made on the occasion of this hui to persuade Te Hira how beneficial mining would be to his people. Mackay and other Crown officials took him on a tour of the Thames area. This excursion was reported in a most sarcastic manner in the *Thames Advertiser*:

Te Hira did Grahamstown yesterday and we hope that what he saw will do him good... A carriage was procured and Te Hira started off accompanied by Mr Allen, Mr A Hogg and Mr J Gibbons. The Telegraph office was visited where the workings of the system was explained to Te Hira by Mr Bull. Te Hira might then have been taken to see the big pump, and down the Bright Smile shaft, but he appeared, shortly after lunch, to be satiated with sightseeing and remarked he had seen enough of the workings of the Pakeha for one day.³⁵

³² *Thames Advertiser*, 26 May 1874, p.3.

³³ *Thames Advertiser*, 18 August, 1874, p.2.
Battersby, 'Evidence', p.60.

³⁴ *Evening Star*, 18 August 1874, p.2.

³⁵ *Thames Advertiser*, 5 September 1874, p.2.

After correspondents for the settler press discovered the implications that Raihana had for Ngāti Tamatera they launched a vigorous attack on both Mackay and government policy. They became more sympathetic to the plight of Ngāti Tamatera and condemned the government's methods of procuring land from Māori. Correspondents viewed Raihana as being 'fundamentally at variance with their own society's standards of fair-trading, which required the two parties first to be the rightful owners of the assets to be traded and then to make that trade openly and knowingly'.³⁶ In 1875 the *Thames Advertiser* succinctly summed up what had happened to Māori land in Hauraki since early 1872:

During the time that the obnoxious system of purchasing land from the natives by the means of raihana was in force, a certain number of would be sellers found it easy to obtain unlimited supplies of goods from the privileged commissariat of the Land Purchase office, and by these means something may be said to have been paid to a few owners of nearly every block extending from Cape Colville to Te Aroha ... The real owners may find that others who have little or know claim have sold their lands for them.³⁷

The editor of the *Thames Advertiser* regarded Raihana as being a 'Government trap' set with enticing bait,³⁸ and quoted Te Moananui who claimed that 'storekeepers were allowed to cook their accounts how they liked'.³⁹

From 1875 onwards the local press devoted considerable time to commenting on the events that led to the signing of the Deed, which would open the Ohinemuri region for mining. Correspondents travelled to Ohinemuri complete with pigeons to cover the opening. The reporter commenced his report with the statement, 'The Eyes of the Province are on Ohinemuri',⁴⁰ and proceeded to describe what took place. One particularly sympathetic correspondent described Te Hira and Te Moananui's

³⁶ Monin, p.238.

³⁷ *Thames Advertiser*, 23 November 1875, p.2.

³⁸ *Evening Star*, 26 May 1874, p.2.

³⁹ *Thames Advertiser*, 6 December 1875, p.3.
Monin p.237.

⁴⁰ *Thames Advertiser*, 17 February 1875, p.3.

Anon., 'Gleanings from the Thames Advertiser and Miners News 1875', *The Ohinemuri Regional History Journal*, 1: October (1964), p.13.

reactions. His report captured their sadness at ceding their land to the Crown:

Te Hira and Te Moananui have maintained a dignified seclusion, but now Te Hira has come down from his settlement to his old place at Papaturua, near where the "Luna" is lying. He is surrounded by his own people and is as polite, hospitable and kindly as ever. He will attend the meeting to-morrow, and now that he has given his consent to have the field opened, he is anxious to have it done as soon as possible, and as peaceably as possible.⁴¹

The deed was finally signed on 20 February 1875 and was witnessed by the local press.

Yesterday afternoon the agreement was at last signed, sealed and delivered. ... First Karaitiana and Wi Koka came forward, and then Te Moananui and Te Hira. In all 97 signatures were appended, but the chiefs of Kiriwera did not sign. They had been the stoutest resisters from the first and objected to roads passing through their property as well as to other conditions. However they signed to-day.⁴²

A journalist from the *Thames Advertiser* was later present when the initial rush to stake a claim occurred. He described the action:

To see the best of the fun I started this morning for the Prospectors' claim, carrying my precious pigeon. He was the only hope of satisfying the burning curiosity of the people of Thames ... 10.07am: We can see clouds of dust; horsemen riding here. ... A Maori has won the race and is first on the ground with rights. ...⁴³

After the Ohinemuri goldfield was declared open the settler press continued to write about issues which concerned Māori, in particular, the impact mining had on the lives of Ngāti Tamatera, and the continued opposition of their rangatira Te Hira, Te Moananui and Tukukino towards allowing mining to take place in their territory. They also concerned themselves with reporting issues such as the necessity to build roads through the district and Māori opposition to this. They also described the proceedings of the Native Land Court.

During the second half of the nineteenth century European artists formulated multiple, seemingly conflicting views of Māori people, their culture and history. Māori could be presented as savages existing in a primitive stage of social development.

⁴¹ *Thames Advertiser*, 17 February, 1875, p.3.

⁴² *Thames Advertiser*, 20 February 1875, p.3.

⁴³ *Thames Advertiser*, 3 March 1875, p.3.

Māori could be presented as romantic beings, as noble, as ignoble, as relics of antiquity, as exotic curiosities, as picturesque, as hostile, as friendly or deferential, as objects of desire, as participants in a spectacle, as members of a dying race, as ethnological specimens, as marketable commodities, or as antipodean peasants.⁴⁴

The usual brief for artists who accompanied travellers, explorers, and diplomats in foreign territory during this period was to make sketches of the places they visited, people and things they encountered and of notable events for both the personal record and for possible use in publications.⁴⁵ Charles Heaphy was one of the first Europeans who made a visual record of Hauraki Māori. Heaphy was a skilled draughtsman, artist, surveyor and government officer and this made him one of the most reliable visual recorders of Māori and European life in the mid-nineteenth century.

In 1851 Heaphy offered to conduct a geological survey of the Coromandel district and subsequently went with the acting Governor of the time Wynyard to Coromandel. Heaphy conducted this survey with Von Hochstetter and it was due to their findings which Von Hochstetter credited Heaphy with, that negotiations took place for the opening of the goldfields for mining.⁴⁶ Heaphy was at Coromandel from November 1852. He had been appointed Commissioner of the Goldfields. Heaphy remained at Coromandel to oversee the diggings and was responsible for negotiating with Maori landowners for prospecting rights. His survey work at Coromandel was the beginning of his lifelong interest in the Hauraki goldfields.

⁴⁴ Bell, *Colonial Constructs*, p.4.

⁴⁵ Bell, *Colonial Constructs*, p.42.

⁴⁶ Briar Gordon, and Peter Stupples, *Charles Heaphy*, Petone: Pitman, 1987, p.8.

Heaphy was remembered mostly for his accurate map work and for his paintings and drawings of New Zealand scenery:

These are more than the accurate topographical illustrations the New Zealand Company employed him to produce; the best of them are illuminated by some poetic insight; most of them indicate his struggle to come to grips with the savage landscapes so alien to one brought up in the milieu of the traditional English water colourists.⁴⁷

Heaphy's depiction of the Patapata meeting, which appeared in the *Illustrated London News*, is one of the best-known images of Nineteenth Century New Zealand artwork:

On the foreshore among the original settler dwellings are numerous tents dominated by a grand marquee which probably served as a wharenui of the hastily improvised marae. Canoes of all sizes are hauled upon the beach while others are on the harbour along with a fleet of European sailing vessels.⁴⁸

In this work, Heaphy managed to capture the essence of the Patapata meeting and represented the two worlds of the participants. During his time at Coromandel Heaphy also drew a number of sketches of the gold fever days. He depicted in these drawings the negotiations in 1852 with Ngāti Maru rangatira for miners' rights.

Heaphy's most enduring legacy was the large number of topographical watercolours, portrait studies, charts and coastal profiles which he produced, mainly in the service of the New Zealand Company, during his early years in New Zealand. His depictions of New Zealand Company sites and settlements remained fresh and vivid and reflected the eye of a young enthusiast firmly based in the English tradition of accurate draughtsmanship.⁴⁹

Gottfried Lindauer, who arrived in New Zealand in 1874, was the first residential professional artist who specialised in

⁴⁷ <http://www.teara.govt.nz/1966/H/HeaphyCharles/HeaphyCharles/en>, accessed 30 August 2006.

⁴⁸ 'Conference of Lieutenant-Governor Wynyard and Native Chiefs in Coromandel Harbour, The New Zealand Gold Field', *Illustrated London News*, Vol. 23, No. 465. Dec. 3 1853, p. 465. Monin p.141.

