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### Glossary of Maori Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ariki</td>
<td>Paramount chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiuku</td>
<td>Eat clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaumatua</td>
<td>Elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawanatanga</td>
<td>Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komiti</td>
<td>Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mana</td>
<td>Power or authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohaki</td>
<td>Verbal of wishes and intentions when near death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pana</td>
<td>expel or drive out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangatira</td>
<td>Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raruraru</td>
<td>Trouble, commotion or problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riripi</td>
<td>Paste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runanga</td>
<td>Tribal Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapu</td>
<td>Sacred or restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taua</td>
<td>War party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teina</td>
<td>Younger, usually in reference to a sibling or cousin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wairua</td>
<td>Spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whangai</td>
<td>Adoption - usually of a related child</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction

This thesis examines the involvement of Hineipaketia Te Hei in the sale of and succession to tribal land that she exercised authority over in Hawke’s Bay during the nineteenth century. Little has been written about Hineipaketia and she has for the most part been ignored in written historical accounts. At best she is a shadowy figure attached to the better known figure of Te Hapuku who was effectively the ‘government agent’. Hineipaketia had ultimate authority over large tracts of land, which without her assent could not have been purchased by the Crown. In written sources she is viewed as a woman of high rank who had authority over and was eager to sell as much land as possible.

Hineipaketia, Te Hapuku and Hori Niania Te Arotua, are considered to be responsible for the wholesale disposal of large tracts of land. However the process by which the land was sold needs to be placed in the context of the times.

Hineipaketia descends from Ngati Te Whatuiapiti, Ngati Te Rangikoianake, Ngai Tahu o Takapau and Ngati Kahungunu. Hineipaketia was senior in rank to her older relative Te Hapuku with whom she maintained a close relationship throughout her life, and her younger relative Hori Niania Te Arotua. She was also known variously or referred to as Te Kuini, Te Hei, Henerieta Te Hei, Heipora\(^1\), and Tia.

The catalyst for writing this thesis was an assertion made some years ago that our whanau descend from Hineipaketia Te Hei. I am of Ngai Tahu o Te Waipounamu descent and my wahine tipuna is Riria Taihekeheke. Her mother\(^2\) was Hineipaketia and when I was informed that the Hineipaketia our whanau descend from was the ‘Queen of Heretaunga’ I began researching her. An article to this effect appeared in the Ngai Tahu magazine *Te Karaka*, in 2002. Hineipaketia of Te Waipounamu whom our whanau descend from has a different whakapapa from Hineipaketia of Hawke’s Bay.\(^3\) The whakapapa in *Te Karaka* was that of Hineipaketia of Te Waipounamu, but the accompanying story combined elements of the stories of both

\(^1\) This is likely to have been because of her close association with Te Hapuku’s wife Te Heipora.

\(^2\) Some oral histories record Hineipaketia as the grandmother of Riria Taihekeheke.

\(^3\) Hinepaketa of Te Waipounamu is a daughter of Te Rangipake and Mihiata. Hine-i-paketa Te Hei is a daughter of Hihia Te Nahu and Hineiwhakwhiwhia, a daughter of Te Rangikoianake’s son Te Kikiri.
women.\(^4\) Ngati Te Whatuiaipiti oral history appears to support the story. According to oral history, Hineipaketaia and Te Hapuku’s wife, Te Heipora, were taken to the Wairarapa as a place of refuge after the battles at Roto-a-Tara. From there it is said Hineipaketaia was taken to Kaikoura, Te Waipounamu.\(^5\) My wahine tipuna Riria Taihekeheke was born in Kaikoura in 1826 and kidnapped by Te Rauparaha in 1828. Oral history has more importance for tangata whenua than written accounts which are generally viewed as selective and habitually positioned in a political, social, or economic context for a particular purpose. The wairua or spirit of history assumes a much more important role than written history.

Hineipaketaia was married at least twice, to Puhara Hawaikirangi and later Nepia Hapuku, the son of Te Hapuku and Te Heipora, but according to oral and archival sources she had no children. She adopted her near relative Arihi Te Nahu\(^6\) who was born on 24 January 1851.\(^7\) Arihi was the eldest child of Te Hapuku’s eldest son Karanema and Te Urihe.\(^8\) Arihi recounted in 1891 that Hineipaketaia had adopted her while she was still a suckling and took her away and reared her at Te Whakatu and Pakowhai.\(^9\) Arihi succeeded to a substantial proportion of Hineipaketaia’s interests some ten years before Hineipaketaia’s death. Arihi and another relative Tangatake Hapuku succeeded to the Hineipaketaia’s remaining interests in the years after her death in 1891.

By looking at the role played by Hineipaketaia in the context of the events and era that she lived through, some balance may be added to the existing historiography that

---


\(^5\) This is the Ngati Te Whatuiaipiti oral history that has been hand down as recounted by kaumatua Jerry Hapuku.

\(^6\) She was also known as Arihi Te Heipora, Arihi Te Urihe and later Princess Alice. See JLCDNZ, "Further Report from the Commissioner Under the Native Lands Frauds Prevention Act, 1870," \textit{Journals of the Legislative Council of the Dominion of New Zealand} (1872): p.19.


\(^8\) According to Hineipaketaia, Karanema and Te Urihe had married while they were all cultivating at Te Karamu. Arihi Te Nahu’s younger brother was known as Hapuku Te Nahu and Hapuku Paku. Evidence given by Hineipaketaia at the Te Karamu hearing in 1888. Napier Minute Book 14, pp.269-70.

\(^9\) Napier Minute Book 26 A, p.314.
focuses on male rangatira and ariki. The central argument of this thesis is that rank and the related preservation of mana, not gender, determined the extent that a person exercised power within the tribal framework. In order to examine this argument in a confined context it is necessary to look initially at how Maori women have been represented in historical discourse and then follow Hineipaketia and those around her through the trajectory of their contact with the institutions and individuals that impacted on their lives. Colonial histories made very little reference to whanau, hapu, and tribal groups and the interrelationship with each other. Danny Keenan notes that Maori historians have been increasingly challenging the grand narrative and reconsidering New Zealand historiography.

There is a dearth of historical accounts of Maori women. More research needs to be undertaken to address the imbalance that exists as a result of the ‘colonisation’ of history and this thesis aims to add to the debate. Maori women have been variously objectified as tradable commodities and mute or benign support acts in a male versus male historical context. There is an assumption in much of the existing body of work, that leadership was a male preserve despite a plethora of evidence to the contrary. Despite the wealth of raw material that exists in archives, Maori women have been underrepresented in historical accounts. When Maori women are ‘discovered’, or included in historical discourse, they are portrayed through a romantic lens, or ‘viewed as exceptions, anomalies, or problems’. The outcome of this view is that Maori and particularly Maori women are invariably portrayed in the role of ‘victim’.

The relationship between power and knowledge determines which voices are heard and what is allowed to become established as the ‘correct’ view of the past. The local and specific become lost in a national or generic narrative. The domination of

---

colonising voices and perspectives has been challenged by many historians.\textsuperscript{14} Charlotte MacDonald notes that,

‘The legacy of nineteenth-century empire and its colonial history is very much alive in the post-colonial present. That present shapes the current volume. In this context knowledge production is never without political significance. As a volume of colonizing women’s letters ‘home’, Maori women’s voices are not present here’.\textsuperscript{15}

Schools have played a significant role in perpetuating notions of Maori which according to Linda Tuhiwai Smith has ‘served to legitimate selected historical discourses through its curriculum, pedagogy, assessment and organisation’ translating Maori history into ‘mythology’ in which Maori women ‘add interest to an otherwise male adventure’.\textsuperscript{16} This has affected the rendition of tribal histories. As Soutar puts it ‘the average tribal history carries a heavy male bias being mostly about men as seen through the eyes of men’.\textsuperscript{17} The women are there, but are rendered as ‘passive old crones’.\textsuperscript{18} Western historians challenging of the place of women in mainstream historical accounts, has encouraged some writers to bring gender issues to the forefront when writing about particular periods of tribal history.\textsuperscript{19} Judith Binney has observed that history is often remarkably arrogant. She observes that ‘it can too frequently dismiss whole groups of people...who are therefore obliterated from memory’.\textsuperscript{20}

The perceptions of Maori women are deeply embedded within a nationalist colonised historiography. This has been acknowledged by Tony Ballantyne who notes that ‘the

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{14} These historians include the following, in no particular order, Judith Binney, Anne Salmond, James Belich, Ranginui Walker, Keith Sinclair, Michael King, Claudia Orange, Linda Tuhiwai Smith, Alan Ward, Michael Belgrave, Danny Keenan, Charlotte MacDonald, Ani Mikaere, and Angela Wanhalla.\
\textsuperscript{15} Charlotte Macdonald, \textit{Women Writing Home, 1700-1920. Female Correspondence across the British Empire}, vol. 5 New Zealand (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2006).\
\textsuperscript{17} Monty Soutar, ”A Framework for Analysing Written Iwi Histories,” \textit{He Pukenga Kōrero} 2, no. 1 (1996): p.51.\
\textsuperscript{18} Smith, ”Maori Women: Discourse, Projects and Mana Wahine,” p.34.\
\textsuperscript{19} Soutar cites Mahuika 1974 Binney et al 1979, Te Awekotuku 1981. See Soutar, ”A Framework for Analysing Written Iwi Histories,” p.51.\
\end{flushright}
gendered dynamics of colonial knowledge production and the gendering of the colonial archives also remains largely unexplored in New Zealand historiography’. An example of this gendering has been identified by Claudia Orange. Her research reveals that missionaries’ preference for male signatories angered women of rank. Orange has also challenged the default assumption that signatories were male. To date she has identified at least thirteen women who were signatories. Ani Mikaere acknowledges the need for more research to be undertaken to identify female signatories to the Treaty of Waitangi. This thesis is based primarily on primary sources and oral sources. Primary material can assist in examining and analysing the interaction and shifting relationships between individuals, whanau, hapu, and iwi in relation to the intrusion of a colonising culture. Colonial archives are essentially an artefact of colonialism, and the historiography of colonial New Zealand is based on a male orientated foundation. Therefore care must be taken when evaluating the material.

The journals and letters of missionary William Colenso provide an excellent eyewitness account of the district and people in the 1840s and 1850s, mainly in terms of placing people in particular locations at particular times. Hineipaketia was mentioned frequently by Colenso in his journals and letters in which he refers to her with thinly veiled sarcasm as ‘the Queen’ and ‘the person of highest rank in these parts’. The correspondence and diaries of Crown Land Purchase Commissioner Donald McLean contain many letters written by Hineipaketia. McLean also mentions her in his diaries, particularly during the negotiations to purchase the Waipukurau block. The Napier Minute Books of the Maori Land Court contain particularly valuable accounts of the events that punctuated Hineipaketia’s life and the lives of her contemporaries. While some of this evidence is clearly biased with a view to gaining an ‘edge’ over a rival litigants, there are many oppositional, albeit

24 From 13 June 1847. Colenso, Journals of William Colenso 1841-1854
convergent recollections that add valuable insight into the historical trajectory of the people and events. Newspapers also provide a contemporary account of events. Taking into account the potential bias these sources can contain, they provide a valuable overview of land transactions and representations of the personalities involved and contemporary attitudes.

In secondary sources Maori women have been largely ‘missing in action’ within New Zealand’s historiography. Women were written out, marginalised, and made invisible. Danny Keenan refers to this as the ‘silences and invisibilities’ of the Maori past.25 This imbalance and invisibility has been examined by Angela Wanhalla, who after looking at the existing literature, concluded that biography is ‘one of the few ways in which historians of women, Maori women in particular, can overcome their invisibility in official and written sources’.26 In relation to the establishment of the whaling industry, the received view is that males controlled women’s interaction with whalers and traders. Wanhalla gives as an example James Watkins, who viewed interracial marriage as a trade relationship, one which he describes as “the practice of selling” which effectively denies female agency.27 James Belich also constructs Maori women as commodities.28 Wanhalla in her most recent work gives an example of Belich’s misrepresentation of Maori women as commodities and victims and Pakeha men as violent colonial oppressors.29 Wanhalla recognises that interaction was more often than not driven by women. In her Ph.D thesis,30 and subsequent book, she examines the mixed descent communities of Maitapapa, Te Waipounamu. Wanhalla’s research demonstrates the autonomy that women of rank

29 Wanhalla considers that Belich characterised the relationship between Isaac Rhodes Cooper and Ekora as typical of elite Pakeha men. According to Wanhalla Major Isaac Rhodes Cooper was investigated in 1861 for ‘abducting’ a Maori girl. The investigation determined that the relationship was reciprocal. See Angela Wanhalla, Matters of the Heart: A History of Interracial Marriage in New Zealand (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2013), pp.xi-xii. A descendant confirmed that the couple married in 1864 and had three children between 1865 and 1875.
had in southern New Zealand and illustrates how cross-cultural contact at a local level provides a particular explanation of the experience of colonisation that is difficult to articulate within a national narrative. 31

Much of the marginalisation of Maori women is supported by the language used to describe the role and position of Maori women by both Maori and Pakeha historians. Maori women are often constructed as possessions and background or supporting figures in the mode of European historical accounts which perpetuates the effect of the colonisation process. For example in Ka Whawhai Tonu Motu: Struggle Without End Ranginui Walker employs language that undermines the status of Maori women of all ranks in the nineteenth century. Walker effectively denies female agency by using terms such as ‘given in marriage...to cement peace’ to describe marriage negotiations designed to bring about a strategic tribal alliance. 32 Walker also describes women as commodities when he says ‘women of high status were married to sea captains and station managers to confirm the deals’. He goes on to say ship jumpers and ex-convicts ‘were given land and wives to bind them into the tribe’. 33 Although marriage to high ranking women was one way of gaining access to resources, land and forging political alliances and brokering peace deals, women played a major role in those decisions. 34 Women were an integral part of the fabric, the warp and weft, of their whānau hapu and iwi groups. Ani Mikaere gives some excellent examples including Hineipaketia. 35 Both Judith Binney 36 and Ani Mikaere 37 discuss the status of Maori women in various works. Angela Ballara also recognises the role that rank played in exercising power. She uses Hineipaketia as an example

33 Ibid., pp.78-79.
of that power and notes that both men and women of rank were involved in arranging alliances through marriage. Ballara has given Hineipaketia the most attention in written accounts. She mentions Hineipaketia a number of times in her Ph.D thesis, *The Origins of Ngāti Kahungunu.* Ballara has also written Hineipaketia’s biography in which she was portrayed as unwavering in her determination to sell land. The construction of Hineipaketia as a keen land seller is in part due to Ballara attributing a speech made by Ani Matenga Te Patukai Kino to Hineipaketia.

In general histories, Hineipaketia is also briefly mentioned by J. G. Wilson in his *History of Hawke’s Bay* and in *The Founding of Hawke’s Bay* in relation to correspondence between Te Hapuku and George Grey in 1851. More recently Ray Fargher has mentioned her and the fact that Te Hapuku required her consent to sell land. Matthew Wright does not mention Hineipaketia at all. There are many accounts of wars and conflicts in pre-colonial Hawke’s Bay, including those written by S. Percy Smith, John White, and J. H. Mitchell.

Land sales are discussed extensively in Waitangi Tribunal reports and working papers. Those who have written about Hawke’s Bay land sales include Ballara and Scott, Patrick Parsons, and Dean Cowie. They all mention Hineipaketia’s rank.

---


45 S. Percy Smith, *Maori Wars of the Nineteenth Century* (Christchurch: Whitcome & Tombs 1910).


Cowie acknowledges Hineipaketia as a key figure although he is uncertain about what motivated her and her relatives to sell land.\(^{48}\) Histories written in support of Waitangi Tribunal claims are a valuable resource albeit a decidedly partial one. Michael Belgrave acknowledges that writing reports for the Waitangi Tribunal is very different to the process of writing academic history,\(^{49}\) which W. H. Oliver describes as an elusive way of writing and using history.\(^{50}\) Alan Ward points out that subjective approaches to history are an ongoing barrier to the critical use of sources and the appropriate use of wider frameworks of reference with which to appraise local and particular experiences and viewpoints.\(^{51}\) Belgrave also notes that a Marxist left wing has encroached on the counter-narrative histories presented to the Waitangi Tribunal which tend to generalise histories of Maori.\(^{52}\) Nevertheless this research has over time moved to challenge the idea of a homogenous nation.\(^{53}\) Treaty claims research has unearthed a considerable quantity of fresh material that despite the perceived partiality of the research provides a ready reference that can be challenged expanded upon and analysed in a broader context.\(^{54}\)

The discussion and interpretation of rank has also been a divisive theme. Margaret Mutu considers that the status of rangatira was dependent on the goodwill of the people and any transgressions could lead to rangatira losing status. Mutu argues that Pakeha are responsible for the actions of those rangatira who allocated or sold


resources and land outside their areas of authority. Hirini Moko Mead states that ‘no Māori will admit to belonging to the tutua (commoner) or taurekareka (slave) ranks’ as ‘the social divisions of the past have flattened out, and there is one class called Maori’. Walker concurs. Elizabeth Rata considers that tribal hierarchy is alive and well, and is supported by the Waitangi Tribunals’ claims process which feeds what she terms neo-tribal capitalism.