⁴⁹ Michael Fitzgerald, Heaphy, Charles 1820 – 1881, *Dictionary of New Zealand Biography*, <http://www.dnzb.govt.nz/>, accessed 30 August 2006.

portrayals of Māori. Lindauer had the longest working career of any European painter resident in New Zealand who depicted Māori. Lindauer's best-known pictures were his half-length and bust-size portraits of famous Māori, which included a number of Hauraki rangatira.

There was considerable variety in the subject and manner of Lindauer's presentation of Hauraki Māori. His works included portraits of famous Māori both living and dead; little-known figures in European and Māori dress; depictions of traditional activities and customs; genre-like paintings of contemporary Māori life; groups of figures with Māori artefacts, and the occasional Māori belle and mythological subject.⁵⁰

According to Bell Lindauer's 'old-time' Māori appeared to inhabit a timeless realm.

The absence of drama, the static frozen quality of his tableaux, the archaism of the figures, their half smiles and abstracted looks conveyed a sense of remoteness, distance and dream which fitted in with the standard European view of traditional Maoridom as either of the past or something the last remnants of which were about to vanish for all time in the face of European progress.⁵¹

Bell has suggested that this is why Lindauer's European contemporaries viewed his paintings as historical records of early Māori life. They were representations of history as they viewed it.⁵²

Hauraki Māori may be seen in some of Lindauer's works in both positive and negative ways. A depicted Māori could be anything that a European artist wanted him or her to be. Lindauer often painted his Māori patrons in their best European clothes or in traditional dress. By the 1870s most Māori were normally wearing European clothing. It was his European patrons who wanted Māori figures presented in more fitting, more awe-

⁵⁰ Bell, *Colonial Constructs*, p.195.

⁵¹ Bell, *Colonial Constructs*, p.205.

⁵² Bell, *Colonial Constructs*, p.205.

inspiring, more exotic dress.⁵³ There is evidence too which suggested that Lindauer worked from photographs of staged tableaux of traditional activities. This is particularly true for the works that he constructed for his patron Partridge.⁵⁴ The work commissioned by Partridge was typical of the artwork that was constructed during this period. In late 1875 Lindauer arrived in Auckland and became friendly with Partridge, an Auckland businessman, who commissioned Lindauer to paint portraits of Māori rangatira and other personalities. In his work for Partridge Lindauer sometimes idealised or 'improved' his Māori subjects and presented them in their 'best dress' with their hair and beards neatly groomed, skin smoothed and blemishes removed. Such improvements were standard practice in European portraiture.⁵⁵ His sources for his portraits of Hauraki rangatira included photographs taken by Foy's Brothers of Thames, earlier paintings, and book illustrations of Māori customs. The end product was his desire to present his subjects in the 'best' possible light for his patron.⁵⁶

Gottfried Lindauer has been described by Bell as being a 'journeyman painter', that is, an artist who mainly painted commissioned portraits to earn an adequate living in order to support himself and his family.⁵⁷ Shortly after his arrival in New Zealand, Lindauer began travelling through the 'native districts' of both islands. While in the Hauraki region he secured sittings from several influential rangatira and members of their families. Partridge influenced Lindauer to paint the Ngati Maru tūpuna, Hori Ngakapi.

⁵³ Briar Gordon, *Gottfried Lindauer: His Life and Maori Art*, Auckland: Malcolm McGregor, 1989, unpaginated.

⁵⁴ Bell, *Colonial Constructs*, p.201.

⁵⁵ Leonard Bell, *The Maori In European Art: a Survey of the Representation of the Maori by European Artists from the Time of Captain Cook to the Present Day* Wellington: Reed, NZ Art Series, 1980, p.64.

⁵⁶ Leonard Bell, *The Maori In European Art*, p.64.

⁵⁷ Bell, *Colonial Constructs*, pp.62-63.

Partridge, as well as James Mackay amongst other prominent Europeans, commissioned painting of Māori. They were interested in preserving a record of old time Māori. Partridge and these other collectors commissioned these works to portray a 'dying race'. Their collections included representations of famous Māori of the immediate past and present, both those who supported European settlement and those who opposed it, as well as Māori 'types' representative of the exotic and picturesque.⁵⁸ Partridge's collection included Lindauer's most well known work, that of a Hauraki women, Ana Rupene of Ngāti Maru.

During the 1870s Lindauer spent ten months in the Thames district painting both Pākehā and Māori portraits. He painted portraits of prominent Hauraki rangatira as well as other Māori who came under his gaze. Ana Rupene was a well-known resident of Thames. Along with her friend Pare Wātene, she would wander along the streets of Shortland. Miners and residents of the goldfields often admired them both. Lindauer met Ana Rupene outside the Shortland hotel in Thames and gained her consent to paint her picture.⁵⁹ Unfortunately soon after this painting was taken Ana's baby died and she blamed having her photograph taken for the baby's death. She was described as being one of the prettiest girls in the Hauraki region.⁶⁰

Lindauer's painting of Ana and her baby was typical of the many stylised portraits of Māori women of this period. Her portrait was based on a photograph, which was possibly taken by Foy Brothers of Thames. Lindauer presented her as a stereotype. She represented the sentimental maternal image of a Madonna

⁵⁸ Brian Gordon, and Peter Stupples, *Gottfried Lindauer: His Life and Work*, unpaginated.

⁵⁹ Gordon and Stupples unpaginated.

⁶⁰ James Cowan, *Sketches of Old New Zealand*, Auckland: The Brett Printing and Publishing Company Ltd, 1901, p.190.

and child rather than of a flesh and blood human being.⁶¹ His portrait of her was regarded as a notable example of a picturesque Māori, of a pretty mother with child smiling sweetly at the viewer.

It is the opinion of nearly everyone who had the pleasure of seeing this charming portrait that Lindauer must have had his heart and soul in his work when painting it, certainly no picture in the collection has been so universally admired.⁶²

This work became his most well known painting. Lindauer turned this particular painting into a small industry, producing over thirty versions.

Lindauer's painting of Hori Ngakapa was also well known, not just for its artistic merit, but for an anecdote that is associated with it. Ngakapa was painted in European clothing, a suit and tie, and like European gentlemen of the period he was depicted with whiskers.⁶³ Lindauer's portrait of him was painted at Thames in 1874.

This painting was exhibited in Foy's window. A few days later Ngakapa was in town and was told of the painting. Calling a cab he drove to the shop and said to Foy "how much the picture?" "£25 answered Foy. Without another word Ngakapa went out, climbed into the cab and drove to the bank. Then returning, he placed the money and said "give me the picture." Foy wanted to wrap it but Ngakapa insisted on taking it as it was. He sat next to the cab driver and ordered him to drive slowly along the street while he held the picture out for all to see. Arriving at Shortland he hired a room at the hotel and charged 6p to view his portrait. Maori and Pakeha alike paid up and soon he had a cigar box full of coins. He bought drinks for everyone.⁶⁴

While living in Thames, Lindauer also painted Haora Tipa Koinaki of Ngāti Paoa. It has been argued that Lindauer painted him as a role model for other rangatira, and as an example of a rangatira who accommodated the Settler population.⁶⁵ Tipa also worked alongside Mackay as a native assessor for many years and accompanied him on several diplomatic missions in 1864 to 1865.

⁶¹ Bell, *The Maori in European Art: a Survey of the Representation of the Maori by European Artists from the Time of Captain Cook to the Present Day*, Wellington: Reed, NZ Art Series, 1980, p.4.

⁶² Cowan, *Sketches of Old New Zealand*, p.190.

⁶³ Bell, *The Maori in European Art*, p.4.

⁶⁴ Gordon and Stupples, *Gottfried Lindauer: His Life and Work*, unpaginated.

⁶⁵ Monin, p.201.

After residing in Thames, Lindauer travelled to Ohinemuri where he painted several rangatira of Ngāti Tamatera. His portrait of Taraia Ngakuti te Tamuhuia was also painted for the Partridge collection. Lindauer's portrayal of him has been described as being 'neither disparaging nor caricatured but as a representative of the ancient Māori past'.⁶⁶ Lindauer portrayed Taraia in fighting costume, with his toki (war-tomahawk) in his hand. 'Through Taraia's fierce stare, his eyeball-to-eyeball confrontation with the viewer and his brandished tomahawk hinted at a stereotyped Māori warrior'.⁶⁷ The sense of the old man's strength of character, which is portrayed in this painting, suggested that Lindauer was interested in Taraia as an individual and not just as another trophy for Partridge's collection. In his portrait of Tukukino, the subject is shown wearing the dried skin of a huia bird in his ear, a typical ornament of a highborn Māori rangatira of former days. In these works Lindauer portrayed these Hauraki tūpuna as proud reminders of the distant past.

Most of Lindauer's subjects were reported to have been quite uneasy at being painted, as they feared that being painted or having their image taken insulted their Ātua. (God) As stated previously Ana Rupene also believed that Lindauer's portrait was responsible for the early death of her daughter Huria.