The Native Lands Acts and the Native Land Court have been extensively investigated and analysed particularly by Richard Boast and David Vernon Williams. Stuart Banner disputes the prevailing view that blames individuals involved in land sales. Banner considers that introduced laws created a market for land acquisition and also created administration costs that were borne by sellers/participants in the transactions. As he puts it ‘A market is made up of laws like a crowd is made up of people’ and the laws that establish a market are created in the political process.

The introduction and amendment of the Native Lands Act of 1862 and the subsequent establishment of the Native Land Court legalised the investigation of the ownership of native land and enabled land held in customary ownership to be converted to Crown Grant or freehold title. Customary ownership was viewed as tribal communism. The overlapping and intersecting relationships between hapu and rights to resources and land created complex problems when investigated by the Native Land Court. The Court invariably concluded that Maori customary title should be extinguished and converted to Crown title.

62 Williams, "Te Kooti Tango Whenua": The Native Land Court 1864-1909: pp.82-88.
The 1865 Act allowed for land to be vested in tribal ownership yet the notorious ten-owner rule required hapu to name ten owners for blocks of land less than five thousand acres, which further heightened tension and enmity. Boast has examined the effect of the 1865 Native Lands Act ten-owner rule and concludes that it is quite possible that the Native Land Court was created in order to have an entity to blame for any negative outcomes. He concludes that the intention of the Acts was ultimately to individualise titles. In his most recent work Boast observes that most of those excluded from titles were tangata o waho or outsiders, probably women and children although he concedes it is difficult to identify them.63

Hineipaketia was a grantee in numerous blocks. Grantees under the ten-owner rule may have been regarded as trustees for those with less significant interests but in effect were given absolute ownership.64 David Vernon Williams cites Binney’s view that the Native Lands Act of 1865 were ‘an act of war’ a view which Boast disputes. Williams considers that the terms ‘an act of war’ and promoting colonisation and ‘a perfect revolution’ as merely different ways of expressing the same sentiment.65 The ten owner rule was finally abolished when the Native Land Act of 1873 was enacted and all owners had to be registered on a Memorial of Ownership.

There has been much discussion about researching Maori subjects which Linda Tuhiwai Smith describes as ‘tricky ground’.66 Smith calls for the decolonisation of research methods. She considers that the way Maori women were described, objectified and represented by Europeans in the nineteenth century has left a legacy of marginalisation. Maori women have been required to prove that both men and women were rangatira, as the colonial view of chieftainship was male.67 Smith questions the construction of knowledge based on accounts by both Maori and

64 Boast, Buying the Land, Selling the Land: Governments and Maori Land in the North Island 1865-1921: pp.139-40.
65 Williams, “Te Kooti Tango Whenua”: The Native Land Court 1864-1909: pp.81-82.
European men. She considers that historicist thought, which forms the historical and philosophical base of Western methods of researching the past, is incompatible with the Maori world view. Smith argues that the term ‘research’ is inextricably linked with European colonialism. Consequently history is mostly about power and for that reason it is ‘not of interest to indigenous peoples as it cannot deliver justice’. Te Maire Tau has also contributed a valuable analysis of historicist perspectives of Kai Tahu. Ballara has also noted that suspicions can arise when historians write about subjugated groups such as women or indigenous peoples.

There is a danger in labels and categories. Categorising people individually or collectively as male or female, Maori or Pakeha encourages a binary oppositional approach to the research and writing of history. Charles Darwin considered that ‘First impressions at all times very much depend on one’s previously acquired ideas.’ The shifting interpretations of New Zealand’s history and much of the tension between pan-Maori and pan-Pakeha versions of historical events is centred on an imagined past that has become disconnected from historical ‘facts’ over time. Belgrave has pointed out that historical actors are categorised as colonial villains and indigenous heroes and gives Walker and Tony Simpson as examples of this style of grand narrative.

A biographical localised approach that is based on primary documents provides a prism for looking at wider issues from a closer perspective. Biographical and localised histories can add to the existing body of work by providing examples of individuals and groups that can be cited in a wider context or in comparative studies. Alison Holland and Barbara Brookes cite the ideas of Tony Ballantyne in the introduction to Rethinking the Racial Moment: Essays on the Colonial Encounter. Ballantyne states that one of the aims of world history is to tell a single coherent

---

68 Ibid., p.190.
69 Ibid.
73 Belgrave, Historical Frictions: Maori Claims and Reinvented Histories: p.34.
story at the expense of particular stories of individuals and communities.\textsuperscript{74} Examining historical events in the context of individual lives in a localised setting, that is ‘history from alongside’ allows people and events to be viewed in the context of their own place and time, thereby avoiding the abstractions that W. J. Gardner alludes to in relation to New Zealand’s history.\textsuperscript{75} For example Gardner notes the value of the \textit{Dictionary of New Zealand Biography} in relation to women, and in particular Maori women, enabling them to be ‘retrieved from local environments...and reclothed in something approaching historical flesh and blood’.\textsuperscript{76}

Carina Hickey discusses the advantages and drawbacks of a biographical approach to the writing of history.\textsuperscript{77} Hickey acknowledges that a biographical approach is not always accepted as good history. However if the subject is not removed from the social, economic, and political context, a biographical approach can shed new light on contemporary and subsequent events.\textsuperscript{78} This view is shared by Joseph Pere who considers that the focus should be on tribal history rather than a national Maori perspective, as identity is historically connected with hapu and iwi affiliations and ancestral ties.\textsuperscript{79}

This thesis follows a chronological sequence and is divided into four chapters. Chapter One focuses on the major events, conflicts and battles that occurred during Hineipaketia’s early years prior to and during the exile at Nukutaurua. This chapter also examines the rank and position of women in the pre-colonial era and the role of whakapapa and how that relates to the hierarchical tribal structure. Chapter Two discusses the arrival of missionary William Colenso in Hawke’s Bay in the 1840s which played a significant role in the return of Hineipaketia and her people to Hawke’s Bay. Also discussed is the arrival of Donald McLean in 1850 and the


\textsuperscript{75} William James Gardner, \textit{Where They Lived: A Study in Local, Regional and Social History} (Christchurch: Regional Press, 1999), p.107.

\textsuperscript{76} Ibid., p.55.

\textsuperscript{77} Carina Hickey, ""Man in his Time Plays Many Parts": Life Stories of William Jordan" (M.A. Thesis, Massey University, 2003), pp.13-16.

\textsuperscript{78} Carina Hickey, "From Coal Pit to Leather Pit: Life Stories of Robert Semple" (Ph.D Thesis, Massey University, 2010).

negotiations for the purchase of large tracts of Hawke’s Bay land. This chapter analyses the effect that McLean’s negotiating methods had on existing and introduced tensions and rivalries between chiefs both male and female, the various hapu and wider tribal affiliations. Chapter Three discusses the Native Lands Acts and the establishment of the Native Land Court that governed the sale and succession process and the trajectory of land sales, claims and succession orders involving Hineipaketia, her adopted daughter Arihi Te Nahu and Te Hapuku. Chapter Four evaluates the aftermath and the battle for succession to the remaining lands belonging to Hineipaketia and others which also includes the battle to have adoption recognised.\textsuperscript{80}

This thesis argues that rank and the related preservation of mana, not gender, determined the extent that a person exercised power within the tribal framework. Hineipaketia was the person of highest rank in Hawke’s Bay in the nineteenth century whose influence affected the trajectory of events which impacted severely on inter and intra hapu relations, yet she is barely recognised or acknowledged in historical discourse. Hineipaketia was the ‘invisible’ hand behind the development of Hawke’s Bay.

\textsuperscript{80} AJHR, "Native Land Court and Native Appellate Court: (Decisions Of) Relative to Wills in Favour of Europeans and the Adoption and Succession of Children," Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives G-05(1907).
Chapter One

‘The Mana of All I Have Named Was Under Hers’: Rank and Rights

The way Maori women are ‘seen’ historically is based on the imposition of introduced concepts of ‘female’ and ‘male’ which remain as a persistent legacy of the colonisation process. The consequent interpretations of the status and role of Maori women have been embedded in New Zealand’s histories, demonstrating that the colonising process remains in force as a persistent influence on the way knowledge and ideas about Maori women are transferred in historical accounts. The dominant narrative of male centred history prevails. Rather than seeking to discover a ‘pre-contact golden age’, this chapter aims to provide an account of the past in the context of Hineipaketia’s early years, followed by the disruption experienced as a result of the ‘contact’ period. From the time of her birth to the early 1840s, Hineipaketia lived through escalating tribal conflicts, the ‘musket wars’ which resulted in a twenty year exodus, the return to Heretaunga and the arrival of missionaries and settlers.

Hineipaketia was born in about 1810 and lived at Poukawa as a child. She was known by three names Hineipaketia, Te Hei, Henarieta and ‘Te Kuini’ or ‘the Queen’. She was the only child of Hinewakawhiawhia and Hihipa Te Nahu.

---

81 Nolan and Daley argue that this often leads historians to search for a pre-contact golden age, a time when indigenous women’s status and role in decision making was relatively high. See the Introduction in Caroline Daley and Melanie Nolan, eds., Saffrage and Beyond: International Feminist Perspectives (New York: New York University Press, 1994), p. 12.

82 Ringanohu the child of Pihaiti lived at Waimarama. Their child Hinewakawhiawhia married a Waimarama man. They were the parents of Hineipaketia. Evidence in the Aorangi hearing of 1924. See Napier Minute Book 72, p.30. See also Napier Minute Book 26, p.87.

83 In 1895 Pera Wheraro stated that Hihipa Te Nahu died at Waimarama. He said Te Nahu had a kumara plantation on Koparakore A and that Hineipaketia Te Hei had the largest share in that block. Napier Minute Book 33, p.278.
Her whakapapa embodied the most important lines in the district and their associated histories.

Figure 1.
Whakapapa acts as a template for the ordering and understanding of the visible and invisible worlds.\textsuperscript{84} Tribal organisation was structured around whakapapa which determined rank, entitlement, and obligations. Bradford Haami notes the importance of women in preserving whakapapa and acknowledges the equal importance placed on both male and female lines of descent. All whakapapa is traced to the elemental ancestors Papatuanuku, or Earth Mother and Ranginui, or Sky Father.\textsuperscript{85} Elsdon Best, whose work was very influential, understood Papatuanuku to be inferior to Ranginui which determined his overarching if somewhat contradictory patriarchal framework within which he tended to categorise Maori women by employing a system of binary opposites that classified the female character as inferior, evil, or dark.\textsuperscript{86} Other important females include Hinenuitepo, guardian of the spirits of all her descendants, and Mahuika, a tohunga.\textsuperscript{87}

Two of Hineipaketia’s preeminent ancestors were her great grandparents, Te Whatuiapiti and Te Huhuti. The marriage of Te Whatuiapiti and Te Huhuti is credited with ending an ongoing feud between rival groups which traced its origins to the divisive union of Taraia and Hinepare’s daughter Te Raupare and Te Ariariiterangi. As an infant Te Raupare was to be sacrificed by her father Taraia and buried at the foot of main post of the great house Te Raroakiaki.\textsuperscript{88} Taraia’s elder half brother, Tuwhakawhiurangi, did not wish the child to be sacrificed and concealed her under his cloak. He placed a stone wrapped in cloth in the hole instead.\textsuperscript{89} When it was revealed that Te Raupare had not been sacrificed, she was betrothed to Tuwhakawhiurangi. Unbeknown to Taraia and Hinepare, Te Raupare had married Te Ariariiterangi, a grandchild of a younger sibling of Taraia and Tuwhakawhiurangi. When Te Raupare was expecting her first child she returned to Tahunamoa to collect

\textsuperscript{84} Bradford Haami, \textit{Pūtea Whakairo: Māori and the Written Word} (Wellington: Huia Publishers), p.44.

\textsuperscript{85} Mead, \textit{Tikanga Maori: Living by Maori Values}. See also Mitchell, \textit{Takitimu}.

\textsuperscript{86} Elsdon Best, \textit{The Maori As He Was: A Brief Account of Maori Life as it was in Pre-European Days} (Wellington: Dominion Museum, 1924).

\textsuperscript{87} See Chapter Nine in Mikaere, \textit{Colonising Myths-Maori Realities: He Rukuruku Whakaaro}.

\textsuperscript{88} According to evidence given by Meihana Takahi the object ive behind Taraia sacrificing his daughter was to take possession of the land. See Napier Minute Book 19, p.86.

some clothing. She unintentionally woke her mother Hinepare who enquired as to with whom she had been dwelling. When informed that she had married Te Ariariiterangi, from a rival hapu, Taraia informed Tuwhakawhiurangi and hostilities escalated in a series of battles which would eventually lead to Taraia’s death.\textsuperscript{90}

Te Huhuti was the daughter of Taraia’s son Rangitaumaha. Te Whatuiapiti had arrived at Takutaioterangi, the pa of Rangitaumaha, with a war party. Te Whatuiapiti caught the eye of Rangitaumaha’s daughter Te Huhuti and she persuaded her father to make peace with him although Te Whatuiapiti’s proposal that Te Huhuti become his wife was rejected by both groups. The story is very similar to the better known Hinemoa and Tutanekai.\textsuperscript{91} Te Huhuti defied the wishes of her kin and pursued Te Whatuiapiti leaving from another of her father’s pa Oueroa and heading to Roto a Tara. On reaching the lake, she called out and unable to get a response she decided to swim to the island. Te Whatuiapiti took her to his house which attracted the wrath of his mother who hurled abuse at Te Huhuti.\textsuperscript{92} Between them Te Huhuti and Te Whatuiapiti held the mana over all the lands of Heretaunga and a lasting peace ensued,\textsuperscript{93} with agreed territories for the former adversaries.

Ka noho i tera o Ahuriri, te ingoa o Kahungunu, ka noho i tenei taha i rorto o Heretaunga te ingoa o te Whatui Apiti.

The name of Kahungunu stayed on that Ahuriri side; the name of Te Whatuiāpiti stayed on this side, inside Heretaunga.\textsuperscript{94}

Heretaunga was the area between the Ngaruroro and Tukituki Rivers. The Ngaruroro provided a natural boundary between the two hapu. Identification was with the hapu

\textsuperscript{90}Two wives of Rakaihikuroa, Papauma and Ruarauhanga, established competing divisions, Taraia and Tuwhakawhiurangi were of the Te Hika Ruarauhanga and Te Ariariiterangi belonged to Te Hika a Paupama. See J. D. H. Buchanan, \textit{The Maori History and Place Names of Hawke’s Bay} (Auckland: Reed, 2004). pp.24-25.


\textsuperscript{92}Buchanan, \textit{The Maori History and Place Names of Hawke’s Bay}: p.29.

\textsuperscript{93}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{94}Ballara cites tribal historian Mohi Te Ātahikoia in Ballara, \textit{Iwi: The Dynamics of Māori Tribal Organisation from c.1769 to c.1945}: pp.139-40.
rather than iwi. The tribal framework within which each person was placed was complex and occasionally mutable.

Traditionally, Maori women’s names were remembered in whakapapa, and rank and relationships, not gender, determined the ‘importance’ of the person. Conversely Lowenthal states that ‘Medieval European women by comparison were ‘victims of genealogical amnesia’.

However it remains a widely held belief that in Maori society ‘the lines of men are more important’. Ballara agrees that ‘the norm was that the primary derivation of descent group identity was through the male link’. Chiefs are assumed to be male, although Raewyn Dalziel acknowledges that Maori women could claim ‘mana and authority through their descent lines and land ownership’. Soutar notes that in the works of Gudgeon, Drummond, and Isles that the latter dedicates a whole chapter challenging the notion that women were ‘universally subordinate and politically insignificant in tribal life’ as opposed to the standard approach that includes women ‘only in a cause of a battle or as progenitors of well known hapu’.

The way Maori women have been portrayed in historical accounts, perhaps explains Caroline Ralston’s surprise, when contrary to her initial expectation, she found that ‘Maori women at the time of early contact appeared to enjoy acknowledged status and power as chiefs, autonomy in much of their economic lives, and standing in their communities’.

Missionary William Colenso, observed that rank was determined partly on nearness to a paramount progenitor and partly on the rank, power, and influence of the immediate the ancestor (male or female) who had married into the tribe. Colenso wrote that ‘paradoxical as it may seem, the children were often of higher rank than

---

96 Ballara, Iwi: The Dynamics of Māori Tribal Organisation from c.1769 to c.1945: p.152.
either of the parents’, consequently the child’s behaviour towards the parents would be interpreted by Europeans as ‘gross insubordination’. Colenso also wrote ‘The children of principal chiefs by wives of unequal rank would not all be of one rank; as their rank always depended on that of their mothers as well as on that of the fathers’.  