Many of these Hauraki tupuna instinctively abhorred the idea of having their portraits painted or being sketched or photographed, and almost every member of their iwi equally shared this dislike. Lindauer's portraits of Māori in European dress conveyed a different impression of Māori to those painted in traditional kākahu (dress). These may be considered to be more socially realistic. The majority of Māori had adopted European dress by the 1870s. Unlike other depictions of Māori

⁶⁶ James Cowan, *Sketches of Old New Zealand*, p.63.

⁶⁷ Bell, *The Maori in European Art*, p.63.

during the same period these paintings could not be mistaken for a museum record of a member of a allegedly dying race, the relic of a past age.⁶⁸

In later years his painting of these Hauraki rangatira received enthusiastic and admiring responses from most of their Whanaunga. James Mackay personally wrote to Lindauer to commend him for his portraits of Hauraki rangatira:

After a very careful inspection of your Gallery of Māori Portraits, I am of the opinion, that it would be impossible to have more correct or life-likeness of the persons represented in those pictures. I was (or am, in the case of those now living) personally acquainted with thirty-four notable individuals shown in your collection; and a glance at each sufficed for immediate recognition of their well-known features; and they were as if they stood in the flesh before me. The clothing, ornaments, weapons and pose of the figures, as delineated, is truly and thoroughly Maori.⁶⁹

Various Crown officials also attempted to represent Hauraki Māori in artwork. These included J. C. Richmond. His watercolour painted during the 1870s represented the lifestyle of Ngāti Tamatera at Ohinemuri. This work compared the living standards of Hauraki Māori living in Ohinemuri with their relations in Thames.

This lone whare, raised above the damp conveys the simplicity of Maori life at Ohinemuri before 1875, a world away from the comparatively wealthy lifestyle of at least some of Maori at the Thames.⁷⁰

In the second half of the nineteenth century the camera replaced the watercolour sketch as a visual record of colonisation. Photography was the new trend and Māori were popular as models. Early New Zealand photography was used to document land exploration, settlement and development. Māori exposure to photography dated from the late 1850s and early 1860s. And it was from this time that Māori attitudes to the practice of photography began to form. In most cases the results of photography generated respect, in some instances even awe

⁶⁸ Bell, *The Maori in European Art*, p.64.

⁶⁹ Cowan, p.210.

⁷⁰ James Crowe Richmond, *Ohinemuri, Thames* 1860s, A-245-008, A.T.L. Monin, p.239.

and fear.⁷¹ Prior to 1860, due to the cost of photography, during this period only those of some rank or standing in the community managed to pose before the camera. The noble, upright natives depicted are moulded on European society.⁷² During the next decade the educated and respected were replaced with the rank and file. Photographers during this period seem to compete with one another for the most fearsome individuals.⁷³

Hauraki Māori were exposed to photography after the Foy brothers arrived in Thames in 1872. Joseph and James Foy were prolific photographers of early Hauraki Māori. Their photography business operated in Thames until 1886. They used many studies of local men and women to show in clear detail the elaborate tattooing, especially of rangatira and the moko of many of the women. Young attractive Māori were a popular subject for colonial photographers. Photographs of young Māori women and tattooed men adorned the walls in many of the hotels in Thames Main as argued that early photographers such as Foy were often not particularly concerned with their subjects as individuals.⁷⁴ They were more concerned with representing Hauraki Māori to meet the popular market than portraying the impact that gold mining had on their lives. There was strong demand from Europeans for pictures of Māori and photographers such as Foy would induce Māori to sit for them dressed in traditional clothing so they could mass-produce their images for sale. European interest was in the exotic, so individual with strong facial moko were sought after for this trade.

⁷¹ Micahel King, *Maori: a Photographic and Social History*, Revised Edition, Auckland: Reed Books, 1996, p.1.

⁷² William Main, *Maori in Focus: a Selection of Photographs of the Maori from 1850-1914*, Wellington: Millwood Press, 1976, p.5.

⁷³ Main, *Maori in Focus*, pp.4-5.

⁷⁴ William Main, *Striking Poses: New Zealand Portrait Photography: Whakaahua Whakaata Atarangi: an Exhibition Presented by Museum of New Zealand, Te Papa Tongarewa, 12 March - October 2003*, Wellington: Museum of New Zealand, 2003, unpaginated.

Representations of Māori women during the second half of the nineteenth century in particular held popular appeal. Images of Māori women fell into four broad categories: the lone female or maiden, presented in a variety of genres; pairs of Māori females; mother-and-child images; and group photographs, including formal portraits and representations of 'village life'.⁷⁵ Ana Rupene of Ngāti Maru in the Hauraki district was the best known of Māori mother-and-child pictures and was distributed widely by Foy Brothers, as well as being the subject of a large number of near-identical portraits by Gottfried Lindauer.

Authenticity was also desired by photographers of this period, and these Thames photographers often portrayed their Māori subjects in traditional dress complete with the necessary props. They persuaded their subjects to swap their European street clothes for an array of studio-owned customary clothing and weaponry. Whether these sitters were paid or given complimentary copies of the photographs is unknown. If they received copies, then whether these might have served the sitters' purposes by remaining in families is equally uncertain.⁷⁶

Another ploy popular with Victorian photographers, such as Foys was to invest their young female subjects with a gamine appearance, for the delectation of European customers.⁷⁷ These types of images were used to endorse the assumptions that were made about Māori during this period. A portrait of Matira Rawiri of Hauraki by the Foys Brothers photographers achieved the effect with the inclusion of a Jew's harp. This instrument was popular among Māori in the nineteenth century because of its versatility and the relative ease with which it could be played.⁷⁸

⁷⁵ Jacqui Sutton Beets, 'Images of Maori Women in New Zealand Postcards After 1900', *Women Studies*, 13:2 (1997), p.7.

⁷⁶ Main, *Striking Poses*, unpaginated.

⁷⁷ King, *Maori: a Photographic and Social History*, p.18.

⁷⁸ King, *Maori: a Photographic and Social History*, p.18.

Foys took many photographs of young Māori women and children with the intention of selling these as postcards. They often did not bother to record who their subjects were.

Many older Hauraki rangatira preferred to be photographed in their traditional clothing of former days for personal reasons, while the younger generation preferred to be photographed in European clothing and fully participating in the new colonial society. One example of this style of photography was a photograph taken by Foys of a young Māori who acted as the mailman on the coach to Thames. His photograph was taken with him resplendent in his European dress and he appeared to be proud of his job.⁷⁹

The attitude of Māori individuals to photography in the nineteenth century is difficult to gauge. About the same time as the growth of European interest in portrait photographs of Māori, Māori also became interested in having photographs taken of their family, but for a different intent to that of European photographers. Some affluent Maori who were at ease with European ways commissioned their own portraits; while rumours spread in some Māori communities that sickness or death would result from exposure to the camera.⁸⁰ The fact that some people died within a short time of being photographed added impetus to that fear. Even if individuals were concerned about their mana or mauri (spirit) being stolen there were plenty of photographers who managed to photograph Māori.

Photographs, which had been taken mainly for the tourist market, did however, become highly valued by the subjects' families, especially after their death. In addition to sitting for portraits, commissions from Māori included photographs of

⁷⁹ Main, *Maori in Focus*, p.28.

⁸⁰ King, *Maori: a Photographic and Social History*, p.2.

functions, group pictures on special occasions, and copying earlier photographs taken by other photographers.

European technology was adapted to suit Māori purposes. Hauraki iwi also developed the custom of placing photographs of dead people and their pre-deceased relatives around bodies at tangi. These pictures would then be addressed in oratory or lament as if they were living presences.⁸¹ The parallel custom grew of hanging such portraits on the interior walls of meeting houses. The placing of photographs of recently deceased relatives within such an environment was entirely consistent with earlier usages. It was regarded as being a classic example of Māori accommodation of features of Western technology into a framework of Māori values, with a consequent strengthening of those values.⁸²

This chapter has made a textual and visual analysis of how the iwi of Marutuahu were represented in the newspapers, artwork and photographs of the period 1850 to 1880. It compared the different ways in which Māori and English language newspapers observed the impact that mining had on their lives of Hauraki Māori. It also examined how they were represented in the artwork of the nineteenth century artists, Charles Heaphy and Gottfried Lindauer, and in the photographs of the Foy brothers of Thames and why these artists and photographers chose to represent Hauraki Māori in the manner in which they did.

Newspapers written in Te Reo Māori served several purposes during this period. They enabled Hauraki Māori to become informed about events which were taking place in both their own world and related directly to Māori tikanga, such as the staging of important hui and hakari, and obituaries for prominent

⁸¹ King, p.2.