More importantly, according to Colenso ‘a chief generally lost his influence among his own tribe, if not his rank, by not asserting his position and rights.’ This would prove to be a factor in much of the competitive land selling that would occur during the 1850s.

Marriages and alliances were established in order to forge and or strengthen economic and political ties and the history attached to the whakapapa of Hineipaketia is no exception.

Te Hapuku needed to create marriage alliances and gather ‘persons of consequence’ around him in order to strengthen economic and political ties, and enhance his mana. Hineipaketia was the highest ranking person in the district and an essential conduit for his aspirations. Te Hapuku married strategically to elevate his position. His first and most important marriage was to Te Heipora. According to oral history, Te Heipora was also known as the Queen of Heretaunga. Hineipaketia recalled that she was living at Poukawa when Te Hapuku and Te Heipora were married. After the marriage she lived with them there. They did not live there long, but went to Heretaunga ‘on account of the marriage with Heipora’. The ‘hapus to which Heipora belonged’ returned her land ‘in order that she might live with them’. Hineipaketia acknowledged the mana exercised by Te Heipora’s contemporary chiefs of Heretaunga and elsewhere. She identified Moananui, Te Karawa, Karaitiana, Tareha, Matenga, Puhara, and Te Hira. However Hineipaketia made it clear that ‘...the mana of all I have named was under hers’. When Hineipaketia

102 Ibid., p.23.
104 Napier Minute Book 14, p.261.
105 Hineipaketia recalled ‘I was not then married. I was young. I accompanied the married couple to Heretaunga. Ibid., pp.268-69.
106 Ibid., p.271.
107 Ibid.
said that ‘Others did therefore exercise mana’ she was acknowledging the relative autonomy of chiefs in their own area, but that they were under the mana of the highest ranking chiefs. In this case it was Te Heipora, a woman. The evidence Hineipaketaia gave concerning the rank of Te Heipora was not challenged.

This contradicts the basis of the evidence given by Kingita Tohunga, who claimed Hihipa Te Nahu left the mana to Te Hapuku as Hineipaketaia was female.

‘On his death bed he intended to give the mana to Te Haurangi, but thought it better to give it to Te Hapuku...Hihipa did not give the mana to Te Hei because she was a woman. He gave the mana to Te Hapuku, who accepted it & said he would look after the interests of Te Hei & the tribe’.  

This evidence was given in 1895 four years after Hineipaketaia’s death, and is likely to have been influenced by European notions of gender. Te Nahu would have been concerned about the safety of his only child. In her early years Hineipaketaia lived with Te Hapuku and continued to do so until she married, but it is very apparent as will be demonstrated later that Te Hapuku had to defer to her.

Te Hapuku was exceedingly ambitious, but he was not the highest ranking chief. He was extremely jealous of his older relative Pareihe who was also not of the highest rank but was establishing his mana as a master tactician and fighting chief. Te Hapuku and Te Moananui challenged Pareihe constantly as he was below them in rank.

When Hineipaketaia’s elderly father Te Nahu died at Lake Poukawa tensions rose again. Te Wanikau, whose sister Ihukino had married Te Nahu as part of a peace agreement between Ngati Rangikoianake and Ngai Te Upokoiri, organised Te Nahu’s tangi, and placed a rahui on Te Roto-a-Tara, Te Roto-a-Kiwi and Te Poukawa. Ngati Whatuiapiti were very annoyed that their food supply had been interfered with and the poles were removed and burnt. Te Wanikau was cursed.

108 Ibid.
109 Napier Minute Book 33, pp.276-77.
110 Hineipaketaia was ‘grown up’ when her father died. Evidence of Pera Wheraro in 1895. Ibid., p.278.
111 Opinion is divided as to whether it was the death of Te Nahu or that of his father Te Whakahemo at Mangatameko that instigated the extended period of conflict. Patrick Parsons, Waipukurau: The History of a Country Town (Waipukurau: Waipukurau Rotary Club, 1999).
‘Those posts that are burnt are the bones (koiwi) of Wanikau.’\(^{112}\) Te Wanikau solicited the help of Tuwharetoa and Ngai Te Upokoiri and unsuccessfully attacked Roto-a-Tara. Part of the party travelled towards Waimarama and unsuccessfully attacked the pa at Maungawharau at Te Aratipi and Te Heuheu’s younger brother Manuhiri was killed. Te Heuheu then sent the whole of the war party back to Waimarama to seek revenge and the following day they triumphed.

Te Heuheu then departed for Taupo with a plan to come back and conquer Heretaunga.\(^{113}\) Pareihe anticipated retribution and reinforced Roto-a-Tara. When Te Heuheu returned aided by Ngati Raukawa, Ngati Maniapoto, Waikato, Ngati Maru and also Ngai Te Upokoiri, Pareihe was prepared. Te Heuheu began constructing a whatakaupapa, or causeway, using timber from the Te Aute bush. Pareihe responded by constructing a causeway from the island end\(^{114}\) and building a puhara, or puwhara, a high platform from which to assail the attacking forces from above,\(^{115}\) successfully holding the enemy at bay. Hineipaketia’s future husband Puhara Hawaikirangi attained his forename when he killed Te Arawai\(^{116}\) the son of Waikato chief Tukorehu from the puhara.\(^{117}\) Te Pareihe was astute enough to know they could not hold out much longer and once darkness fell they retreated to Porangahau. Some 25 years later in 1845, when William Williams visited the island on Lake Roto-a-Tara he was aware of the battles that had taken place there.

‘Went on to a small village on an island in the lake Rotoatara which has been the scene of some desperate conflicts between these peoples & the natives of Waikato. The latter succeeded in taking the pa and kept possession of it for

\(^{112}\) Smith cites a ‘native account’ that ‘Nahu was killed, who was a very old man, he was killed by the weapon( mate-a-rakau). It was near the time when the spirit should have left the body. He was a parent of Hine-i-pikitia [sic].’ See Smith, Maori Wars of the Nineteenth Century: p.295. See also Buchanan, The Maori History and Place Names of Hawke’s Bay: p.36.

\(^{113}\) Buchanan, The Maori History and Place Names of Hawke’s Bay: p.36.

\(^{114}\) Parsons, Waipukurau: The History of a Country Town: p.31.

\(^{115}\) Smith, Maori Wars of the Nineteenth Century: p.298.

\(^{116}\) Te Arawai was the elder brother of Kawhia who was the father of Manga or Rewi Maniapoto. See Apirana Ngata and Pei Te Hurunui Jones, eds., Ngā Mōteatea: The Songs Part 1 (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2004), p.179.

some months, but were again driven away with loss by these people assisted by
the Ngapuhi chief Te Wera from Table Cape’. 118

The Battle at Te Pakake

With the constant threat of reprisals, Pareihe solicited the assistance of Te Wera of
Nga Puhi in early 1824. Pareihe entered into negotiations with Te Wera who was at
Tanenuiarangi119 near Pakowhai and agreed to take his people to Nukutaurua under
Te Wera’s protection.120 Pareihe attempted to persuade those at the island pa Te
Pakake121 to join him in anticipation of an attack to avenge the death of Te Arawai.
Te Hauwaho, Tareha, Te Waka Kawatini, Tiakitai, Te Hapuku and Te Moananui and
others elected to remain122 and set about reinforcing the pa.123 Some months later a
large Ngati Tuwharetoa, Ngati Raukawa and Waikato taua said to number one
thousand, attacked the area.124 Other pa fell and the survivors fled to Te Pakake
where they managed to hold their enemies at bay, as Te Pakake controlled the
Ahuriri channel.125 According to Te Waaka Kawatini’s obituary in the Hawke’s Bay
Herald there were several unsuccessful attempts over some weeks to take the pa at
night. Some of the young men on Te Pakake took a fast sailing canoe and crossed to
the Ahuriri lagoon where they overheard the enemy say that a war party was due to
arrive via Petane. Kawatini and others lay in wait and when daylight came routed the
party. The remaining war party on the eastern side of the Spit constructed canoes
called moki and proceeded from the mouth of the Ngaruroro along the shore to
Pakake pa and attacked at daybreak. The sustained attack eventually led to the fall of

118 Journal entry dated 29 October 1845. Frances Porter, ed. The Turanga Journals, 1840-1850:
Letters and Journals of William and Jane Williams, Missionaries to Poverty Bay (Wellington: Price
119 According to Buchanan a war council was held at Rakaihikuroa which would later be the site of
conflict known as Pakiaka. Buchanan, The Maori History and Place Names of Hawke’s Bay: p.56.
120 Mitchell, Takitimu: p.168.
121 Te Pakake was at the south end of the lagoon close to Mataruahou inside the mouth of the river.
The land was reclaimed for railway facilities. Buchanan, The Maori History and Place Names of
Hawke’s Bay: pp.37, 45. See also “The Late Te Waaka Kawatini,” Hawke’s Bay Herald, 17 August
1878, p.3.
123 Smith, Maori Wars of the Nineteenth Century: pp.301-02.
124 Buchanan, The Maori History and Place Names of Hawke’s Bay: p.37. Mitchell puts the number at
125 Ahuriri is a name that has been used widely meaning a lagoon separated from the sea by a narrow
sand and boulder bank. See Buchanan, The Maori History and Place Names of Hawke’s Bay: pp.51-
52.
the pa. Heavy losses were sustained on both sides and the pa and surrounding waters were packed with the dead.

Figure 2. Te Pakake pa c1850-1859 by Joseph Rhodes Courtesy of Alexander Turnbull Library

Tareha who was about fourteen years of age at the time returned by waka from a tangi at Wairoa with his father Oneone, as the pa was being taken. In an 1857 account it is claimed that Hineipaketia and Tareha escaped Te Pakake together.

‘the doomed fugitives, anxious to save the heirs (arikis) of their chiefs, conducted Tarehah and a girl of noble descent to the opposite side of the island, whence they swam across the mouth of the river, and ran along some miles of sea-beach to a friendly pah at Petane. Their brave friends meanwhile covered their retreat by an obstinate and prolonged resistance, which ended in an indiscriminate and unsparing massacre... The girl who escaped with Tarehah is now the wahine tapu, or head wife, of Puhara, the brother of te Hapuka. On account of her illustrious descent, she is styled the Queen (te Kwini)...\(^\text{126}\)

While it is possible that Hineipaketia was at Te Pakake, it seems unlikely and she does not mention it. Hineipaketia does mention that she was present at the birth of Karanema at Petane.\textsuperscript{127} Arihi Te Nahu was told that her father Karanema was born at Nukutaurua, or Wairoa, when his mother Te Heipora was fleeing from enemies on her way to Nukutaurua after Pakake.\textsuperscript{128} Hineipaketia states she went to Nukutaurua with Hapuku and Heipora with whom she was living.\textsuperscript{129}

Te Hapuku, Te Moananui and many others were captured. According to some accounts Te Hapuku escaped near Taupo and went to Te Mahia (Nukutaurua). Rev. Tuturu Hinei Teri recalled that Tukorehu allowed Te Hapuku to escape at Tauranga-a-Kumu and it was also said that obsidian was given in payment.\textsuperscript{130} Tiakitai and Te Karawa were left behind to tend the wounded. Waikato chief Te Wherowhero is said to have felt that the Heretaunga people had been harshly treated and sent a message to Tiakitai asking him to go to the Waikato and he released the prisoners to him.\textsuperscript{131} A small number returned to Te Pakake but most went to Nukutaurua.

**The Exodus to Nukutaurua and the Siege at Kaiuku**

There followed several attacks and counter-attacks. Due to the constant threat of attack, most of the remaining Heretaunga people went to Nukutaurua.\textsuperscript{132} The exile was to last some twenty years. Pareihe continued to build on his reputation as a master tactician and fighting chief. He returned from Nukutaurua several times to defend Heretaunga against any attempts by outsiders to become established. Only a small number remained at Heretaunga with most seeking refuge at Nukutaurua.\textsuperscript{133} In the early 1830s while at Nukutaurua the people were attacked at what was then known as Okurarenga. Te Heuheu of Ngati Tuwharetoa accompanied by some Ngati Maru, Ngati Raukawa, and Ngai Te Rangi had attacked and overwhelmed other pa

\textsuperscript{127} Oral history places the location of Karanema’s birth at ‘Te Mata’. Te Hei stated during the Te Karamu hearing of 1888 that ‘all Hapuku’s children were born at Whakatu’. Evidence of Hineipaketia Te Hei 1888. Napier Minute Book 14, pp.266-71.

\textsuperscript{128} Evidence given by Arihi Te Nahu at the Te Karamu hearing in 1888. Ibid., pp.266-67.

\textsuperscript{129} ‘Hineipaketia said ‘I remember their going to Nukutaurua – I went with them’. Evidence of Hineipaketia Te Hei 1888. Ibid., pp.261-70.

\textsuperscript{130} Napier Minute Book 19, pp.234-35.

\textsuperscript{131} Smith, *Maori Wars of the Nineteenth Century*: p.306.

\textsuperscript{132} Smith, *Maori Wars of the Nineteenth Century*: 303-05.

\textsuperscript{133} Smith, *Maori Wars of the Nineteenth Century*: p.306.
on his way to Te Mahia, but found the forces of Pareihe not so straightforward. Puhara was amongst the tribes collected at Okurarenga. The pa was under siege for two and a half months. At the end of the first month provisions were running low. What food was left was reserved for those Nga Puhi who had guns so as to maintain watch. The defenders were in great distress and reduced to skeletons, surviving on seaweed and then finally to eating the blue clay dug from the bank by boiling it with water to make a paste or riripi. This is why Okurarenga became known as Kauiku which means to eat clay. It is said that at times they captured ‘a good fat Waikato or two who had been feeding on the cultivations of the besieged’. Mitchell’s account credits the arrival of a war canoe bearing muskets and ammunition from the Bay of Islands that were unloaded and hauled into the pa via the steep cliffs with flax ropes with bringing the situation to an end.

Te Whatanui and Ngati Raukawa aided by Ngai Te Upokoiri had taken advantage of the situation at Okurarenga and occupied Roto-a-Tara. When Tiakitai heard that the siege at Kauiku was over, he sent word of the occupation to Pareihe and Te Wera. A taua of some two thousand descended and took Pakake. They then set out for Roto-a-Tara and despite being armed had to return to Pakake as they did not have canoes. Ngati Raukawa were getting closer to Pakake so Pareihe returned to Roto-a-Tara by way of canoe up the Tukituki River and Papanui Stream, carrying the canoes from there to Roto-a-Tara. Ngati Raukawa and Ngai Te Upokoiri were defeated and departed the region.

There were many journeys between Heretaunga and Nukutaurua by different groups both to defend their land and cultivate. According to Arihi Te Nahu’s evidence given in the Te Karamu hearing, there were several trips made between Nukutaurua and Heretaunga, which included women. Hineipaketia also said several trips were made. Te Hapuku and Te Heipora returned to Heretaunga and went to reside at the Rangikoianake settlement at Te Karamu. Their son Karanema was a child at the

---

135 “Visit of Mr. McLean and Party to the North,” Hawke’s Bay Herald, 12 November 1864.
137 Buchanan, The Maori History and Place Names of Hawke's Bay: p.39.
138 Napier Minute Book 14, pp.266-67.
139 Ibid., pp.268-69.
time. Heipora, Hapuku and their son later returned to Nukutaurua. She had five children besides Karanema.\textsuperscript{140} Hineipaketia said ‘all Hapuku’s children were born at Whakatu’\textsuperscript{141} which may indicate that Te Heipora returned to Heretaunga in order to give birth on the land. Te Heipora died at Nukutaurua before the final return. On their final return Karanema was an adult and had established himself at Te Karamu. Urepene Puhara states that when he returned from Nukutaurua with Te Hapuku, Te Hei (Hineipaketia) and others, Karanema was already living at Te Karamu.\textsuperscript{142}

**The Return to Heretaunga**

The return of the people occurred in several hekes from about 1840 encouraged by the appearance of missionaries and the promise of peace and stability. A changing world had placed traditional dispute systems under pressure. Ralston identifies the impact that increased warfare and the associated masculine emphasis had in relation to diminishing the status and position of Maori women which was further amplified after 1840.\textsuperscript{142} Hineipaketia was married to Puhara Hawaikirangi by the time she returned to Heretaunga permanently.\textsuperscript{144} Te Heipora who had died at Nukutaurua was brought to Whakatu and Te Hapuku had accompanied the remains. ‘Poito carried the body. She was a tapu’d woman. It came in a canoe in charge of that woman. I know the spot where the body was first buried’. Te Heipora was ‘buried, this side of Te Karamu’\.\textsuperscript{145}

Hineipaketia was in Hawke’s Bay when the Treaty of Waitangi was signed in 1840. She stated in the Karamu hearing, ‘Have heard of the Treaty of Waitangi. It was while we were cultivating at Whakatu that we heard of that treaty’.\textsuperscript{146} Furthermore it was stated that ‘Hapuku was not at the return from Nukutaurua, he was at

\textsuperscript{140} Ibid., pp.266-67.
\textsuperscript{141} Ibid., p.271.
\textsuperscript{142} Urepene Puhara also states that when they returned they first lived at Awapuni, then at Tanenuiarangi and Te Ngaue. Ibid., p.291.
\textsuperscript{143} Ralston, ‘Maori Women and the Politics of Tradition: What Roles and Power Did, Do and Should Maori Women Exercise?’ , pp.23-44.
\textsuperscript{144} Napier Minute Book 14, p.291.
\textsuperscript{145} Ibid., p.264.
\textsuperscript{146} Ibid., pp.269-70.
When Hapuku returned from Nukutaurua ‘he took up his abode at Whakatu’.

The *Herald* arrived at Waipureku inside the mouth of the Tukutuki River in Hawke’s Bay on 24 June 1840. Major Bunbury hoped to locate the elusive Te Hapuku and persuade him to sign the Treaty of Waitangi. Te Hapuku had signed the 1835 Declaration of Independence on 25 September 1838. It was therefore considered imperative that his signature be added to the Treaty of Waitangi. Te Hapuku had a reputation for rapacity and extortion amongst the Europeans settled at Ahuriri and Bunbury anticipated trouble. He had heard about Te Hapuku’s overbearing character, ‘nor did the tears of some of the women who followed us from one of his residences we found at the bottom of the bay make me think more favourably of him’. Te Hapuku initially refused to sign the Treaty, one of his reasons being that Nga Puhi had been made slaves through the signing of the Treaty. He considered that the Treaty undermined the mana of the chiefs as it placed the Queen above them. Claudia Orange notes that Bunbury’s meticulous accounts of his negotiations illustrate the methods employed to gain Te Hapuku’s assent. Bunbury convinced Te Hapuku that signing the Treaty would elevate his importance. He then cautioned Te Hapuku that regardless of his decision, British authority was a *fait accompli*, adding a threat to use the *Herald’s* guns to force the return of a whaleboat stolen from a Pakeha. Te Hapuku finally signed on 23 June 1840 after Nga Puhi

---

147 Ibid., p.280.
150 Ibid., p.253.
151 Ibid.
153 Ibid.
154 Fredrick Sturm recounted that Te Hapuku and Puhara signed the Treaty at Nukutaurua. He states that he saw them board the ship and leave with two red blankets each. According to Sturm, Te Hapuku had ‘told the natives he touched a little stick and got two red blankets for doing so.’ However there is no known record of a signature being procured at Nukutaurua.Parsons, *Waipukurau: The History of a Country Town*: p.35.
signatory, Hera advised him to do so.\textsuperscript{155} Te Hapuku, Hoani Waikato and the Waimarama chief Harawira Te Mahikai also signed the Treaty.\textsuperscript{156}

Orange notes how the preference shown by missionaries towards Maori men as signatories of the Treaty, angered women of equal or higher rank. It was once thought that only three or four women had signed the Treaty.\textsuperscript{157} The precise number of women who signed the Treaty of Waitangi is unknown, due in part to the gender neutral nature of some names, but also due to the default assumption that signatories were male. To date, Orange has identified at least thirteen women who were signatories and it is accepted that many more may yet be identified.\textsuperscript{158} Ani Mikaere acknowledges the need for more research to be undertaken to identify female signatories to the Treaty of Waitangi.\textsuperscript{159}

At this time the potential for land loss was recognised by Tohutohu, the chief of Werowero who had travelled ‘in a vessel’ from Mahia to Ahuriri on 9 February 1840 in order to see his people and prevent his land being sold to Europeans who were arriving in great numbers. He saw ‘nine vessels at the place’.\textsuperscript{160} The following observation by missionary William Williams was a portent of what was to come in the following decade. Williams wrote,

\begin{quote}
‘A nominal purchase has been made by a Captain Rhodes from one chief, but the natives generally are altogether opposed, and the principal claimants are now living upon Table Cape. This Rhodes professes to have purchased the whole district extending from Port Nicholson to Ahuriri in Hawks Bay [sic], being a line of coast of more than 100 miles in extent. It is by report the finest district in New Zealand being principally rich grass land... The natives are told
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{156} Orange, \textit{The Treaty of Waitangi}: p.83.

\textsuperscript{157} Ibid., pp.90-91.


\textsuperscript{159} Mikaere, \textit{Colonising Myths-Maori Realities: He Rukuruku Whakaaro}: pp.195-96.

\textsuperscript{160} Porter, \textit{The Turanga Journals, 1840-1850: Letters and Journals of William and Jane Williams, Missionaries to Poverty Bay}, pp.81, 84.
by the Europeans that the land is now bought, and that they will have no claim on it. They are now therefore justly under great apprehension. Surely British justice will not allow these proceedings to go on.”

Williams took particular notice of Te Hapuku describing him as ‘wholly destitute of any right feeling’. Williams elaborates further:

‘The circumstance of my taking interest in Hapuku’s temporal concerns, (for he is one of the chief men of Ahuriri though he has been living at Table Cape for the last 7 years where he has no land of his own) seems to have bought him a little round ; this morning he requests that his brother may have some of our books, saying that perhaps he will come around by and bye.’

‘A native from Table Cape is come to remain for a time with me. He is a relation of Te Hapuku, a man of notorious character for his overbearing conduct to the Europeans living near him, and who has declared himself a papist. He however directed this man to come to me for books but added that he should not mention his name because he would have nothing to do with them. I asked what is Hapuku’s object in calling himself a Papist. It is because he can go through a form of karakia thus – touching with his right hand his two shoulders his breast and forehead…and then he may be allowed to “haka” and “rurerure” which are names for the native dances which are accompanied by obscene songs’.

The Arrival of Missionaries

The arrival of missionaries, the encroachment of Christianity and the accompanying patriarchal hierarchy persistently undermined existing traditional social structures and consequently the position of women in the shifting social order. The cumulative effects of cross-cultural contact with the church, traders and settlers altered the balance. Customary marriage was a source of anguish for missionaries

161 Journal entry dated 19 February 1840. Williams recorded that the property given for this by Rhodes is by the native report as follows: 13 Casks of Powder of 25 lbs each, 36 Shirts, 36 Duck trowsers, a part of a Cask of Tobacco, 36 Hatchets, 36 Garden Hoes, 29 Iron Pots, £12 in cash, 12 Blankets, 3 Cloaks, 1 Coat, 2 Boxes, 20 Handkerchiefs, 40 Knives, 1 Piece of Print. Ibid., p.84.

162 Journal entry dated 18 March 1842. Ibid., p.198.

163 Journal entry dated 21 February 1840. Ibid., p.84.

164 Journal entry dated 28 September 1840. Ibid., p.123.

and targeted for eradication. The missionaries, convinced that the Western institutions of marriage and family formed the foundation of civilised society, sought to remove Maori marriage from within the traditional context and promote female subservience. A combination of control, coercion, rejection and assimilation placed Maori traditions and values under enormous pressure and forced Maori to negotiate with the imposition of Christian beliefs and practices. Ballantyne considers that:

‘New Zealand historians have paid limited attention to the place of Christianity in debates over colonisation or the place of religion within the developing colonial culture, as race and land have been firmly embedded as the key nodes around which the historiography of nineteenth century New Zealand is organised’.  

Ballantyne conservatively estimates that there were two New Testaments in circulation for every three Maori in 1845. The CMS press produced three and a half million pages of Maori language texts between January 1835 and the beginning of 1840 and a further two million in 1840. According to Ballantyne,

‘From the late 1820s distinctive sectarian identities emerged as Wesleyan and Catholic missionaries joined Anglicans in the New Zealand mission field. Maori religious affiliation was often determined by old agendas as denominational identity became a new vehicle for kin-group rivalries and, in turn, Christian identities became a means of reinscribing boundaries between rival kin-groups. Both Catholicism and Methodism became ‘denominations of dissent’ allowing kin-groups to emphasise their autonomy from both Pakeha and powerful Māori Anglican groups.’

Many of the ‘Native teachers’ in Hawke’s Bay had been exposed to Christianity during periods spent, sometimes in captivity, in the far north. Renata Kawepo is perhaps the best known of these ‘Native teachers’.

By October 1840, a substantial number of people had returned to Hawke’s Bay. When Williams travelled south he noted,

---

166 Ibid., p.24.
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‘Proceeded to Ahuriri to a small settlement where the natives did not exceed 50. It was the abode of two principal chiefs who propose that we shall remain here over Sunday and that they will assemble their whole tribe which is now scattered abroad in the cultivations...addressed the natives assembled to the number of about 100’. 170

Williams comments on a boat that was ‘forced to land here’ and four casks of rum and other items on board had been taken by the natives. Williams endeavoured to have it returned.

‘I spoke to the chief again, but he was quite disposed to be angry at my resuming the subject. Shortly after, Hapuku from Table Cape made his appearance, a man who bears a worse character than any native I know. I expected he would take the remaining cask of rum & anything else he might fancy. He was contented however with a keg containing about ten gallons and a bag of rice with some sugar, which he says he will pay in pork. To me this chief was very civil, much more so than when I saw him at his own village at Table Cape. I was nevertheless glad to see him take his departure. I was grievous [sic] to see the rum carrying about in calabashes & I was on the point of leaving the place forthwith, but on further consideration remained and addressed the natives in the evening on the subject of the last judgement’. 171

The spread of Christianity was gathering momentum:

‘The natives tell me that [Puhara] Hawaikirangi the chief supporter of the papists is anxious that I should baptise his daughter. Examined Hawaiki’s daughter a girl about 12 years of age. She is tolerably well informed and under the circumstances I think it desirable to comply with the father’s wishes. An application was made from the Papist party to be present at the service which of course was assented to. The chapel was well filled with about 650 persons of whom the Papists did not number more than 30.’ 172

In Hawke’s Bay the earliest missionaries were Anglican. A Roman Catholic mission would not be established until 1851. Archdeacon William Williams and Reverend

---

171 Journal entry dated 7-9 October 1840. Ibid.
172 Journal entry dated 16-17 October 1841. Ibid., p.181.
W. C. Dudley had visited in 1842 and Bishop Selwyn had also travelled through and had been pressurised by the Chiefs to send a minister. William Colenso who had ‘laboured among these tribes’ in 1843, arrived to establish the Church of England Mission Station at Waitangi towards the end of December 1844. The chapel at Ahuriri where William Colenso was soon established was according to William Williams an:

‘excellent chapel of superior workmanship, 60 feet by 36...as a missionary station Ahuriri will be highly important though the population is not large having been much diminished by attacks from the natives of Waikato, yet there are several hundreds still remaining. It is a place moreover to which Europeans are likely soon to resort, when the natives, unless taken special care of, will many of them fall a prey to temptation’.

Marriage was a prerequisite to ordination. Colenso had married the previous year on 27 April 1843 to Elizabeth Fairburn. Colenso’s proposal was accepted by Elizabeth and her father although Colenso would later allude to something unsavoury that affected the marriage. Prior to his proposal to Elizabeth he had unsuccessfully tried to recruit daughters of other missionaries who were considered marriageable. Colenso approached Williams and Maunsell both of whom had eligible daughters and both had flatly refused to give their permission.

Colenso was ordained on 22 September 1844, but soon attracted the negative attention of Mrs Williams who wrote a letter ‘upbraiding me severely for not remaining with Mrs Colenso at either her former or present confinement’.

Colenso also offended Treaty signatory Hoani Waikato who grabbed Colenso by the hair and smashed his head on a rock. He believed that Colenso had seduced his

---

175 Ibid.
176 Colenso wrote‘...it was only after I had procured the Marriage License and upon the eve of our marriage, that I knew for certain what I have often wished I had either known earlier, or never known...’William Colenso, Letters 1850-1854 (Dunedin: Hocken Library MS-63B). p.407.
177 Ibid., pp.409-10. Colenso’s daughter Frances Mary was born early 1844 and his son Latimer in September 1845.
daughter who was living with the Colenso’s. In this case it was apparently not true.\(^{178}\)

The following extracts and quotes further illustrate Colenso’s views of Maori traditions. Colenso considered that Te Hapuku was ‘too old and too much used to evil ever to change’.\(^{179}\) One particular incident in December 1845 related by Colenso was that of Te Hapuku’s behaviour in relation to the disinterring of Te Pareihe’s remains. Te Pareihe had died in 1843 and,

> was buried on the opposite side of the river scarcely a musket shot from my dwelling house. His burial, however, was only a temporary one, as, according to ancient native custom his bones were to be disinterred when the flesh should have been consumed, and then taken to their final resting place in a cave in a distant mountain. For some time past Te Hapuku has been making preparations for this long talked of disinhuming of Pareihe, declaring that he would do it with all the abominations of former times.’

Many of the natives had asked Colenso how they should act as they feared Te Hapuku. Colenso said he was not opposed to their giving Te Hapuku gifts of food and garments for the ceremony, nor to their partaking of the feast, but they were not to ‘assist in any heathen orgies, or diabolical ceremony’. The natives told Colenso that,

> ‘Hapuku has said if we don’t assist him, he will take the bones of Pareihe, and put one in the village, one in this plantation, and another in that, and drive us all away, for if he does this we cannot kindle a fire, nor drink, nor cook, nor plant, nor live, nor do anything wherever a bone of Pareihe has touched’.

Lazarus Takapari ‘a quiet baptised chief of inferior rank, retorted “Yes and what then? Does he think we will care for that...who cares for the bones of a dead man?” Hapuku...vowed revenge’. Colenso drew an analogy between Hapuku’s threat to ‘bring sacred things upon profane spots belonging to us’ and them carrying ‘food to yonder mountain where your ancestors lie’.\(^{180}\) Three months later, ‘Te Hapuku and

---


\(^{180}\) Journal entry dated 11 December 1845. Ibid.
other heathen chiefs disinterred the dead bodies of Pareihe and 2 others. They were very noisy firing their muskets all the night while engaged in their dirty work’. 181

Colenso expressed grave concern about the negative impact that land purchases could potentially have on the ‘natives’ when writing from his tent at Te Kopi, Palliser Bay.

‘The natives are all very quiet in this District, and considering all things, in as good a state as can be expected. I fear, however, before another 12 months have elapsed there will be a great alteration for the worse; for the white man is now seeking to settle everywhere, even in the wilds about Ahuriri – and thus arousing the cupidity of the natives. The Governor, too, wishes to purchase “the whole of the country from Wairarapa to Ahuriri’!! which, if done, will certainly seal the natives’ ruin; for unless their “reserve” is in one block and at a distance from the Whites I cannot see any chance of their escaping the hitherto common fate of all aborigines with whom the white has come in contact’. 182

Internal pressure was mounting and towards the end of 1848 a meeting was arranged at Whakatu where Te Hapuku was living, to discuss land sales. Colenso had been asked to attend the meeting at Whakatu, but on his way he passed Puhara’s village at Te Pakowhai on the Ngaruroro River and was ‘hailed and required to land there’. Colenso ‘knew it was not according to New Zealand etiquette, and foreboded a blustering day from Puhara and his little Papist party’. Te Hapuku and Puhara’s uncle Te Wiri put up a screen of fern to shelter Colenso from the sun which cheered him ‘as it was a mark of honor to have it done by them’.

In response to the question of land sales, Colenso said:

‘Now I am asked to counsel you, to sell all your lands to the Government, but I tell you candidly I cannot do so. I shall not deviate from what I have always told you. Never to part with the whole of your land and, when you part with any, be sure to have a good natural boundary between. Henceforth I have not a word to say on the land question’. 183

181 Journal entry dated 14 April 1846. Ibid.
182 Journal entry dated 9 November 1848. Colenso, Journals of William Colenso 1841-1854
183 Journal entry dated 22 December 1848. Ibid.
The prospect of land sales fuelled the rivalry between Te Moananui and Te Hapuku. Colenso noted that the principal chiefs of Heretaunga had most seriously fallen out and were threatening to kill each other.\textsuperscript{184} Colenso called a meeting of the chiefs. Hapuku and his associates arrived but Te Moananui and his followers ‘vexatiously procrastinated and did not come until past noon’. The contending chiefs and their people assembled silently opposite each other and with Colenso in the middle several speeches were made and the belligerents finally made peace.\textsuperscript{185}

Land continued to preoccupy Te Hapuku’s mind. During a visit with Colenso he ‘sat on a high chair’ and for three hours ‘his conversation was entirely about his lands and his ancestors, the upstart assumptions of several petty chiefs which he is determined to put down and his son Te Nahu [Karanema]’. Colenso considered him [Te Hapuku] ‘greatly improved in behaviour, but still a Heathen’.\textsuperscript{186} Te Hapuku later showed Colenso a letter he had written to the Governor respecting his land.\textsuperscript{187}

When the principal chiefs went to Manawatu for ‘the long talked of “hahunga”’\textsuperscript{188} for Te Wanikau, who had died about 8 years before,\textsuperscript{189} Colenso received a letter from Puhara ‘....committing his wives into my charge!’ Accompanied with a well worn copy of our 8 [?] N. Testament belonging to one of them for me to repair!!’\textsuperscript{190}

Colenso had introduced the first horse into the area which he named Caesar. He had observed the arrival of the first horse brought into the district by a chief.\textsuperscript{191} Colenso was passionately opposed to the use of horses by Maori.