⁸² King, p.2.

rangatira. They provided rangatira with a forum with which they could discuss issues such as the sale of land and their relationship with the Crown. These papers also provided the government with an opportunity to announce various policies and to address an audience whose command of written Māori was often greater than their command of written English. Māori language newspapers did not place a great deal of importance on reporting the economic changes that the discovery brought to the lives of Hauraki iwi. They concentrated on reporting the discovery from a more Māori perspective, preferring to cover the hui that were held in the region and publishing the views of various Hauraki rangatira about the issues that concerned them personally. The issue of Raihana, apart from meetings with Crown officials, appeared to be the principle Hauraki issue that was reported in any depth in all of the Māori language newspapers of the period.

The settler press of the period reported the discovery of gold in Hauraki from a completely different perspective to the Māori language newspapers, as they were more concerned with informing the general public about what was happening with the day-to-day operation of the fields. They also had the freedom to criticise both Crown officials and key Hauraki rangatira when they did not act in the manner in which they expected. Due to language difficulties, Hauraki Māori often only had a limited opportunity to respond to their criticism and when they did they were often ridiculed.

The representation of Hauraki Māori in artwork and photographs provided a valuable yet limited visual record of the impact and consequences that mining had for the iwi of Marutuahu and of race relations in the Hauraki region during the period 1850 to 1880. Heaphy's drawings recorded the negotiations that occurred for the opening of the first field at

Coromandel, while ‘Lindauer’s historical portraits of prominent nineteenth century Māori constituted an extremely interesting pictorial chronicle of the times. He painted to preserve the dying race, an invaluable record of moko, dress and ornament’.⁸³ The Foy Brothers were responsible for photographing a large proportion of the Maori population of Hauraki. Their portraits of Hauraki Māori were a popular means for many Pākehā to observe representations of tikanga Māori. However, they failed to accurately represent the involvement of Hauraki Māori in gold mining, as they did not provide a record of the impact that mining had on Hauraki iwi. They preferred instead to concentrate on the stereotypical representation of Māori, as they photographed them inside a studio and used artificial props. Nevertheless their work did provide many Hauraki Māori with an opportunity to have a permanent record of their whānau for future generations. These representations of the iwi of Marutuahu in newspapers, artwork and photographs influenced how the wider public perceived Hauraki Māori and subsequently engaged with them.

⁸³ Bell, *The Maori in European Art*, pp.62-63.

Conclusion

This thesis is a study of the interaction between Pākehā and Māori in the Hauraki region during the period 1850 to 1880. It investigated the contribution made by the iwi of Marutuahu, that is Ngāti Maru, Ngāti Paoa, Ngāti Tamatera, and Ngāti Whanaunga, in the three Hauraki goldfields, namely Coromandel, Thames and Ohinemuri, and was primarily concerned with making an analysis of the economic, political and social impact this involvement had on their lives.

Hauraki Māori have been viewed by some local historians, such as Isdale and Grainger as playing only a minor role in the establishment of the three goldfields on the Coromandel Peninsula. They briefly described in their texts how Hauraki rangatira ceded their land to the Crown and place emphasis in their work on impact that the mining had on the colonial economy. They fail to recognise the shift in the socio- economic relations that occurred for the Tāngata Whenua of Hauraki as a result of mining. Their works do not acknowledge the loss of land or the impact that mining had on the traditional lifestyle and society of Hauraki iwi.

Scholars such as Petrie, Monin and Hutton have also written about Māori and Pākehā race relations in the later half of the nineteenth century. Their works deal with Maori socio

economic relations and the impact that Crown policy has had on the economic outcomes for Māori. The views expressed in thesis about the impact that mining had on Hauraki Māori and on Māori and Pākehā race relations should be placed in context with what these academics have previously expressed. It articulates the view that despite the Hauraki Māori failed to receive any real benefit from becoming involved in the gold mining process and their involvement with gold mining impacted on their traditional society and lifestyle.

When the negotiations took place for the opening of the Coromandel goldfields Maori were viewed by the Crown as being equal partners who would receive an equal share in any revenue that occurred from mining. Most rangatira who attended the hui at Patapata were suspicious of the Crown's intentions and were not convinced of what benefit that they would receive. They initially agreed to mining occurring on their land on the condition that although the Crown could have the gold they would remain in control of their land. It is argued in this work that the subsequent agreements, which were made with Māori for the opening of the Thames and Ohinemuri fields, resulted in a shift in dynamics which saw the Crown gradually gain control of the land as well as the large proportion of the revenues from mining. The two principal Land Commissioners Donald McLean and James Mackay were primarily responsible for this happening. As a result of the relationship that they established with key rangatira they were able to use their influence to further the Crown's cause. Mackay's role in particular, after 1869 as both a private businessman and land agent under contract to the government involved a conflict of interests. He had good intentions and anticipated that Māori would share in the prosperity promised by gold mining and secure a role in

the colonial economy. His use of raihana, his relationship of trust with Hauraki Maori and his knowledge of their society cast an unpleasant light over his use of the practice.¹

Hauraki rangatira who entered into the arrangements with the Crown to open their land for mining did so with the intention of improving the lifestyle of their people and to enable them to reap the benefits from participating in the colonial economy. However, they anticipated that they would still be in charge of their own affairs and that they would operate within the confines of their own traditional society. It is suggested in this work that at no stage did these rangatira foresee the damage that would occur to their traditional lifestyle or to the lives of their people.

This work has challenged some of the misconceptions that have been made about the manner in which Hauraki rangatira negotiated deals with the Crown on their people's behalf. They have been criticised for being self-serving and for being reckless in the manner in which they spent their people's money. It is concluded here that they acted in the best interests of their iwi and that it was not financially worthwhile for them to individually distribute gold revenue to all their people. Attempts were made by various Crown officials to alter the relationship that they had with their iwi by attempting to persuade them to act as the individual proprietors of their land and not as the customary protector of the rights of their iwi. Although these rangatira have been criticised for spending money on the trappings of European wealth and on traditional hui such as hakari, it is argued here that it was necessary for them to do this in order for them maintain their traditional position in their own

¹ Monin, *This is My Place*, pp.248-249.

society as well as amongst the wider mining community. Several rangatira who wanted their people to be financially independent, attempted to negotiate private arrangements with miners for the leasing their land without consulting the government agents, but they were unsuccessful due to the Crown passing legislation to prevent this happening.

Crown officials also failed to show any respect for and proper acknowledgement of Māori Tikanga. They expected Māori to participate in the colonial economy on their terms alone and required them to have an immediate understanding of European financial arrangements, such as banking and account keeping, something that Māori in Hauraki had no previous knowledge. When Māori expressed their concerns about the way in which they were being treated directly to Crown representatives, or in letters and petitions to the government, their views were often ignored or dismissed. These rangatira were viewed as being “difficult”.

Their exposure to the new colonial order had severe economic and social consequences for the traditional lifestyle of all Hauraki Māori. The loss of their land and the pollution which was caused by mining affected their ability to live entirely off the land and to harvest their kaimoana. After being introduced to European food and goods such as alcohol, biscuits and tobacco they became reliant on these good as part of their everyday life. Their desire for these goods also resulted in Māori becoming indebted to Europeans storekeepers and enabled Mackay to take advantage of this and carry out his Raihana policy. It also became important for rangatira to supply European food and goods as provisions for Hakari and Tangi.

It is also argued in this work that public perceptions of Māori influenced Crown policy. The representation of Māori by newspaper correspondents, artists and photographers acted as a public record of what was happening on the goldfields and influenced how Māori were regarded by the wider mining community. It is concluded here that these people all had their own agenda with regard to how they perceived Māori. They had the freedom in their work to represent Maori using various means which was often not complimentary. Due to language difficulties Māori were often unable to respond to their criticism. Te Reo Māori newspapers did provide Māori with an opportunity to discuss issues which were of concern to them but these were also under European control and often just contained announcements of hui which were due to be held in the region and articles that were repeated from the colonial newspapers. These articles were often very critical of Māori. There was no evidence found during the course of this study of Māori reporters writing about issues which concerned their people.

This thesis makes a contribution to the wider discourse on nineteenth century Māori and Pākehā race relations and Māori socio-economic relations. It looked at the key events that occurred in the foundation of the three Hauraki goldfields, and has discussed the role that Maori played in their establishment. It considered the establishment of these goldfields from the viewpoint of Hauraki Māori and offers a different perspective from what has been written previously by local historians such as Grainger and Isdale, about the participation of the Tāngata Whenua of Hauraki in gold mining and about the interaction that occurred between Māori and Pākehā in the Hauraki region. Their texts have mainly dealt with the white settlement of the Hauraki region,

while this work has looked at the impact that gold mining had on the lives of Hauraki Maori. It has also challenged the approach that has been taken by Monin and other scholars concerning the motivations of Hauraki rangatira in becoming involved in gold mining.