‘I should state, that of all the useful things which of late years have got into the possession of the Natives, the horse is not only the most perverted, but (strange

\begin{footnotes}
\item[184] Journal entry dated 10 May 1849. Ibid.
\item[185] Journal entry dated 25 May 1849. Ibid.
\item[186] Journal entry dated 26 September 1849. Ibid.
\item[187] Journal entry dated 16 December 1849. Ibid.
\item[188] Hahunga refers to the exhumation ceremony which took place some time after the tangihanga. The ceremony involved the scraping and painting of the bones of the deceased with red ochre and reinternment in a secret place to prevent potential desecration. See Mead, Tikanga Maori: Living by Maori Values: p.68.
\item[189] Journal entry dated 26 June 1849. Colenso, Journals of William Colenso 1841-1854
\item[190] Journal entry dated 29 June 1849. Ibid.
\item[191] The horse mentioned by Colenso in a journal entry dated 9 February 1847 was brought from Rotorua and probably belonged to Tiakitai. Ibid. Hineipaketia also had a white horse and is acknowledged as one of the first owners of a horse in the area. See Chambers and Chambers, "Social Progress at the Antipodes."
\end{footnotes}
as it may appear) actually the greatest hindrance to their own real good-
physical, moral, and spiritual. Through their having horses, they (the chiefs) till
less ground, and catch less fish—become more boastful & envious, lazy &
careless—oppress the poorer native...  

When Tiakitiai’s horse died in May 1847 when it was being led over a high precipice
and suddenly fell and drowned, Colenso considered the event divine retribution for
Tiakitiai’s sins. Furthermore, two of Tiakitai’s daughters one of whom was named
Kore, had died by drowning in the previous two years. Colenso noted with
satisfaction that ‘ill gotten wealth never thrives’. Colenso had remonstrated with
those who ‘trafficked’ women and girls to the whalers who had established
themselves along the coastline and paid rent to the chiefs. On one occasion he talked
with Tuahu ‘the old chief of Waimarama who sold his only daughter a baptised
female, to the wretched whites living on the whale fishery at the Cape...’. Colenso
found him ‘as hardened...as ever’. On another occasion Colenso was approached
by Te Moananui, ‘Kurupou [Te Moananui]...came to tell me about the white men,
their incessantly demanding, and his promise to supply them with women...[he]
promised they should not be supplied—but I have little faith in his word’. Colenso
had come from the Bay of Islands where women and girls of slave or tutua rank were
traded for muskets. Women were more likely to be treated as a commodity if they
were not of chiefly rank. Women of rank had more control and choice.
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example Ngai Tahu women who entered into unions with Europeans often made their own decisions regardless of the views of their family.  

Colenso also viewed Tiakitai’s death as divine retribution. In 1847, Tiakitai and one of his sons drowned, along with twenty-one others, including ‘all the male Papist heathens of Tiakitai’s village...[and] that miserable white man, to whom Tiakitai sold a woman’, while returning from organising the betrothal of another of his sons, Te Teira. Karaitiana Takamoana had survived and returned from Te Wairoa ‘very much downcast’ and according to Colenso acknowledged that Tiakitai deserved his fate. Colenso’s view that papists and heathens were being punished by God was further confirmed when Puhara informed him by letter that his father Te More had drowned in the Manawatu River. Te Hapuku, Puhara and one-hundred and fifty mourners attended Tiakitai’s tangi. A man named Broughton attempted suicide as he had lost the last of his ten children, his son Mathew, ‘a fine young man’ Colenso notes that ‘some of the old people appear to be quite overwhelmed with stupid grief’.  

The position of disconnected females was apparent when some two years later Colenso was outraged when informed that a child at Tangoio named Reremorehu, the daughter of Te Korou had ‘been sold by her unnatural father, to a wretch of a white man...she had been ill ever since’. A few days later he was informed the girl had been rescued but was expected to die as she was very ill and that the ‘white brute’ would be leaving the following week. The Papist priests arrived and stayed at Puhara’s village. Colenso was informed that the Popish priest had married Reremorehu and the whaler and he considered the actions of the priests to ‘have effectually “served me out” I having said I would not go thither again until they had taken away the child, and separated themselves from this dealer in human flesh’.

201 The woman was sold by Tiakitai shortly after Colenso’s arrival in Hawke’s Bay. Journal entry dated 16 September 1846. Colenso, Journals of William Colenso 1841-1854  
202 Journal entry dated 22 September 1846. Ibid.  
203 Journal entry dated 25 September 1847. Ibid.  
204 Journal entry 1 October 1847. Ibid.  
205 Journal entry1 October 1847. Ibid.
Reremorehu died a few days after her marriage. The whaler ‘fearing the rage of the people’ had fled to Table Cape (Mahia Peninsula).

The Church disapproved of polygamy and had incrementally moved to formalise Maori marriages and put an end to multiple wives. In 1848 William William’s when examining candidates for baptism at Whareponga left those ‘who had not made up their minds to put away the wives they had in excess of one each’. One candidate when asked his opinion on the matter looked ‘very wistfully’ at his two wives and replied ‘these women must settle the point’. On another occasion William’s notes that a candidate ‘had the misfortune to have two wives’ and though he had decided to keep only one the ‘poor woman who was to be rejected was not so easily satisfied’. The husband’s baptism was deferred until ‘this difficulty had been disposed of’. Colenso makes it clear he considers women should be subordinate, when Te Hapuku’s brother Te Waihiku (Haurangi) visited.

‘[He was] full of complaints and professions- Time was, when I got little but the lowest abuse from this chief and now though still a Heathen he humbly seeks my advice and help in matters between himself and his own heathen people! His present personal grief is, that one of his (7) wives had left him, and now sought to get married to a young baptised native, and he therefore came to beg that I would not (if they applied) call their banns and marry them. I assured him, that he might rest satisfied. I should do no such thing, for I considered his 7, and his elder brother’s 8, wives, to be truly their own proper wives, and, consequently not at their own disposal, unless they (the husbands) choose to put them away’.

Even though Colenso disapproved of and was attempting to prevent polygamy, it was more imperative that the husband made the decisions.

---

206 According to Colenso ‘her malady’ was ‘vagina lacerae!’ See Journal entries 1-10 October 1849. 
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209 Journal entry dated 16 October 1849. Colenso, Journals of William Colenso 1841-1854
Colenso’s journals record that 1847-1850 was a particularly devastating period in which increasing illness and death punctuated the lives of the people including Hineipaketia, Puhara and Te Hapuku. Illness and death and associated population decreases were largely a result of introduced diseases to which there was no immunity, rather than inter and intra tribal wars. Colenso ridiculed traditional methods of healing. In one encounter with Te Hura, a healer, who Colenso found disturbing, he recounts that ‘her small dark eyes fixed upon me’. When Te Hura was asked by Colenso whether she would consent to throw her practice aside, she replied in the negative. He then pointed out that several people who had been attended to by Te Hura had died, and mocked her. ‘Moses appearing to her! A poor stupid old New Zealand woman; - and not to the Bishop or to the Archdeacon or to myself their Minister’. Missionaries often provided medicine. In 1847 Hineipaketia’s husband Puhara had begged Colenso for medicine after the death of two adults at his village; one was a wife of Te Hapuku. Colenso sent medicine and advised them ‘to cast aside their bawling to Mary and all other false refuges, and to call upon the name of the Lord’. Two days later Hineipaketia was ill. A messenger from Puhara came, ‘to fetch medicine for his master’s principal wife, who is the person of highest rank in these parts; I sent it with tea and sugar, & advice’. The following year Puhara’s daughter who had been baptised at Nukutaura was taken very ill and died. Colenso remarked that ‘I could never get a sight of her, although I had tried to do so’. Puhara requested that Colenso give him some nails to construct a tomb around his daughter’s grave. Colenso offered to sell them to him as ‘Ever since our large and well fenced Burial Ground has been finished, I have declined giving nails for tombs and fences (which are placed here and there, on hills and in plains) but in all cases give nails for Coffins’. Pareihe’s daughter aged about eight years old was also ill and ‘sinking fast’. She died on 15 January 1849.

210 In 1851 Colenso observed that of the two thousand seven hundred people recorded in the census in 1849, more than an eighth have since died. Letter dated 13 December 1851 from William Colenso to McLean. MS-Papers-0032-0221.
Tuhitio, who had recently been baptised by Colenso, died on 7 January 1850, Colenso wrote, ‘I believe the father was greatly attached to her’.

The death contributed to the revolt against Colenso organised by Renata Kawepo, Te Moananui, Tareha, and Karaitiana Takamoana who were all infuriated by Colenso’s dictatorial approach. There had been loud and angry gatherings at Te Awapuni accompanied by exchanges of angry letters and other attempts to boycott Colenso and the Mission Station, yet Colenso had refused requests to appear before them to discuss their grievances. Eventually Colenso was seized when returning from chapel and dragged into Te Awapuni pa by Te Moananui amid the shouts from the more than one hundred and fifty persons present. The assault continued for quite some time with Colenso struggling to break free. The momentum was interrupted when Colenso hurled his hat at Te Moananui striking him in the head, the most tapu part of the body. With an enraged Moananui bearing down on him Colenso invited Moananui to strike him but begged him to leave his children unharmed. Colenso broke free and attempted to run but was caught again. Moananui pressed his face against Colenso’s and said ’Listen thou art a slave. Yes our slave. This is our word to thee. Make haste and depart, for here in this district you shall not stay’.

Within the next few weeks two of Tareha’s wives became very ill, one was the sister of Karaitiana who was also the mother of Ani Tuhitio who had died just over a month before. Although despondent about his circumstances, Colenso was buoyed by the support of Hineipaketia, Puhara, and Te Hapuku. Te Hapuku courted Colenso and once spent five hours with Colenso dissuading him from accepting a place at Waimarama and offering him a place of his own inland near Te Hapuku’s village. Williams continued the discussion a week later, noting that ‘the great difficulty is Hapuku’ who he described as ‘an overbearing heathen native’. According to Colenso when Te Hapuku finally gave his consent he demanded
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222 Williams notes that ‘since the establishment of the government none of our stations have been paid for but have been made over by gift’. Porter, *The Turanga Journals, 1840-1850: Letters and Journals of William and Jane Williams, Missionaries to Poverty Bay*, p.542.
payment for any site selected ‘his object being to take the whole payment for himself’. Colenso comforted himself with the notion that ‘this will not be allowed by the rest of the tribe.’ Te Hapuku’s approach to land transactions would soon be given the opportunity to be executed on a grand scale. Hawke’s Bay was experiencing a continuation of a period of rapid change. The previous year the first flock of sheep had arrived in the district. Donald McLean, the newly appointed Land Purchase Commissioner was not far behind them.

223 Ibid.
Chapter Two

‘Flattery and Kind Words’: The ‘Queen’ the ‘Fish’ and ‘Makarini’

The government push to purchase land created what Boast refers to as an ‘indigenous landed aristocracy’. Donald McLean identified and exploited the complex and finely balanced inter and intra hapu relationships which challenged the mana of the various leaders when negotiating land purchases. The alienation of large tracts of Hawke’s Bay land, although instigated by government policy, was driven at a local level by the ‘fish’ Te Hapuku, Makarini, and Hineipaketia who was also known as ‘the Queen’. Crown right of pre-emption had been in place since the introduction of the Native Land Purchase Ordinance of 1846. Consequently the Crown was the only legitimate buyer and seller of Maori land and functioned as a dual agent, a monopsonist to Maori as sellers and monopolist to the settlers as purchasers. Individual Maori of rank who were able to attach themselves to a valuable piece of land whether entitled to or not, could and often did, use that opportunity to reinforce their power and exploit their position. Land provided access to the cash economy and consumer goods. The practice of leasing land had led to
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226 History was perpetuated and preserved in the names of the people of a tribe. The story attached to Te Hapuku is as follows, ‘Some time before Te Hapuku was born, the corpse of the son of the great Hawke's Bay chief, Te Pakiko, was being taken from the settlement in which he died to the sacred place at Waimarama. The procession carrying the corpse, in passing some strangers on the road, one of them said, “Is that a codfish [Hapuku] which is being carried.” When the child was born, Hapuku (cod-fish) was the name given to it, to keep the insult in remembrance...Europeans who could not speak Maori, having heard that Hapuku stood for codfish, some of them in a joke, called him, “...great fish of the sea”...[or]...”Te Ika nui o te Moana”. In 1854 another name was appropriated by Te Hapuku “Karanema was the eldest son of Te Hapuku, who just before he died asked for Aruhe (fern-root) to be given to him to eat. Hence Hapuku assumed the name of Aruhe to keep the dying wish of his son in remembrance.”Funeral of the Late Te Hapuku,” Te Wananga, 8 June 1878, pp.286-87.
227 Donald McLean was also known to Maori as Makarini.
228 The Crown Land Purchase Ordinance of 1846 introduced penalties for those who dealt directly with Maori in purchasing or leasing land, or obtaining cutting rights for timber or paying ‘grass money’ in relation to land that had not been Crown granted. The Constitution Act 1852 made such transactions illegal. Williams, “Te Kooti Tango Whenua”: The Native Land Court 1864-1909: pp.63-64. The principal had been included in Article Two of the Treaty of Waitangi which states that “The Chiefs of the United Tribes and the individual chiefs yield to Her Majesty the exclusive right of pre-emption over such lands as the proprietors thereof may be disposed to alienate, at such prices as may be agreed upon between the respective proprietors and persons appointed by Her Majesty to treat with them”.
229 Monopsonist refers to a market condition in which several sellers are negotiating with one buyer allowing the buyer to influence the price they paid. Stuart Banner, Possessing the Pacific: Land, Settlers, and Indigenous People from Australia to Alaska (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2007). p.76.
increasing tensions over boundaries. In the early months of 1850, Colenso noted that
the principal chiefs were quarrelling bitterly about boundaries and were preparing to
fight ‘in consequence of the rage for letting land to the Colonists’.  

Colenso had been approached to act as a conduit to facilitate land sales. He had
consistently advised Maori against selling land, but should they decide to sell he
advised them to keep strategic lands with natural boundaries to separate them from
the settlers. When Te Hapuku and his eldest son [Karanema] Te Nahu visited
Colenso they ‘conversed only about money and land of which subjects his heart
seems full’. Less than two weeks later, Colenso went by canoe to Te Hapuku’s
village where he found Te Hapuku and Te Waihiku waiting for him. Shortly
afterwards Hineipaketia arrived. Colenso again refers to her as ‘the principal wife of
Puhara and chief person of the district’. They ‘conversed till sunset’, but Colenso
makes no further reference to her. In reference to relocating the Mission Station, Te
Hapuku insisted that Colenso could not relocate to Waimarama unless the site was
purchased for £200 and any other site would likewise have to be paid for.

As well as demands for payment for land, Colenso was also subjected to repeated demands
for horses and cows. Colenso wrote ‘Te Hapuku called to say he must have my mule
or a horse for himself!’, which was quickly followed by a visit from Karanema,
who ‘arrived with a message from Te Hapuku requesting another horse’.
The pressure continued when Colenso went to Puhara’s village, Te Wareotokopounamu,
where all the principal chiefs were gathered. Te Hapuku was absent and was
represented by his eldest son. Puhara gave Colenso some examples from around
New Zealand where land was bought and paid for. He demanded two cows and two
horses. Colenso assured him he would never pay him for ‘what he and his fellow
coadjutors had freely given’. Puhara put his demands in writing ‘we the people of
this place are very dark indeed. Thence it is that i demand of thee, that thou pay for

231 Te Nahu was known as Karanema or Cranmer after he was baptised.
233 Journal entry dated 28 May 1850. Ibid. The land offered at Te Wataarakai was bounded by
Kaimotumotu and the Tukituki and Waipawa Rivers.
234 Journal entry 1 July 1850. Ibid.
235 Journal entry 21 July 1850. Ibid.
our place, where thou dwellest, with some of thy cows and a horse’.

Colenso eventually agreed to give two cows in return for the right of common to the marshy flat to put an end to the demands.

The increasing discontent was not only about land. There was considerable acrimony over Colenso’s autocratic approach. He had little regard for rank and even less tolerance for transgressions. Colenso noted that Leonard, Karaitiana, and Tareha were ‘busy all day concocting and writing letters to the Bishop and others against me!’ Karaitiana was ‘sick of hearing the bells so often’, and had been ‘severely talked to’ by Puhara and Te Hapuku. Colenso had heard the chiefs planned to ‘seize me and te pitoti (bind me hand and foot) if I attempted to baptise or hold divine service’.

Te Moananui threatened Colenso with physical violence. Colenso had overheard him say repeatedly that what they would shortly do to him “the ill usage of the other day shall be as nothing in comparison thereof”. Colenso took some comfort in the belief that Te Hapuku wished to keep him by his side ‘on account of medical & other collateral aids’.

Throughout his journals and letters Colenso records in detail many conversations with male chiefs but does not record any specific conversations with Hineipaketia. When he does mention her he recognises her rank yet refers to her in either a patronising or sarcastic manner. On one occasion he recounts ‘Puhara’s principal wife, Hineipaketia (or “the Queen” as they term her, she being the principal person of the whole district) called this morning with some other wives of principal chiefs to see me. Received them kindly, and gave them some grapes and apples of our little garden. They left apparently much pleased’.

---
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Colenso mentions other Maori women in the contexts of motherhood and behaviour. He was shocked by a case of attempted infanticide, a practice that was not uncommon.  

‘The recently baptised son of a native chief and Communicant recently arrived from Nukutaurua was ‘nearly murdered by his mother (a heathen) directly after his birth! She attempted to crush him between her knees, saying she was weary with rearing children, having no relation to help her in nursing them...this too is only her third, the eldest being about 6 years of age’.  

In this statement Colenso dismissed the traditional structure within which children were raised. He also made his view of rank clear when he interfered in social order. The chiefs showed their displeasure when Colenso refused to baptise Hematahuna, the sister of Te Teira Te Paea, a ‘lady of the village and tribe’, by threatening to physically obstruct the baptisms of those who were selected. According to Colenso they could not comprehend that Hematahuna could be rejected because she could not read when ‘Pohutu a slave girl, who had been sold like a pig, & defiled’ was accepted. 

On another occasion Colenso was asked to baptise the son of Te Hapuku and Tarewa. He refused as Te Hapuku was not there. Tarewa, her mother, and her father Tuahu, were also candidates for baptism. It is quite possible that Colenso was afraid, as Te Hapuku employed the element of fear in his dealings with others. Even Tuahu was afraid of Te Hapuku. On another occasion Colenso recorded his outrage over an incident at the marriage of Tareha’s nephew. The gifts for the couple from the father and relations of the bride, which included blankets, and elegant white flax mats, were seized by Tareha who according to Colenso had ‘rushed forth and grasped all for himself! As well as two cows for his sister’.  

---

244 Colenso, *Journals of William Colenso 1841-1854*  
245 Journal entry May-June 1850.Ibid.  
246 Colenso informed McLean that ‘one of Hapuku’s wives (Tarewa)... strangled herself very shortly after you left’. McLean left Hawke’s Bay in late 1851. See letter dated 12 April 1853 from William Colenso to McLean. Donald McLean Papers 1012399 MS-Papers-0032-0221. (Alexander Turnbull Library).  
248 Mohi Te Atahikoia stated at the Waimarama hearing in 1884 that his grandfather had adopted him to reinforce his rights in the area. Napier Minute Book 7.  
Of particular interest are Colenso’s sardonic observations of the status and rank of Hori (George) Niania Te Arotua, principal chief at Te Waipukurau:

‘George from his being a brother of Hineipaketia (the person of greatest rank in the whole district, and head wife of the heathen chief Puhara) is so led away by her (or their?) evil counsels, and puffed with his own imagined greatness...George is determined to include this place within the block of land to be offered to the Government Land agent... Te Hapuku is said to be opposed saying to his nephew George “it is not right thus to disturb your uncles and aunts who are quietly residing here and worshipping God” (this from a professed heathen chief to a Christian one – a Monitor and Communicant!!) It was but three years ago that George lived at Table Cape, that he was working as a common servant in the employ of the whalers there at which occupation he would now have been had I not used my influence, on his returning to this side of the bay, and prevented him’.  

Colenso alludes here to a chain of manipulation engineered by Te Hapuku and implemented by Hineipaketia. Colenso made further observations on rank when he visited the remote village of Eperaima which lay close to the block of land which Te Hapuku and Niania intended offering to the Government. Colenso noted that ‘the people of the place lament very much. They are not however of first rank, and therefore they must go to the wall, for here (as in too many other places) it is not right but might which carries off the prizes’.  

Tension and conflict involving Te Hapuku featured throughout the 1850s. He had quarrelled with another chief Te Pakeke about their boundaries, leaving the ‘neighbourhood in a very disturbed state’. It had escalated to the point where ‘according to native custom they could not again be at peace without fighting, for which they were preparing’, but peace was able to be restored. Colenso also reported that Te Moananui and Te Hapuku were ‘quarrelling again’, and that Te Moananui had visited to inform him of the disagreements and to tell him that he was...

---

250 Hori Niania was born at Akitio. He left for Nukutaurua in about 1824. He and others returned about 1846 and went to live at Te Awapuni... Napier Minute Book 72, p.30.
252 Journal entry dated 23 November 1850. Ibid.
253 Journal entry dated 23 August 1850. Ibid.
254 Journal entry dated 17 September 1850. Ibid.
‘going inland to burn the rahuis which Te Hapuku had recently set up’. Colenso convinced him to put a halt to his plans until he returned from Tarawera and Te Moananui had reluctantly agreed. After Colenso had returned, Te Moananui and Puhara visited ‘both on horseback!’ Te Moananui told Colenso he would attend the meeting at Te Waiapukura to meet the government agent as he had been ‘ordered to go by his Minister’ but added that Colenso would ‘certainly hear of his having been insulted to death by Te Hapuku, and of the consequences’. However within a week Te Moananui, Tareha, and Puhara had made up their minds not to attend Te Hapuku’s call to assemble at Te Waiapukura to meet the Government agent.

The presence of both Anglican and Roman Catholic missionaries provided an additional opportunity to revisit old rivalries. Colenso was certainly concerned about the threat presented by the ‘Popish priest’ who had arrived from Te Wairoa and ‘immediately bought a piece of ground not far from the Mission Station of Puhara!’ Colenso believed that ‘by this cunning stratagem...he doubtless hopes to...obtain for himself an advantage over me.’ In one humorous incident some two weeks later, Te Moananui approached Colenso wishing to purchase a cow. Colenso noted with astonishment that he had ‘brought the money to pay for it!’ Te Moananui had told Colenso the money was from his sister, who had recently returned from Waikato from slavery. Colenso was outraged when he was informed that Te Moananui ‘only wanted the cow to sell to the Popish priest!!’ The arrival of Donald McLean however, would prove to be a genuine threat to Colenso’s aspirations.

Donald McLean was appointed Native Land Purchase Commissioner in 1850 and arrived in Hawke’s Bay in December of that year having been invited by Te Hapuku who was at the forefront of the push to sell land. McLean elected to establish a

---
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preferential relationship with Te Hapuku262 who he considered to be ‘not only the cleverest, but the most influential and powerful Chief in the region’. 263 Te Moananui was senior in rank to Te Hapuku but Te Hapuku became recognised as the chief cloaked with the authority and power of the government. McLean, as Parsons notes, was aware of and quick to take advantage of the rivalry between Te Moananui and Te Hapuku. McLean had been informed by Colenso that the paramount chiefs of the district were Puhara Hawaikirangi and Te Hapuku of Ngati Whatuiaipiti, Te Moananui of Ngati Hawea, and Tareha of Ngati Kahungunu. The other important chief was Tiakitai of Ngati Kurukuru who had died in 1847.264 Colenso also identified Hineipaketia but mentioned her separately to the list of male chiefs. Early in negotiations McLean was quickly made aware that Te Hapuku could not act without the assent of Hineipaketia. In contemporary accounts both William Colenso and Donald McLean acknowledge her rank and recognise her as the highest ranking person in the district.

The push to purchase land was underway. Colenso reported 10 December 1850 that all the chiefs had gone to Te Waipukurau to meet McLean.265 McLean then went with Te Hapuku to Pa Tangata:

‘At Pa Tangata there is a sister of Te Hapuku’s living who is in a bad state of health his object in coming to call on her with me was to obtain her consent to the sale of some which she appeared to agree to after Te Hapuku had most skilfully managed by flattery & kind words to obtain her consent’.266

---

262 McLean went as far as having one of Te Hapuku’s sons living with him in Wellington. Letter dated 20 March 1852 from Te Hapuku, Te Kuini (Hineipaketia), Puhara and Te Haurangi to McLean. Donald McLean Papers MS-Papers-0032-0676B-08, (Alexander Turnbull Library).
263 AJHR, “The Land Purchase Department Relative to the Extinguishment of Native Title in the Ahuriri District,” Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives C-01(1862): p.312.
265 Journal entries dated 10-12 December 1850. Colenso, Journals of William Colenso 1841-1854
At this early stage McLean noted with satisfaction that ‘Te Hapuku is acting precisely as I have directed him, that is he is going about negotiating and arranging with his tribe for the sale of more land’.267 It was a pre-requisite that McLean put a stop to the practice of leasing land as it was a barrier to Crown purchase. Te Hapuku was his best conduit to that end. Henry Tiffen and Northwood had started grazing sheep the year before and McLean targeted them. Within a week of meeting the chiefs, on 16 December 1850 McLean wrote to Tiffen warning him to remove his sheep,

‘I need scarcely tell you that these unauthorised arrangements entail various evils, besides operating against purchases of land by the Government; moreover they are a direct violation of the “Native Land Purchase Ordinance,” the

---

provisions of which I am directed to carry into effect...the Government will not
sanction the leasing of land from the Natives in this district...consider your
lease cancelled...remove your sheep from the Ahuriri plains’.268

Northwood and Tiffen agreed to pay £60 per annum for a portion of Te Aute. Before long McLean reported with satisfaction that,

‘the leasing of land from the natives which was becoming general, has been
entirely prohibited in this district; the chiefs after various arguments in favour
of the system, agreeing to co-operate with me in carrying out the provisions of
the Native Land Purchase Ordinance’.269

Towards the end of 1850, McLean highlighted the rivalry between the paramount chiefs. He considered it was advisable to have two surveyors firstly to ‘expedite negotiations...and discontinue...the present system of leasing from the Natives’. Secondly, because Hapuku, ‘would be exceedingly jealous and displeased, if the land offered by a rival chief Tareha, should be surveyed before his...although it is essential that Tareha’s land, in the neighbourhood of the Ahuriri harbour, where settlers are most likely to form their earliest establishment, should, if there is only one surveyor be attended to first’.270 Two months later, Robert Parks and his surveying team arrived from Wellington.271

Another incident that angered Te Hapuku at the end of 1850 was the return of the first heke of Ngai Te Upokoiri escorted by Renata Kawepo. They had been in exile at Manawatu as a result of the killing of Te Moananui’s mother Paeroa, and her aunt Kutia, by Ngai Te Upokoiri at Tangoio. Te Moananui had visited the Manawatu in 1845 with a large party of Heretaunga people, of which ‘Hineipaketia was among the hundreds’.272 Renata Kawepo and Te Moananui negotiated a peaceful resolution which included the ceremonial return of Paeroa’s head allowing Ngai Te Upokoiri to

268 AJHR, “The Land Purchase Department Relative to the Extinguishment of Native Title in the Ahuriri District,” p.308.
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272 Noah Huke recounted that the Heretaunga people went to Manawatu and he was the guide on 8 January 1845. Noah Huke evidence in Napier Minute Book 19 p.475 cited in Parsons, "Repatriation and Colonisation," p.475.
return and settle in Hawke’s Bay in three hekes. Colenso noted that ‘they had no less than nine horses with them!’

Rumours surrounding land sales were also causing problems. Te Hapuku and his son Karanema Te Nahu wrote to McLean,

‘I’m suffering here from the people of Heretaunga and the Pakeha too. The Pakeha told the Maori that I had completed with you the ceding of Te Matau-o-Maui out to Porangahau, with one side of the outer boundary for you and running on from the inland side to come out at Te Awanga. Hence I said to you to come here quickly, so we can talk with these Pakeha. Their letter has also arrived and is with me.’

McLean secured the support of Hineipaketia in his push into the Wairarapa when he visited her again in March 1851.

‘saw the Queen Hineipaketia who is ill she has great influence and [is] a well behaved person. I told her to send a native for food to Ahuriri and intended giving her a present besides – Hapuku and her both agree to let me have their full cooperation in settling the Wairarapa’.

Describing Hineipaketia as ‘well behaved’ reflects McLean’s views of acceptable female behaviour. McLean’s wife Susan was subject to his judgemental musings. Although he seemed genuinely fond of her, she was instructed as to what she should eat, when she should bathe and warned not to indulge in any of the ‘disagreeable’ and ‘foolish fits which you occasionally indulge in. I mean the hysterics, the fainting of course you cannot avoid poor thing’. McLean also cautioned her against her ‘inclinations to associate more intimately with persons of doubtful position in society’ telling her that the ‘sooner she changed her sentiments on the subject the better’. McLean’s ideal wife should be ‘good and amiable’, anticipate the wishes of her husband and ‘calmly undergo every trial’ to make him happy. His vision of her future included putting her to work at Ahuriri with visions of her as a ‘highly

273 Ibid., p.52. See also Evidence of Paramena Te Naonao given at the Omahu hearing. Napier Minute Book 20, p.102.
276 Diary entry dated 18 March 1851. Donald McLean Papers MS1232.
accomplished dairy maid...in a short gown and grey petticoat with sleeves tucked and fat arms slappering away among cream, cheese and butter...do not laugh at this as I intend it in reality’. 277 He also counselled his sisters reminding them of the necessity of making a good marriage. Education was important to McLean. He encouraged his sister Annabella, of whom he was particularly fond, to stay at boarding school paying her fees and suggesting she ‘could assist [him] in preparing a history of New Zealand as Lord McCauley’s [sic] sister has done recently’. 278

During negotiations to establish the price of the Waipukurau block, McLean noted that several women rose to speak at length. One of these speeches was made by the daughter of Te Pareihe, Ani Matenga Te Patukaikino. McLean acknowledges Ani’s rank and skills as an orator, ‘Ani, Te Hapuku’s sister and principal chief made a most impressive speech...bade farewell to the land and turned her district over to my protection’. 279 McLean mentions Ani’s concern about the future of her eight year old son Hoera, 280 He gave Hoera one of his own blankets promising to ‘give him a good fit out and see that he is not left destitute hereafter if I fail in doing so I shall be robbing an orphan of his natural rights, poor Ani I felt for her as she spoke so feelingly about her child becoming a slave to Europeans and confiding him to my care’. 281

Ani made a second speech the following morning. McLean wrote, ‘Ani the great Chieftainess and claimant of the country around spoke firmly about her rights and possessions and repeated her former determination to sell her land to the Europeans as they were now waste the birds and usual food that rendered the land valuable have disappeared and let us have Europeans to enrich our country and bring goods for all old and young’. 282 Colenso had also observed that English rats ‘now overran the country resulting in the destruction of the once abundant birdlife leaving a deathly silence in the forests.’ 283

278 Ibid., pp.245-46.
279 Diary entry dated 20 March 1851. Donald McLean Papers MS1232.
280 Hoera Pareihe was the son of Ani Matenga Te Patukaikino.
281 Diary entry dated 20 March 1851. Donald McLean Papers MS1232.
282 Diary entry dated 26 March 1851. Ibid.
Ballara attributed Ani’s speech to Hineipaketia as evidence she was ‘determined to sell her land as it was now useless’. 284 This citation was subsequently included as part of a secondary school history examination resource. 285 Ballara comments that ‘Hineipaketia’ ‘did not hesitate to speak’ at meetings, suggesting that it was unusual for a woman to do so. 286 It is unlikely that Hineipaketia was even present at the meeting in March 1851 due to the ill health noted by McLean several days prior to the meeting, 287 which is likely to have been a continuation of the illness McLean had mentioned in December. 288 There was opposition to the sale. Hoani Paraone was one who opposed the sale of the land where they lived. He asked why they did not sell the land that was unoccupied and useless to them. 289 Hupata had also expressed his concern. Te Hapuku would brook no interference and speeches continued to midnight. 290 Three days later Colenso wrote to McLean requesting that he set aside a large reserve between the Tukutuki River to Te Apiti and Waimarama. 291

On the day that Ani made her last speech, McLean’s travelling companion Charles Rudston-Read had received a letter from Colonial Secretary, Alfred Domett, granting him permission to occupy land at Ahuriri ‘as soon as it is purchased from the natives’ and ‘provided it does not interfere with any previous application’. 292 During this period there had been many letters sent from the Wairarapa advising against selling land. Te Hapuku had also received a letter informing him that a great numbers of chiefs have united together to hold their lands at Manawatu and Wairarapa and they ‘strongly advised him to do the same’. McLean remained

---

284 Ballara includes Ani as one of the names Hineipaketia was known by. See Ballara, "Hine-i-paketa fl 1850-1870," p.10.
286 Ballara, "Hine-i-paketa fl 1850-1870," pp10.11.
287 Diary entry dated 18 March 1851 in Donald McLean Papers MS1232.
288 Diary entry dated 13 December 1850. Donald McLean Papers MS-1231.
289 Diary entry dated 26 March 1851. Donald McLean Papers MS1232.
290 Diary entry dated 26 March 1851. Ibid.
291 Diary entry dated 29 March 1851. Ibid.
292 Domett added that Rudston Read would be subject to any squatting regulation that may be established by Government and that the permission was personal and could not be transferred. Letter dated 26 March 1851 from Colonial Secretary Alfred Domett to Charles Rudston-Read. DDCR/7/8/2/4, (Yorkshire: East Riding Archive).
confident in the belief that he was ‘too near to me to be influenced by such letters. He appears to treat with some degree of indifference especially in my presence’.  