Emphasis was placed in this study on the impact that mining had on the lives of all of the iwi of Marutuahu and on the interaction that occurred between Māori and Crown officials, and between Māori and the wider mining community. It has examined the economic, social and political consequences that mining had for Hauraki Māori. It draws the conclusion that there needs to be a greater recognition of the participation of the Tāngata Whenua in the three Hauraki goldfields, and of the economic benefits that Māori should have received as promised by the Crown during the negotiation process. Hauraki rangatira and their iwi desired to participate fully in the colonial economy while maintaining their own traditional society and values. The loss of their land impacted greatly on the lives of the iwi of Marutuahu and eventually led to their economic and social disempowerment.

Glossary

Ā t u a	God
A u k a t i	Boundary line
Hakari	Feast
Hui	Meeting
Kaimoana	Seafood
Kaitiakitanga	Guardian
Kākahu	Dress
Koha	Gift
Koura	Gold
Mana	Prestige
Mana Whenua	Customary right
Manaakitanga	Entertain
Manuhiri	Guests
Mauri	Spirit
Ngaki Mate	Avengers
Pāpākāinga	Homeland
Rahui	Embargo
Raihana	Ration
Rangatira	Chief
Rohe	District
Tāngata Whenua	People of the land
Tangi	Funeral
Taonga	Treasure
Te Pai o Hauraki	Peace in Hauraki
Tikanga	Custom
Tikapa Moana	Firth of Thames
Tohunga	Priest
Toki	War-tomahawk
Tukua	Cede
Tupuna	Ancestor
Tūrangawaewae	A place to Stand
Uhunga	Reburial of bones
Utu	Revenge
Whaikōrero	Speech
Whānau	Family
Whanaunga	Kin
Wharehui	Meeting house

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

UNPUBLISHED

Alexander Turnbull Library

Grey, George, Sir, Maori Manuscripts, 1812-1898, MSY-2046-2146.

_____, Papers, 1839-1891, MS 0705/7.

McLean, Donald, Donald McLean Papers, 1832-1927, MS 0032.

_____, Inward Letters in Maori, 1861-1876, MS 0032-0685B, MS 0032-0697D,
MS 0032-0700A, MS 0032-700D.

Nahe, Hone, History of the Ancestor Hotunui of the Tribe Marutuahu of Hauraki;
Whakapapa of His Descendants, translated by George Graham, 1883-1926,
MSX-4057.

_____, Waikato Papers, 1893-1894, MS 1187-106.

Nicholl, William, Diaries, MS 1713-1714.

Proceedings of a Native Meeting Held at Thames on 11th and 12th of December
1874, MS-2520.

Rolleston, William, Rolleston Papers, 1858-1903, MS 82-355, ATL.

Archives of New Zealand, Wellington

Auckland Provincial Government General Inwards Correspondence, 1875,
AP 2 1875/315,

Heaphy Report, 1852, 1A 1 1852/2511.

Hauraki Gold Fields Special Block File, 1872, MA 13/35, (a)-(c).

Inward Dispatches from Lieutenant-Governor Wynyard, 1852, G8/8.

Komata Special Block File, 1874, MA 13/44.

Lanfear Report, 1852, 1A 1 1852/2544.

Lawlor, H. C., Alphabetical List of Prominent Natives of the District of Coromandel, *Raupatu Document Bank*, Vol. 107, 41190-41193.

Maori Affairs Head Office File, 1872, MLP1873/35.

Native Affairs Outward Letter Books, 1852, MA 41/1.

Native Land Purchase Board File, 1872, NLP 73/37.

Native Land Purchase Department Registered File, 1880, MA MLP I 1880/79.

Ohinemuri Gold Fields Special Block File, 1882, MA 13/54a.

Speeches of Native Chiefs at a Meeting at Patapata in Coromandel Relative to an Agreement for Working Gold on Their Lands Taken Literally 19, 20, 22 November 1852, G8/128.

Auckland Institute and Museum Library

Graham, George Samuel, Ngati Tamatera of Hauraki, Tribal History and Genealogies, 1830-1901, MSY-1862.

Hammond, William George, Journals and Papers, 1868-1967, MS 134.

Isdale, A.M., Coromandel Industrial Archaeological Project: Historical Research Report 1983-1984, MS 1631.

Nahe, Hone, Hotunui and Marutuahu, 1883, MS 449.

Private Collections

Isdale, A.M., Writings of Tukukino, 1994.

Thames School of Mines

Hammond, Thomas, (Toss), Memoirs, January 1864, transcribed by Geraldine Dunwoodie, March 2004.

Dihar, Louis, Manuscript, Thames School of Mines, (date unknown).

Isdale, A.M., Isdale Papers, 1943-2000.

OFFICAL PUBLISHED

Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives, 1860-1890, 1940.

Auckland Provincial Government Gazette, 1854-1876.

New Zealand Government Gazette, 1860-1880.

New Zealand Government Gazette for the Province of New Ulster, 1852-1853.

Papers of the Legislative Council, 1860-1890.

Parliamentary Debates, 1858-1890.

NEWSPAPERS

Daily Advertiser, 1868 -1870

Daily Southern Cross, 1867-1876

Evening Star, 1865-1875

Illustrated London News, 1853

New Zealand Herald, 1863–1880

New Zealander, 1850-1852

New Zealander Spectator and Cook's Strait Guardian, 1852

Thames Advertiser and Miners News, 1868-1880

NIUPEPA MĀORI

- Māori Messenger, Ko Te Karere*, 1854 – 1880
- Panui Whakawa Whenua Māori*, 1894-1896
- Te Manuhiri Tuarangi and Māori Intelligencer*, 1861
- Te Waka Māori o Ahuriri*, 1863-1871
- Te Waka Māori o Niu Tirani*, 1871-1879
- Te Wananga*, 1874-1878

BOOKS

- Davis, Charles Oliver, *Maori Mementos: Being a Series of Addresses, Presented by the Native People, to His Excellency Sir George Grey, K.C.B., F.R.S., Governor and High Commissioner of the Cape of Good Hope and the Late Governor of New Zealand, with Introductory Remarks and Explanatory Notes to Which is Added a Small Collection of Laments*, Auckland: Williamson and Wilson, 1855.
- MacDonald, J. E., Mrs, *Thames Reminiscences*, Auckland: Observer Printing Works, 1926.
- Mackay, James, *Our Dealings with Maori Lands: or Comments on European Dealings for the Purchase and Lease of Native Lands, and the Legislation Thereon*, Auckland: Kidd and Wildman, 1887.
- , *Whakaaturanga o nga Tikanga o te whakapuraretanga o Hauraki mo te Mahinga Koura*, Auckland: McCullough, 1896.
- Old Thames Boys Association, *Thames 1867-1917: Fifty Years a Goldfield: A Record of the Thames a Gold field, Reminiscences and of Old Thames Days Compiled and Issued by the Old Thames Boys Association as a Souvenir of the Jubilee*, Auckland: Observer Print 1917.
- Swainson, William, *Auckland, The Capital of New Zealand, and the Country Adjacent: Including Some Account of the Gold Discovery in New Zealand*, London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1853.
- Turton, H. H., *Epitome of Official Documents Relative to Native Affairs and Land Purchases in the North Island of New Zealand*, Wellington: Government Printer, 1883.

Weston, Fred, *Thames Goldfields: a History from Pre-Proclamation Times to 1927, Gathered from Authentic Documents and Living Witnesses*, Thames: Thames Star, 1927.

White, John, *The Ancient History of the Maori*, Vols 4 and 5, Wellington: Government Print, 1887-1891.

ARTWORK AND PHOTOGRAPHS

Alexander Turnbull Library

Foy Brothers, Portrait of Hori Ngakapa te Whanaunga, PA2-0725.

_____, Unidentified Maori Woman with Huia Feathers in Her Hair, Thames District, PA2-0719.

Auckland Institute and Museum Library

Firth, H., Photographic Collection, DU 402.2.

Hammond, William George, Photographic Collection, MS 134.

Heaphy, Charles, Sketches and Drawings, PD56.

Kinder Collection, Drawings and Photographs, Vol. 3, Album 90.

Auckland City Art Gallery

Lindauer, Gottfried, Ana Rupene and Child, 1878, 1915/2/1.