Three weeks later at the ‘grand meeting’, which was held to discuss the price of the Waipukurau block, McLean was impressed by the excellent speeches especially those of Te Hapuku, Wi Tipuna, Anny [Ani Te Patukaikino], Karaitiana, Hori Niania, Paora Kopakau, Paraone, and Harawira. McLean noted that ‘of course they all spoke in high terms of their land’. He reminded them of all that had be done to make the land valuable,

‘even in one line of road where your people may be employed...is it to be wondered at that the land should be sold by the Government to their own people, for a greater price than they could give you for it? Could you render it equally valuable, by bringing living people on it, instead of dead stones, rotten trees, and decayed vegetation that neither feeds nor clothes you? Then you should fairly become the recipients of its enhanced value. But no, you have not the resources for such great undertakings. Then consider whether you should retain your land, or transfer it to those who will turn it to better account than lying idle. The price I consider your land worth is £1,000... However, I will take upon myself to go further than I have ever done before, by saying that another £1,000 should be granted another year, and a third £1,000 another year; making in all, £3,000’.  

McLean received a resounding "We understand!" from Hori Niania, and other young men. McLean replied, "You may but Te Hapuku and the elder people adhere to the old way of counting "Yes," Te Hapuku said, "the old way, a good one, which would fill the land and the belly; not your single counting, which starves both!" McLean observed that the majority seemed ‘thunder-struck’ at the small amount. As the gathering rapidly dispersed, Te Hapuku made ‘an able speech’ in reply to McLean that the price was too low and he would be blamed if they were in future unsatisfied with the price. Te Hapuku handed McLean a note, applying for £7,000, or £8,000,

---

293 Diary entry dated 4 April 1851. Donald McLean Papers MS1232.
294 The ‘grand meeting’ was held on 17 April 1851. Diary entry dated 18 April 1851. Ibid.
295 Diary entry dated 18 April 1851. Ibid.
296 Diary entry dated 18 April 1851. Ibid.
signed by the Queen [Hineipaketia] and all the principal claimants. Te Hapuku was unhappy that the Wairarapa people were getting £1000 per annum in rent, leasing their land, while he was being asked to sell for £3000.

Land sales took place in an environment punctuated by illness and death, the continual nature of which contributed to a sense of urgency and despair amongst the people which, as previously mentioned, had substantially reduced the population. Tareha and his family were particularly affected by illness. In May 1850 Tareha’s son died which Colenso noted brought ‘a new source of unquiet to him and his tribe’. Two months later Tareha’s third and only remaining child died. Colenso experienced a sense of satisfaction when Tareha himself fell seriously ill in October 1850. He wrote ‘I could not but think – when the great chief Tareha was brought to me in a helpless state by his tribe, to beg my instant aid...[that]...since my being seized and carried thither as a slave and held tightly by him was now stretched at my feet’. Tareha’s wife Paerikiriki fell ill a few days later and died on 22 April 1851. McLean viewed her death as an opportunity that would ‘make it easier to purchase Tareha’s block above Titiokura’.

The people’s health was further compromised as tobacco had become a sought after item, ‘...they smoke very much; indeed, you frequently see a mother and the child on her back smoking. When unable to procure tobacco they smoke dry leaves; but now some of the tribes grow and manufacture their own tobacco’. On 9 July 1851 Te Hapuku, and possibly Karanema, wrote to McLean and the Governor ‘I am suffering from consuming the weeds of my place’ and they
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asked McLean why they were being prevented from getting tobacco and requested that some be sent by ship.\textsuperscript{307}

Pending land sales continued to cause controversy and recriminations. McLean expressed his irritation with ‘the natives’ when he met with Park and Pelichet at the Survey Station, where they were busy plotting their work. They were annoyed in their small cottage by ‘the natives continually calling and interfering, especially the Chiefs, who consider themselves at liberty to use a greater licence than any of the others’. When he wished to retire for the night he was ‘obliged to request Te Hapuku, the Queen, Puhara and others, to leave the room,...which they did not appear to relish’.\textsuperscript{308}

In 1851 Hineipaketia and Hori Niania wrote to Governor Grey as they were unhappy with the price for the Waipukurau block,

‘Friend the Governor Wishing you well Friend we have talked with Mr. McLean about the payment; he did not agree to our having a large payment for our land, for our ancestor and parent “Papa” or the earth under us. Mr. McLean said Three thousand pounds would be enough; this we did not like, neither did our Queen Hineipaketia like it; what we wish for is four thousand eight hundred pounds...Mr. McLean said he had no power to agree to such a sum, that the money was not in his hands to give, that it was public money in the hands of this European, and that European, all of whom would say, when he went to their places, that he wasted their money.’...’Mr. McLean is situated like myself; the land is not entirely mine, it is the property of this man and that man, mine is merely handing it over to Mr. McLean. Do not consider the payment should be the same for this land, as for these other lands, as these lands of yours have been enslaved by Waikato and the Rauparaha, but this land has never been enslaved; now for the first time it has by turning it over to Mr. McLean, therefore the people all agree that the land is wholly in Mr. McLean’s hands, that is Heretaonga[sic]’.\textsuperscript{309}

\textsuperscript{307} Letter dated 9 July 1851 from Te Hapuku to Governor Grey and McLean. Donald McLean Papers MS-Papers-0032-0675F-05, (Alexander Turnbull Library).
\textsuperscript{308} Diary entry dated 28 April 1851. Donald McLean Papers MS1232.
\textsuperscript{309} Letter dated 3 May 1851 from Te Hapuku Hineipaketia and other to George Grey. Donald McLean Papers MS-Papers-0032-0675D-05, (Alexander Turnbull Library). This correspondence was later
The following month Hineipaketia and others wrote to McLean,

‘I've this to say to you, and Te Hei [?] and Te Hapuku, that if you and the Governor are of a mind with our letter for the 4,800, with 2000 in the first year, the same for the people, then a meeting will result at Wairarapa. Don't be annoyed about this statement. To start off, it is suggested that there be 2,000 in the first year. This suits the people at a distance, who said that the 2,000 would quickly settle their consideration. Listen, let the payments for my land be handed over at Te Waipukurau, as I don't want to go to Ahuriri, but let it be at the place announced, at Te Waipukurau, it is there the payments should be received. Friend, on the 28th of July the payments will be given for Heretaunga. Come here quickly’. Te Hapuku added ‘I am annoyed with the low Europeans of this place; let the people for this place come direct from England’.310

In July of 1851 Te Moananui visited McLean to discuss the sale of the block of land offered by Te Hapuku ‘of whom he is very jealous, which I have removed by telling him that Te Hapuku spoke of him as one of the principal claimants’. The rivalry is apparent as McLean states that Te Moananui is in favour of ‘selling a more exclusive district and giving up Matau a Maui as a site for a town’.311

The price was eventually settled and the deeds of purchase completed for the Waipukurau block of 279,000 acres on 4 November 1851 for £4800.312 This was quickly followed by the Ahuriri block of 265,000 acres on 17 November for £1500,313 and the Mohaka block of 85,700 acres on 5 December for £800.314

---

311 Diary entry dated 21 July 1851. Donald McLean Papers MS-1231.
313 Ibid., p.488.
314 Ibid., p.492.
Money, Horses, and Alcohol

The new cash economy fuelled the demand for consumer goods. Proceeds from land sales, mortgage advances and leases were used to purchase desirable items such as horses, buggies, tobacco, alcohol, livestock, farm implements, machinery, tools and clothing. A quality dress mat took at best two years to create,\textsuperscript{315} so the convenience and novelty of readymade articles had enormous appeal. Food was often in short supply as crops were also sold to purchase coveted goods. Demand for goods also saw the establishment of lines of credit at stores and through private individuals which introduced an escalating cycle of debt and desperation.

Colenso remained opposed to the acquiring of horses. In 1851 he reported that ‘the natives disposed of their fine crop of wheat for horses along with those who had received monies for alienated lands...[and]...have wilfully squandered it - giving so much as £40 and even £60 for a horse!’\textsuperscript{316}

The following year Colenso censured the chiefs for pillaging the produce of the people to purchase horses,

‘On the banks of the little river Ohiwia, 3 miles from the Station, I found the Chiefs, Te Hapuku, Puhara, Te Tawa, and “the great lady” Hineipaketia, who (knowing this to be my course) were evidently awaiting my arrival, in order to scold me for my remarks upon the rapacity of the principal Chiefs, (in their taking the money, and wheat etc etc of the inferior people, though closely related, to purchase additional horses for their own vain display,”) which I had freely made at Te Aute on the 28\textsuperscript{th} ult. Then I had quite to do to answer the whole of them but I endeavoured to manage the matter, and after an hours talking, we parted amicably’.\textsuperscript{317}

In June 1852, John Rochfort had left the surveying team of Parks in Rangitikei and walked to Poukawa where he ‘borrowed the Queen’s horse’ and travelled fifteen miles across the plains to Te Hapuku’s house.


\textsuperscript{317} Journal entry dated 12 March 1852. Colenso, \textit{Journals of William Colenso 1841-1854}
‘It was a beautiful little black mare, unshod and nearly wild, but she carried my weight with ease...passing between two ranges of hills, she got up to the saddle girths in a bog, but I threw myself off and got her out without much difficulty...after crossing several creeks, which were dangerous on account of the quick sands, we rode at full gallop to Hapuku’s house. He is a fine well made man, about six feet in height and of an intellectual cast of countenance. He has lately been made a magistrate, and decides disputes among the natives...I asked him to lend me the mare as far as Ahuriri, and told him of the desertion of my guide and that I was two days without food. He readily granted my request, saying at the same time, that, if the natives had not lent her to me at the last pah, he would have gone over and stock whipped them’.  

In 1852 Hineipaketia, Te Hapuku, and Hori Niania were at Mataikona ‘to transfer another large portion of land to the Government’. The land referred to was the Castle Point block. Te Hapuku had previously written a letter to McLean in which he alludes to a possible sale and reminds him of his efforts in carrying out directives.

‘I shall adopt them in carrying out our joint work, as I was the first to invite you to Heretaunga, that I might see your ways, that is the ways and customs of the Europeans consequently Te Potangaroa unites with us in carrying on our work’.  

Te Hapuku and Niania informed McLean that Te Ropiha was angry with Puhara and Hineipaketia for negotiating with McLean to sell land in the Porangahau area. Just over a year later, in June 1853, the 275,000 acre Castle Point block was sold for £2500.

---

318 In June 1852, Rochfort had parted company with Parks at Rangitikei prior to the arrival of the surveying team in Hawke’s Bay as he was unhappy with the poor remuneration. He decided to walk to Ahuriri to retrieve his instruments and other belongings that had been sent ahead by boat. The long and harrowing journey left him unable to walk the final distance to Ahuriri. See Rochfort, *The Adventures of a Surveyor in New Zealand and the Australian Gold Diggings*: p.42.

319 Journal entry dated 17 April 1852. Colenso, *Journals of William Colenso 1841-1854*

320 Letter dated 20 March 1852 from Te Hapuku, Te Kuini (Hineipaketia), Puhara and Te Haurangi to McLean. MS-Papers-0032-0676B-08.

321 Te Ropiha said that it was wrong and had threatened that when McLean came back he would call for them to be investigated. Te Ropiha said he has stopped supporting the Pakeha. In response to Niania and Te Hapuku saying he was wrong Te Ropiha said he could not be wrong as he is the judge for his village. Hapuku considered it was not right that Te Ropiha had set himself as a judge as the authority comes from the Pakeha. Letter dated 25 April 1852 from Hori Niania and Te Hapuku to McLean. Donald McLean Papers MS-Papers-0032-0676B-11. (Alexander Turnbull Library).
The rivalry between Te Hapuku and Te Moananui was never far from the surface. Colenso notes ‘Neither Puhara nor Te Hei would consent to go to the meeting proposed to be held at Te Moananui’s village; and consequently he must agree to act with them’.

Tensions were further exacerbated when Te Hapuku was approached about the position of assessor.

‘...a letter lately arrived from the Government to Te Hapuku, offering him the situation of “Assessor” (or as the natives term it, “Judge” for these parts, and which many of his people, and particularly Wi Tipuna, strongly urged him to accept, as it would “make both him and them great”! Colenso attempted to dissuade him from taking the position because it would increase the existing jealousies between himself and the other principal Chiefs whose people (as he well knew) would never allow him to “judge”...’.

As the time of the ‘grand meeting’ approached, Colenso wrote another letter to Te Hapuku, Puhara, Te Hei, and others requesting that,

‘if they were determined to have horse racing and other games at Te Waipukurau, at the approaching payment of money to be made there by the Government Land Commissioner, to carry all such away from the village & Chapel (there being plenty of level grass land nearly belonging to the Government) as I had determined on going thither’.

They agreed. ‘This morning the Heathen Chiefs – Puhara, Te Waihiku, and Te Hei, called, and remained some time; they willingly agree to my letter of Monday last – to carry away the racing day from the village’. By 1853 Colenso stated that ‘strong drink, card playing, horses, petty theft and other sins’ were prevalent.

Also by early 1853 Colenso reported that the ‘sole aim’ of McLean was ‘to keep in with and please Te Hapuku and his relations’ as he was the only principal chief.

---

322 Journal entry dated 10 July 1852. Colenso, Journals of William Colenso 1841-1854
323 Journal entry dated 15 July 1852. Ibid.
324 Journal entry dated 15 November 1852. Ibid.
325 Journal entry dated 19 November 1852. Ibid.
who was ‘determined to sell all the land’. McLean was not impressed with Colenso’s lack of cooperation around land sales. At the instigation of Te Hapuku Colenso was accused by Wi Tipuna, of assaulting him by kicking him in the back of the head. He was forced to appear before McLean who was also the magistrate. Hineipaketia attended court with Te Hapuku and Puhara and Colenso was fined £3 for assault on Wi Tipuna. Colenso was shocked to have been convicted and he reminded McLean that it was through his ‘exertions that he then quietly sat there...on Government land, as a magistrate’. 

At this time Colenso was also in the midst of a personal and theological crisis. In 1852 Niania wrote to McLean,

‘What I am now going to reveal to you is strictly true. Mr Colenso has committed adultery with a native woman of our tribe – her name is Ripeka – if any body should say it is false don’t you believe them for it is quite true...if you chose to make a great matter of it - or if on the contrary - well our own thoughts however are inclined towards making a great matter of it, to distinguish between right and wrong & because he also has endeavoured to keep us down & to raise himself up - let not his misfortune or evil fall upon us’. 