_____, Te Hira Te Kawau, 1874, 1915/2/69.

_____, Horeta Te Taniwha, date unknown, 1915/2/44.

_____, Taraia Ngakuti Te Taumuhia, 1874, 1915/2/41.

_____, Hori Ngakapa Te Whanaunga, 1878, 1915/2/13.

_____, Tukukino, 1878, 1915/2/56.

_____, Pare Watene, 1878, 1915/2/22.

SECONDARY SOURCES

BOOKS

- Anderson, Joan, *Waihi Goldfields: a Brief History 1878-1978*, Thames: Hauraki Publishing, 1978.
- Arbury, David, (ed.), *In the Beginning: James Mackay Recalls the Opening of the Thames Goldfield*, Thames Goldfield Information Series No. 29, Thames: Metallum Research Limited, 2002
- Auckland Institute and Museum, *Whakaahua: Photographic Images of Maori Life 1860s – 1930s from the Collection of the Auckland Institute and Museum*, Auckland: Auckland Museum, 1987.
- Bale, Ann, *Maratoto Gold*, Auckland: Hodder Stoughton, 1971.
- Ballara, Angela, *Iwi: the Dynamics of Maori Tribal Organisation from c.1769 to c.1945*, Wellington: Victoria University Press, 1998.
- _____, *Proud to be White: a Survey of Pakeha Prejudice in New Zealand*, Auckland: Heinmann, 1986.
- Barlow, Cleve, *Tikanga Whakaaro: Key Concepts in Māori Culture*, Auckland: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Belich, James, *Making Peoples: a History of New Zealanders from Polynesian Settlement to the End of the Nineteenth Century*, Auckland: Penguin Press, 1996.
- Bell, Leonard, *Colonial Constructs: European Images of Maori, 1840-1914*, Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1992.
- _____, *The Maori in European Art: a Survey of the Representation of the Maori by European Artists from the Time of Captain Cook to the Present Day* Wellington: Reed, NZ Art Series, 1980.
- Bradbury, E., (ed.), *The Settlement and Development of South Auckland: Waikato - Thames Valley - Coromandel Peninsula, New Zealand: Early Settlement, Industries and Resources, Scenic Attractions*, Auckland: E. Bradbury, 1951.
- Byrnes, Giselle, *The Waitangi Tribunal and New Zealand History*, Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2003.
- Carryer, Basil, *The New Zealand Goldrushes 1860-1870*, Auckland: Berkely Publishing, 1994.

- Colenso, William, *On the Maori Races of New Zealand: Written for the New Zealand Exhibition, 1865*, reprinted, Christchurch: Kiwi Publishers, 2001.
- Condliffe, J. B., *New Zealand in the Making: a Study of Economic and Social Development*, London: Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1963.
- Connell, John, and Richard Howitt, (eds), *Mining and Indigenous Peoples in Australasia*, Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1991.
- Cooper, Theophilus, *A Digger's Dairy at the Thames 1867*, Dunedin: Hocken Library, 1978.
- Coromandel Town History Research Group Inc., (eds), *In Search of the Rainbow: the Coromandel Story*, Coromandel: Coromandel Town History Research Group, 2002.
- Cowan, James, *Sketches of Old New Zealand*, Auckland: The Brett Printing and Publishing Company Ltd, 1901.
- , *Pictures of Old New Zealand: the Partridge Collection of Maori Paintings by Gottfried Lindauer*, Christchurch: Cadsonbury Publications, 1930.
- Curnow, Jennifer, Ngapare Hopa, and Jane McRae, (eds), *Rere Atu Taku Manu: Discovering History, Language and Politics in the Maori Language Newspapers*, Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2002.
- Dalley, Bronwyn, and Bronwyn Labrum, (eds), *Fragments: New Zealand Social and Cultural History*, Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2000.
- Davey, Jocelyn, 'Charles Ring', in *In Search of the Rainbow: the Coromandel Story*, (eds), Coromandel Town History Research Group Inc, Coromandel: Coromandel Town History Research Group, 2002, pp.23-56.
- Davis, Colin, and Peter Lineham, *The Future of the Past: Themes in New Zealand History*, Palmerston North: Department of History, Massey University, 1991.
- Dixon, Jennifer, 'Coromandel Gold: Conquest and Conservation', in *Mining and Indigenous Peoples in Australasia*, (eds), John Connell and Richard Howitt, Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1993, pp169-182.
- Downey, John Francis, *Gold-mines of the Hauraki District*, New Zealand, Christchurch: Cadsonbury Publications, 2002.
- Drummond, Alison, (ed.), *The Thames Journal of Vicesimus Lush, 1862-82*, Christchurch: Pegasus, 1975.
- Dunn, Michael, *John Kinder: Paintings and Photographs*, Auckland: Kinder House Society, 2001.

- Edwards, Elizabeth, *Raw Histories: Photographs, Anthropology and Museums*, Oxford: Berg, 2001.
- Ell, Gordon, *Gold Rush: Tales and Traditions of the New Zealand Goldfields*, Auckland: The Bush Press, 1995.
- Fairburn, Miles, and Bill Oliver, (eds), *The Certainty of Doubt: Tributes to Peter Munz*, Wellington: Victoria University Press, 1996.
- Fieldhouse, D. K., *Economics and Empire, 1830-1914*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1973.
- Firth, J. C., *Nation Making: a Story of New Zealand, Savagism v. Civilization*, London: Green and Co., 1890.
- Firth, Raymond, *Economics of the New Zealand Maori*, Wellington: Government Printer, 1972.
- Gordon, Briar, *Gottfried Lindauer: His Life and Maori Art*, Auckland: Malcolm McGregor, 1989.
- _____, and Peter Stupples, *Charles Heaphy*, Petone: Pitman, 1987.
- Graham, J. C., (ed.), *Maori Paintings: Pictures from the Partridge Collection of Paintings by Gottfried Lindauer*, Wellington: A. H. and A. W. Reed, 1977.
- Grainger, John, *The Amazing Thames: the Story of the Town and the Famous Goldfield from which it Grew*, Wellington: A.H. and A.W. Reed, 1951.
- Grayland, Eugene, *Coromandel Coast*, Wellington: Reed, 1965.
- Grey, Alan H., *Aotearoa and New Zealand: a Historical Geography*, Christchurch: Canterbury University, Press, 1994.
- Hargreaves, R. P. Dr., and T.J. Hearn, (eds), *The New Zealand Goldfields 1861, Victorian New Zealand*, Dunedin: Hocken Library, University of Otago, 1976.
- Hawke, G. R., *The Making of New Zealand: an Economic History*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Isdale, A. M., *History of "The River Thames"*, Thames: A. M. Isdale, 1967.
- _____, *Thames Goldfields Centennial 1867-1967*, Thames: Motel Magazine Co., 1967.
- Kalaugher, J. P., *Gleanings from Early New Zealand History*, Auckland: 1950.

- Keenan, Danny, 'Ma Pango Ma Whero Ka Oti: Unity and Fragments in New Zealand History', in *Fragments: New Zealand Social and Cultural History*, (eds), Browyn Dalley and Browyn Labrum, Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2000, pp.39-53.
- Kelly, Leslie, *Tainui: the Story of Hoturoa and His Descendants*, Wellington: Polynesia Society, 1949.
- Killip, Rosemary, *To Find a Fortune: Women of the Thames Goldfield 1867-1893*, Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington, 1995.
- King, Michael, *The Coromandel*, Auckland: Tandem Press, 1993.
- _____, *Maori: a Photographic and Social History, Revised Edition*, Auckland: Reed Books, 1996.
- _____, *The Penguin History of New Zealand*, Auckland: Penguin Books, 2003.
- Knight, Hardwicke, *New Zealand Photographers a Selection: 23 Selected Biographies Illustrated with 96 Photographs and a List of Over 1,100 New Zealand Photographers to 1900*, Dunedin: Allied Press, 1981.
- Lloyd Prichard, Muriel F., *An Economic History of New Zealand to 1939*, Auckland: Collins, 1970.
- Loughnan, Robert Andrew, *The First Gold Discoveries in New Zealand*, Christchurch: Kiwi Publishers, 1995.
- Maddock, Shirley, *Islands of the Gulf*, Auckland: Collins, 1966.
- Main, William, *Facing an Era: Postcard Portraits from a Century Ago*, with a forward by Tony Simpson, Wellington: Exposures, 2006.
- _____, *Maori in Focus: A Selection of Photographs of the Maori from 1850-1914*, Wellington: Millwood Press, 1976.
- _____, *Striking Poses: New Zealand Portrait Photography, Whakaahua Whakaata Ātarangi, An Exhibition Presented by Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa 12 March – October 2003*, Wellington: Imagelab, 2003(?)
- _____, and John B. Turner, *New Zealand Photography from the 1840s to the Present. Nga Whakaahua o Aotearoa mai i 1840 ki Naianei*, Auckland: Photoforum Inc, 1993.
- McIntyre, W. David, and W. J. Gardner (eds), *Speeches and Documents on New Zealand History*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.
- Miller, John, *Early Victorian New Zealand: A Study of Racial Tension and Social Attitudes 1839 – 1852*, London: Oxford University Press, 1958.

- Monin, Paul, *This is My Place: Hauraki Contested, 1769-1875*, Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2001.
- Moore, Phillip R., *Coromandel Gold: a Guide to the Historic Goldfields of Coromandel*, Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1996.
- Morrell, W. P., *The Gold Rushes*, London: Black, 1968.
- _____, *A Short History of New Zealand Life: Maori Wars and the Gold Rushes*, 7:3, Wellington: School Publications Branch, New Zealand Education Department, 1953.
- Neich, Roger, *Painted Histories: Early Maori Figurative Painting*, Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1993.
- Nolan, Tony, *Historic Gold trails of the Coromandel: Being a Guide for Gentle Travellers Seeking Their Pleasure Amid the Scenic Shorelines and Glorious Goldfields of that Historic and Sun-blessed Peninsula : and Examining how Fortunes were Made in the Wilderness Amidst Pioneering Hardships and Visitations of Disaster: Concluding with a Valuable Account of Methods to be Used in Discovering the Peninsula's Precious Minerals and Gemstones*, Wellington: Reed, 1977.
- Pere, Joseph, 'Hitori Maori', in *The Future of the Past*, (eds), Colin Davis and Peter Lineham, Palmerston North: Massey University, 1995, pp.29-48.
- Petrie, Hazel, *Chiefs of Industry*, Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2006.
- Phillips, F. L., *Nga Tohu a Tainui: Landmarks of Tainui: a Geographical Record of Tainui Traditional History*, Vols 1 and 2, Otorohanga: Tohu Publishers, 1989.
- Pritchard, Muriel E., *An Economic History of New Zealand to 1939*, Auckland: Collins, 1970.
- Rawle, Henry, *The Green Hills and the Gold*, Paeroa: Goldfield Print Ltd., 1981.
- Rice, Geoffrey W., (ed.), *The Oxford History of New Zealand*, Auckland: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Salmon, J. H. M., *A History of Goldmining in New Zealand*, Christchurch: Cadsonbury Publications, 1996.
- Salmond, Anne, *Between Worlds: Early Exchanges Between Māori and Europeans, 1773-1815*, Auckland: Viking, 1997.
- Sharp, Andrew, and Paul McHugh, (eds), *Histories, Power and Loss. Uses of the Past - a New Zealand Commentary*, Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2001.

- Simkin, C. G. P., *The Instability of a Dependent Economy: Economic Fluctuations in New Zealand 1840 – 1914*, London: Oxford University Press, 1951.
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai, *Decolonising Methodologies. Research and Indigenous Peoples*, New York: Zed Books, 1998.
- Stone, R. C. J., *Economic Development 1870-1890 and the Social Consequences*, Auckland: Heinemann Educational Books, 1967.
- , *Makers of Fortune: a Colonial Business Community and Its Fall*, Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1973.
- Sutch, W. B., *Colony or Nation? Economic Crises in New Zealand from the 1860s to the 1960s, Addresses and Papers Selected and edited by Michael Turnbull*, Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1968.
- Sutherland, I. L. G., (ed.), *The Maori People Today: a General Survey*, Wellington: New Zealand Institute of International Affairs and the New Zealand Council for Educational Research, 1940.
- Tau, Te Maire, 'Mauritanga Maori as an Epistemology', in *Histories, Power and Loss. Uses of the Past - a New Zealand Commentary*, (eds), Andrew Sharp, and Paul McHugh, Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2001, pp.61-73.
- Turoa, Taimoana, *Te Takoto o te Whenua: Hauraki Landmarks*, (ed.), Te Ahukaramu Royal, Auckland: Reed, 2000.
- Turton, H. H., *Maori Deeds of Land Purchases in the North Island of New Zealand*, Copied from the Originals, 1877-1888, Wellington: Microfiche, 1983.
- Vennell, C. V., *Men of Metal: the Story of A. & G. Price Ltd, Auckland and Thames, 1868-1968*, Auckland: Wilson and Horton Ltd, 1968.
- Ward, Allan, *A Show of Justice: Racial 'Amalgamation' in Nineteenth Century New Zealand*, Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1995.
- , 'Historical Method and Waitangi Treaty Claims', in *The Certainty of Doubt: Tributes to Peter Munz*, (eds), Miles Fairburn and Bill Oliver, Wellington: Victoria University Press, 1996, pp.140-156.
- Williams, Herbert W., *A Bibliography of Printed Maori to 1900, and Supplement: Dominion Museum Supplement No.7*, Wellington; A. R. Shearer, Government Printer, 1995.
- Williams, Johnny, *Racing for Gold: Thames and the Goldfields with the History of the Thames Jockey Club*, (ed.), Anna Rogers, Thames: Williams Publishers, 1987.
- Williams, Zelma, and John, *Thames and the Coromandel Peninsula: 2000 Years*, Thames: Williams Publishers, 1994.

Winiata, Maharaia, *The Changing Role of the Leader in Maori Society: a Study in Social Change and Race Relations*, Auckland: Blackwood and Janet Paul Ltd, 1967.

ARTICLES

Anon., 'Gleanings from the Thames Advertiser and Miners News 1875', *The Ohinemuri Regional History Journal*, 1: October (1964), pp.11-20.

Beets, Jacqui Sutton, 'Images of Maori Women in New Zealand Postcards After 1900', *Women Studies*, 13:2 (1997), pp.7-24.

Cleave, Peter, 'Tribal and State-Like Political Formations in New Zealand Maori Society 1750-1900', *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 92:1 (1983), pp.51-92.

City Group, 'Deconstruction in Camera: Margaret Matilda White', *Photofile*, 6:3 Spring (1988), pp.29.

_____, 'Photographs as a Meeting Place', *Photofile*, 6:3 Spring (1988), p.5.

Cowan, James, "'My Name is Mackay" An Episode of the Old Frontier', reprinted in *The Ohinemuri Regional History Journal*, 23: July (1979), pp.33-38.

Frame, Alex, 'Colonising Attitudes Towards Maori Custom: an Examination of Attitudes and of Pakeha Officials Towards Maori Customary Law', *New Zealand Law Journal* 17 (1981) pp.105-110.

Gibbons, Peter, 'Cultural Colonization and National Identity', *New Zealand Journal of History*, 36:1 (2002), pp.5-17.

Graham, George, 'Marutuahu', *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 50:3 (1941), pp.121-133.

Hammond, W. M., 'Ohinemuri Links with Thames', *The Ohinemuri Regional History Journal*, 1:October (1964), pp.15-10.

Hargreaves, R. P., 'The Maori Agriculture of the Auckland Province in the Mid Nineteenth Century', *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 68:2 (1959), pp.61-79.

_____, 'Maori Flourmills of the Auckland Province 1846-1860', *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 70:2 (1961), pp.227-232.

Henderson, J., 'A Sketch of the Economic development of New Zealand', *New Zealand Journal of Science and Technology*, V: December (1922), pp.242-246.

- Hillard, Chris, 'Colonial Culture and the Province of Cultural History', *New Zealand Journal of History*, 36:1 (2002), pp.82-97.
- Howe, K. R., 'The Maori Response to Christianity', *New Zealand Journal of History*, 7:1 (1973), pp.28-46.
- Isdale, A.M., B.A., 'Journals of D.McCaskill, 20.11.1864 to 16.5.1866', *The Ohinemuri Regional History Journal*, 3:2 (1966), pp.33-37.
- Lian, Kuren Fee, 'Tribe, Class and Colonisation: the Political Organisation of Maori Society in the Nineteenth Century', *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 10:4 (1992), pp.387-408.
- , 'Interpreting Maori History: a Case for a Historical Sociology', *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 96:4 (1987), pp.445-471.
- McCaskill, Murray, 'The Coromandel Peninsula and the Thames Valley', *New Zealand Geographer*, 5:1 (1949), pp.47-71.
- Main, William, 'Burton's Maori at Home, Notes towards an Analysis and Interpretation of Nineteenth Century Photographic Concepts and Concerns', *Art New Zealand*, 45: Summer (1988), pp.78-81.
- Merrill, Robert S., 'Some Social and Cultural Influences on Economic Growth: the Case of the Maori', *The Journal of Economic History*, 14:4 (Autumn 1954), pp.401-408.
- Monin, Paul, 'The Maori Economy of Hauraki 1840-1880', *New Zealand Journal of History*, 29:2 (1995), pp.197-210.
- Nahe, Hoani, 'Te Takenga mai o Enei Kupu, a Pakeha, a Kaipuke, Translated by S. Percy Smith', *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 3 (1894), pp.233-236.
- Neale, E. P., 'The New Zealand Gold Rushes', *Economic Record*, 23: December (1947), pp.250-263.
- Paora, Hauraki, Rev, 'Notes on Mr. A. S. Atkinson's paper "What is Tangata Maori?"', *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 2 (1893), pp. 116-118.
- Parsonson, Ann, 'The Expansion of a Competitive Society: a Study in Nineteenth-Century Maori Social History', *New Zealand Journal of History*, 14:1 (1984), pp.45-60.
- Reilly, Michael, 'An Ambiguous Past: Representing Maori History', *New Zealand Journal of History*, 29:1 (1995), pp.19-39.
- Salmond, Anne, 'The Study of Traditional Maori Society: the State of the Art', *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 92:3 (1983), pp.309-331.

Sinclair, Keith, 'Maori Nationalism and the European Economy', *Historical Studies*, 5:18 (1952), pp.119-34.

Sorrenson, M. P. K., 'Land Purchase Methods and Their Effect on Maori Population, 1865-1901', *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 65:3 (1956), pp.183-199.

Turner, Brian, Individualism, 'Capitalism and the Dominant Culture: a Note on the Debate', *Australia and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, 24:1 (1988), pp.47-64.

Watson, Norton, 'Civil Commissioner James Mackay', *Auckland-Waikato Historical Journal*, Sept (1971), pp.7-10.

WAITANGI TRIBUNAL EVIDENCE

Anderson, Robyn, 'Statement of Evidence of Dr Robyn Anderson on Behalf of the Claimants in the Matter of Claims by Huhurere Tukukino and Others known as the Hauraki Claims', Wai 100, 1997.

Battersby, John, 'Summary of Evidence of Dr John Battersby Concerning Gold Issues, in the Matter of the Hauraki Regional Inquiry', Wai 686 and Wai 100, December 2000.

Stone, Russell, 'Statement of Evidence of Professor Russell Stone on Behalf of the Claimants in the Matter of Claims by Huhurere Tukukino and Others known as the Hauraki Claims', Wai 100, 1997.

Tukukino, Kemara Pirimona, 'Evidence by Kemara Pirimona Tukukino on Behalf of the Claimants Concerning the Hauraki Claims', Wai 100, 1997.

_____, 'Evidence by Kemara Pirimona Tukukino on Behalf of Ngati Tamatera Concerning Whakapapa and the Hauraki Claims', Wai 100, 1997.

Tukukino, Richard Rakena, 'Evidence by Richard Rakena Tukukino on Behalf of Ngati Tamatera Concerning the Tapu Reserve Claim', Wai 100, 1997.

_____, 'Evidence by Richard Rakena Tukukino concerning the Tauranga Raupatu', Wai 215, Marutuahu Claims in Katikati Te Puna No.3, 1997.

_____, 'Evidence by Richard Rakena Tukukino on Behalf of Ngati Tamatera Concerning the Waikawau Purchase, Closing Submissions,' Wai 686 #Y3, Wai 418 #B1, 2002.

REPORTS AND OTHERS

- Alexander, D., *The Hauraki Tribal Lands, Ohinemuri Block History*, Commissioned by the Claimants for Wai 100, Paeroa: Hauraki Maori Trust Board, 1997.
- Anderson, Robyn, *The Hauraki Treaty Claims, 5 Vols*, Commissioned by the Claimants for Wai 100, Paeroa: Hauraki Maori Trust Board, 1997.
- _____, *The Crown, the Treaty and the Hauraki Tribes, 1800 -1885*, Vol.4, Commissioned by the Claimants for Wai 100, Paeroa: Hauraki Maori Trust Board, 1997.
- _____, 'Goldmining, Policy, Legislation and Administration', Rangahaua Whanui Series, (working paper: first released), Waitangi Tribunal, 1996.
- Gabites, Porter and Partners, *Regional Mining Study, Stage 1 Report*, Te Aroha: Thames Valley United Council, 1984.
- Hauraki Maori Trust Board, '*Hauraki Customary Indicators Report*', Prepared for the Ministry of the Environment by the Hauraki Maori Trust Board, Environmental Performance Indicators, Technical Paper No. 57, Paeroa: Hauraki Maori Trust Board, 1997.
- Jones, K. L., *Selected Papers from the Goldfields Seminar*, Cromwell: New Zealand Historic Places Trust, 1980.
- Oliver, W. H., *The Social and Economic Situation of Hauraki Maori After Colonisation*, Commissioned by the Claimants for Wai 100, Paeroa: Hauraki Maori Trust Board, 1997.
- Riseborough, Hazel, and John Hutton, *Rangahaua Whanui National Theme C: the Crown's Engagement with Customary Tenure in the Nineteenth Century*, Wellington: Waitangi Tribunal. 1997.
- Stone, R. C. J., *The Economic Impoverishment of Hauraki Maori Through Colonisation*, Commissioned by the Claimants for Wai 100, Paeroa: Hauraki Maori Trust Board, 1997.
- Sutch, W. B., *The Maori Contribution: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow, a Paper Prepared as background for the Address by Dr Sutch to the Tenth Annual Conference of Maori Students at the Victoria University of Wellington*, Wellington: Department of Industries and Commerce, 1964.
- Turoa, Taimoana, *Nga Iwi o Hauraki, The Iwi of Hauraki*, Paeroa: Hauraki Māori Trust Board, 1997.
- _____, and John MacEnteer, *Maori Heritage of Thames, Nga Taonga o te Kauaeranga*, Thames: Thames Coromandel District Council, 1993.

THESES

- Cleave, Peter, 'The Languages and Political Interests of Māori and Pākehā Communities in New Zealand During the Nineteenth Century', Ph.D Thesis in Anthropology, University of Oxford, 1979.
- Henare, Manuka Arnold, 'The Changing Images of Nineteenth Century Māori Society: from Tribes to Nation', Ph.D. Thesis in Māori Studies, Victoria University of Wellington, 2003.
- Horsfield, I. W., 'The Struggle for Economic Viability: a Study in the Development of the New Zealand Economy in the Nineteenth Century', M.A. Thesis in History, Victoria University of Wellington, 1960.
- Hutton, John Lincoln, 'Troublesome Specimens: A Study of the Relationship between the Crown and the Tangata Whenua of Hauraki 1863 – 1869', M.A. Thesis in Anthropology, University of Auckland, 1995.
- Lian, Kwen Fee, 'Settler Colonialism and Tribal Society: Maori-Pakeha Relations in the 19th Century', Ph.D. Thesis in Sociology, Victoria University of Wellington, 2003.
- Petrie, Hazel, '"For a Season Quite the Rage?" Ships and Flourmills in the Māori Economy 1840-1860s', Ph.D. Thesis in Māori Studies, University of Auckland, 2004.
- Preston, Edgar George, 'History of the Hauraki Goldfields', M.A. Thesis in History, University of Auckland, 1933.
- Scoble, Aubrey Norman, 'History of the Hauraki Gold Field', M.A. Thesis in History, Auckland University College, 1949.
- Wikaira, Jeanette Marie, 'The Alienation of Maori Land in Hauraki 1853-1882', M.A. Thesis in Māori Studies, University of Auckland, 1994.

AUDIO SOURCES

- Hutter, Gordon, *William Dufty, aged 83, Talks About His Life in Thames Since His Arrival in 1867, Including Maori, Cannibalism, Tohunga, Sir George Grey, Richard Seddon, James Mackay, Maori Land ownership, Maori Stories, Maori Attitudes to Death, Maori Opposition to Surveying, Kauri Milling, Wages, Paper Deliveries and the Black Market in Gold*, Mobile Unit Thames History, Sound Archives, Actual Recording Date Unknown, MUCDR65.

INTERNET SOURCES

Charles Heaphy, <http://www.teara.govt.nz/1966/H/HeaphyCharles/HeaphyCharles/en>, accessed 30 August 2006.

Fitzgerald, Michael, 'Heaphy, Charles, 1820 – 1881', *Dictionary of New Zealand Biography*, <http://www.dnzb.govt.nz/>, accessed 30 August 2006.

Hauraki Report Summary,
<http://www.waitangitribunal.govt.nz/reports/summary.asp?reportid=A9BC122D-9F0C-49FA-A916-C5FF069E8797.pdf>, accessed 7 August 2006.

Lindauer, Gottfried, <http://www.aucklandartgallery.govt.nz/>, accessed 7 May 2006.

Niupepa Māori, New Zealand Digital Library Project, 'The Māori Niupepa Collection', updated April 2000, <http://www.nzdl.org/cgi-bin/niupepalibrary?gg=text&e=q-0niupepa--00-0-0-014-Document-text---0-11--1-en-50---20-about---001-001-0utfZz-8-0&a=p&p=about>, accessed 19 March 2005.

Papers Past, 'New Zealand Newspapers and Periodicals',
<http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/>, accessed 14 April 2005.

Waitangi Tribunal,

<http://www.waitangitribunal.govt.nz/reports/downloadpdf.asp?reportid={A9BC122D-9F0C-49FA-A916-C5FF069E8797}.pdf>, accessed 6 August 2006.