On 28 May 1851 Ripeka (Rebecca) who had long been a member of Colenso’s household, gave birth to his child. Colenso later by way of explanation and justification said he had ‘received plenty of disagreeable language and behaviour from Mrs Colenso’ and nothing but ‘prompt kindness unembittered by a single word from our native girl Rebecca’. Colenso wrote that he had grown to ‘insensibly...esteem...and love the latter...until in an evil moment...we had carnal knowledge of each other...I fell’. Colenso was determined to keep control of the child ‘owing to the repeating and serious illness of the mother , the child was weaned at the early age of 6 months from which hour Mrs Colenso has brought it up, shewing it great kindness’. Colenso would not allow Ripeka to leave...’in the month

---

327 Letter dated 31 January 1853. Ibid.
328 Letter dated 31 January 1853. Ibid.
329 Letters dated 31 January-7 February 1853. Ibid.
of February last, the mother was determined to leave and go to reside at Patangata, when because I would not give up the child to be taken thither, she, out of revenge, disclosed the whole matter.\textsuperscript{332}

Colenso’s license as Missionary Deacon of the District of Ahuriri was revoked on 9 November 1852.\textsuperscript{333} At the same time, the relationship between Colenso and McLean was deteriorating. Colenso wrote to the CMS reporting that McLean ‘would have native females paid as great decorum as the white ones’. Colenso considered that ‘in all cases where native women stroll away to the settlers huts inviting...and mischief ensues, the fault should be laid at her door, and no compensation given to her or her people’. Colenso was mocked ‘especially by Morena and Hapuku’.\textsuperscript{334} Colenso wrote to McLean informing him that he had the support of Te Hapuku, Puhara, and Hineipaketia,

‘You, my dear Sir, well know how very changeable the Natives are. You will not then be surprized in hearing that, when the great men were here, the Natives (having repeatedly heard that the Bishop and the Governor were coming to "pana"\textsuperscript{335} me) were all against me...all loud for "panaing". But when I say all, I must not forget to tell you, that Te Hapuku and Puhara and Hineipaketia were not only against such an atrocity, but made good orations (I am told) to the Bp. and the Govr. when at Wakatu in my favour. And these 2 men are Heathen, and, in certain sense, my enemies Neither of them accompanied the Bishop and Governor to Ahuriri - at which, I confess, I felt surprized’.\textsuperscript{336}

\textsuperscript{332}Rebecca had come from Waimate with the Colenso’s in 1844 and had been part of the household ever since. Ibid., pp.431-32.
\textsuperscript{333} Letter dated 9 November 1852. Ibid.
\textsuperscript{334}Letter dated 31 January-7 February 1853. Ibid.
\textsuperscript{335} Pana means to expel or drive out.
\textsuperscript{336} Letter dated 12 April 1853 from Colenso to McLean. Donald McLean Papers 1012399 MS-Papers-0032-0221.
As a result of events and his deteriorating relationship with McLean, Colenso’s reputation, and consequently his influence, waned and the ‘problem’ of his opposing land sales would be removed. However the disenchantment with McLean and his methods was becoming increasingly apparent. In September 1853 Wiremu Te Kahui Kararehe wrote,

‘When we heard him speak, our hearts, which had been burdened under our Maori customs, lifted. And later we understood McLean’s proposal, when he said to us, ‘Young men, if you give your land to the Queen, then you could be better people in your homes.’ Then we thought, well that’s it, having turned it over in our minds and considered the mistaken views of the Maori, having searched in vain and not found one good aspect of Maori custom. Then later we looked to examining the correctness of what McLean had told us, and thought again that the way of Maori thinking would end in trouble. He said to us, ‘Turn my way so that you can develop as better people in your homes.’ But still Maori thinking suggested that our development would not be good since our land
would be taken away. How could the authority of a real person be maintained if
our land, which ennobles us, was taken?'

McLean’s purchasing methods became increasingly dubious. Towards the end of
1853 McLean was appointed Chief Native Land Purchase Commissioner and the
Land Purchase Department was officially established. In December 1853, Te
Hapuku, Hineipaketa, Puhara, Te Waihiku (Haurangi), Hori Niania and others had
accompanied McLean back to Wellington. At least one other woman of rank was
present, Hinerangia, the daughter of Puhara and wife of Te Hapuku. Four sales were
made in Wellington in December 1853 signed by Te Hapuku, Hineipaketa, Puhara,
Te Waihiku (Haurangi) and Hori Niania. The blocks were settled in 1854. They
were Tautane, part of Ruataniwha known as Te Umuopua, Kahuranaki and
Okawa. In contrast to the sales of 1851 which had been signed by several hundred
interested parties, these sales were signed by just a handful with total disregard for
those occupying the land. The monies received in Wellington were spent there, and
they were entertained grandly by McLean and Isaac Featherston. Some twenty to
thirty chiefs were said to have been present at the festivities.

In an account written a few years after the event a description of Hineipaketa was
published in Chambers’ Edinburgh Journal,

‘The girl who escaped with Tarehah is now the wahine tapu, or head wife, of
Puhara, the brother of te Hapuka. On account of her illustrious descent, she is
styled the Queen (te Kwini); and always goes abroad in considerable state, on a
fine white horse, with English bridle, side saddle, &c. She is tall and queenly,
with lips tattooed blue; wears a ring with a large precious stone on her finger;
and a tooth of the Mako shark dangling from her ear. When at Wellington, a

337 Letter dated 2 September 1853 from Wiremu Te Kahui Kararehe. Donald McLean Papers MS-
Papers-0032-0677B-12, (Alexander Turnbull Library).
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343 District Commissioner G. S. Cooper writing on 25 March 1857 acknowledged that the money
received for Te Umuopua by those in Wellington in 1853 was spent there. AJHR, "The Land
Purchase Department Relative to the Extinguishment of Native Title in the Ahuriri District," p.330.
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few years ago, treating with government for the sale of a large block of land, Madame Puhara figured as the queen of Ahuriri in a royal dress of black velvet.\footnote{Excerpt from \textit{Chambers’ Edinburgh Journal, Sept. 1857} in "Social Progress at the Antipodes," \textit{Hawke's Bay Herald}, 10 April 1858, p.6.}

The following report of the entertainment that took place on 30 December 1853 demonstrates the extent of the efforts made to court the goodwill of Te Hapuku, Hineipaketia and others.

‘The Native Chiefs of the Province of Wellington were entertained by his Honor the Superintendent at a sumptuous feast at the Wellington Hotel, on Friday last, the 30\textsuperscript{th} December. The tables were handsomely decorated, and literally groaned with all the delicacies of the season. Covers were laid for fifty. The Vice Chair was filled by Mr. Speaker Clifford. On the right of the Superintendent sat Te Hapuku, on the left E Puni. Amongst the Chiefs present were : - Te Hapuku, Te Wereta, Te Manihere, Wiremu Kingi, Ngairo, Nopera, Wi Tako, E Puni, Porata, Puhara, Hoera, Wi Tamihaua, Naturi, & c., &c., Te Hapuku, and a large body of influential Chiefs from Hawke’s Bay, Wairarapa, and other parts of the Province, having come to Wellington to arrange with Mr. Commissioner McLean about the sale of land, & c., advantage was taken of the opportunity by the Superintendent to invite them to an entertainment at Baron Alzdorf’s Hotel; at which the Members of the Provincial Council, Col. McCleverty, Commissioner McLean, and Mr. Kemp, & c., also were present....His Honor the Superintendent in proposing the health of the “Queen” requested Mr. McLean to express to his guests the gratification he experienced in having the opportunity of giving a cordial and hearty welcome to so many of the great Chiefs of this Province, and of asking them to meet at the festive board the Members of the Provincial council – the “wise men” of the Province; begged Mr. McLean to dispel any doubts that may have arisen as to the intentions of the new Government – and to give them the most positive assurance, that their interests would be as zealously watched , and efficiently promoted, under the present as under any previous Government – that in fact the great aim of himself and of the members of the Legislature, would be...to cement more strongly than ever the friendly relations which had so long subsisted between the races – and to promote by every means in their power
their future welfare, happiness, and prosperity...Mr. Bell, in speaking of Hapuka, said that through that Chief’s influence a large district...Hawke’s Bay, had been opened to British enterprise...which might have remained waste and unproductive...Hapuka spoke...he was a stranger to English customs and manners, and much more to a great feast with the Pakehas like the present. Nevertheless, he highly valued such meetings...he desired that the British might be enabled to spread over the whole face of the country. They (the British) were the elder brothers of a branch of the same family, and their elders in knowledge and art of every description.” 346

Te Hapuku’s attitude towards appropriation of purchase money which was the cause of much discontent at Porangahau, particularly from Ropiha, was noted by Hawke’s Bay’s Resident Magistrate and Commissioner of Crown Lands, Alfred Domett. According to Domett, Hapuku ‘affects to despise them greatly’ noting that Te Hapuku had given them £20 and had said “the only question as to them a little time ago would be which was the fattest, in order that he might be killed to be eaten”. Domett then referred to Te Hapuku as a ‘horrible savage’. Ropiha had given Domett a letter to forward to McLean about the matter, but did not wish Te Hapuku to know that he had written to McLean. Domett noted the fear that Te Hapuku engendered ‘It was amusing to see...how secretly the old fellow went about this...which shewed in spite of their abuse of Hapuku and his tahae how much they feared him still’. 347

In the aftermath of the ‘secret sales’ the situation deteriorated further. The solution for the ensuing disputes concerning Tautane and Te Umuopua, according to George Sissons Cooper, who had been appointed District Commissioner for Hawke’s Bay and Wairarapa in 1854, was to sell more land including some of Niania’s in order to satisfy the interests of those who had received no payments from the monies received and ‘squandered’ in Wellington. Cooper was aware that the income from wheat and potatoes had fallen dramatically due to a fall in the markets, adding that ‘the habits they have contracted unfit them for labour...[so]...they have no alternative

346 “The Native Chiefs of the Province of Wellington,” Wellington Independent, 7 January 1854, p.3.
but to continue selling their lands...'\textsuperscript{348} The blocks included Te Mata,\textsuperscript{349} Maraekakaho, the Ruahine Bush Block and parts of Ruataniwha.\textsuperscript{350} This led to an escalation of animosity and rivalry which contributed to increased land sales. Rights to the Maraekakaho, Kereru, and Aorangi blocks were more contested than the rest and were responsible for much of the amplified tension.\textsuperscript{351}

Cooper believed that Te Hapuku wished to see Te Moananui embroiled with the settlers so that the government would take action against him. Cooper describes Moananui and Tareha as,

\begin{quote}
'...excessively vain and weak minded and very jealous of Hapuku’s growing influence...the notice that is taken of him...has made the Ika\textsuperscript{352} very bouncible and it cannot be denied that he has divided some of the money very unfairly - for instance the 5000 acre block sold at Auckland will not stand...do not be surprised if you hear of a row...I can see it coming quite plainly...It will probably commence about Wakatu [sic], Karaitiana having given Hapuku notice to quit'.\textsuperscript{353}
\end{quote}

Cooper had been on an expedition with Moananui and Tareha, identifying all their lands included in Te Hapuku’s sales ‘...there is no disguising that the fish has robbed his enemies to an enormous extent, and how they have submitted to it so long is a wonder to me’.\textsuperscript{354}

Squatters were proving an impediment to further land purchases in the Porangahau area. In 1857, Cooper informed McLean that the block adjacent to the one sold at Te Umuopua, that he was negotiating to purchase for £2500, was occupied by squatters who were paying rent to the owners which he saw as a barrier to ‘reasonable terms’ being negotiated. He had sent notices to the squatters informing them that they would be subject to increasing monthly fines if they persisted. McLean replied,

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{348} Letter from Cooper to McLean 29 November 1856. AJHR, "The Land Purchase Department Relative to the Extinguishment of Native Title in the Ahuriri District."
\textsuperscript{349} Turton, \textit{Maori Deeds of Land Purchases in the North Island of New Zealand Vol.II}: p.511.
\textsuperscript{350} Ibid., pp.511-19.
\textsuperscript{351} Parsons, "Repatriation and Colonisation," pp.52-53.
\textsuperscript{352} In reference to Te Hapuku.
\end{flushright}
‘...the Natives would soon find it to their interest to coalesce with settlers in opposing the sale of land to the Government: land purchasing would cease; those who had already sold to the Government would say, what fools we have been to sell, when our opponents to those sales...[obtain] heavy annual payments for their runs, and are greater men than we are by having English settlers at their mercy...’  

McLean considered that the squatting system was so entrenched on the Porangahau block that it should be purchased noting that the ‘Wellington Government were prepared to pay that sum or even much more’.  

The overall effect of McLean’s negotiation and purchase methods rendered all efforts to counter the sales, redundant. Hoani Pakapaka recalled that ‘The chiefs of Heretaunga could not resist Hapuku in selling the lands’. Renata Kawepo was one who eventually did. Hoani Pakapaka recalled that Renata said,

““Let my elder brothers sell away and come up to me and I will be their stumbling block” Hapuku came and crossed Ngaruroro selling and going on to Ruahine...Ngati Rangikoianake were taking a surveyor onto the land to survey. Puhara followed them up to bring them back because Renata was about to go shoot them’.  

Renata Kawepo named the chiefs who sold the land,

‘Te Hapuku, Hawaikirangi, Whaitiri, Hineirangia, Hineipaketia, Kerie Te Awhata, Ropata Te Waiariki, Kerei Tangaru, Ria Tawhara were the chiefs who sold all the land and then claimed a share in ours... they continued to push their land through the court, then the surveyor came here to survey the last we had...I thought that the only way out of the difficulty would be to fight - rather die than lose the land’.  

Throughout this period McLean had been establishing himself on the land that he had purchased for the Crown. He had been justifiably accused of illegal grazing

355 AJHR, “The Land Purchase Department Relative to the Extinguishment of Native Title in the Ahuriri District,” pp.329-32.
356 Ibid., pp.324-32.
357 Evidence of Hoani Pakapaka at the Omahu hearing. Napier Minute Book 20, p.61.
358 Evidence of Hoani Pakapaka at the Omahu hearing. Ibid.
himself, but had also been grazing sheep on land leased or owned by others, and later in partnership with James Kelham. The partnership then entered into a lease of 19,800 acres in 1853 just months after it was purchased by the Crown. Such opportunism justified accusations of political jobbery. McLean’s aim to become a pastoralist in his own right was realised when in 1856 he applied for the Crown lease of 8500 acres at Maraekakaho, taking it up in 1857. During the following two years he obtained the freehold of 2000 acres of his Maraekakaho block and went on to increase his holding to some 50,000 acres albeit with dangerously high indebtedness. McLean’s public and private activities contributed to the tension that was about to erupt at Pakiaka.

**The Battle of Pakiaka**

Te Moananui, Tareha, and Karaitiana Takamoana were not happy with McLean’s negotiating process and his ongoing partiality in dealing with Te Hapuku and Hineipaketia. This was fuelled by Te Hapuku interfering in the efforts of the opposing chiefs to stop land sales in favour of leasing, as well as claiming the right to sell Heretaunga lands to the Government, and demanding payment from Tawhara’s block. Te Moananui, Karaitiana, and Tareha were ‘equally determined to commence a war’ if any payment was made.

The sales of 1854 and the ongoing land quarrels over land eventually led to an outbreak of fighting between Te Moananui, and Te Hapuku at Pakiaka in 1857. Pakiaka bush, a three hundred acre stand of kahikatea surrounded by swamp, was prized as one of the few sources of timber on the Heretaunga plains. Te Hapuku camped at Whakawhiti in August 1857 next to the Pakiaka bush and Moananui

---

361 Buchanan, *The Maori History and Place Names of Hawke’s Bay*: pp.56-57.
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occupied Tanenuiarangi.\footnote{Ibid., pp.56-57.} Samuel Williams\footnote{Samuel Williams arrived in 1854 as a replacement for Colenso. Sybil M. Woods, \textit{Samuel Williams of Te Aute: A Biography} (Christchurch: Pegasus, 1981).} whose first language was Maori, and who had established a close relationship with the people,\footnote{Samuel Williams daughter, Lydia, was given the name Hineipaketia. Article translated by Hirini Moko Mead and June Mead “E ono tau a Hamiora Wiremu,” \textit{Te Toa Takitini}, 1 Oketoba 1929.} negotiated with Te Moananui to allow Te Hapuku to continue to camp there and gather firewood at Pakiaka Bush on the proviso that he would not construct a pa.\footnote{AJHR, “The Land Purchase Department Relative to the Extinguishment of Native Title in the Ahuriri District,” pp.333-34.} A large flagstaff had been in place for some months with a notice warning Te Hapuku’s party not to cut wood in the big bush. In the weeks leading up to the outbreak of fighting, Samuel Williams and Father Reignier had been ‘indefatigable in their endeavours to preserve peace’. In early August, McLean and Cooper had ridden between the two parties as they had nearly come to blows. Just prior to McLean leaving the district ‘the two chiefs had met and rubbed noses’.\footnote{“Ahuriri,” p.2.} However, according to Cooper, Te Hapuku continued to behave belligerently. Interpreting the ‘quiet demeanour’ of Te Moananui’s party as fear, and ignoring the earlier agreement, Te Hapuku proceeded to fell growing timber to erect a pa, despite having been warned that this would be seen as an act of war. Te Moananui asked Te Hapuku to stop, but Te Hapuku’s party ‘shouted defiantly’. Te Moananui announced ‘my rope is broken’ and fighting broke out. Te Moananui’s party would ‘not be content until Te Hapuku is either dead or driven back to Poukawa’.\footnote{AJHR, “The Land Purchase Department Relative to the Extinguishment of Native Title in the Ahuriri District,” pp.333-34.} An eyewitness account of a visit to Whakatu during the Pakiaka battle was published,

‘...the Maories very civilly stopped fighting to allow the pakeha to pass. A mighty army was supposed to be encamped in front of the besieged pa, but I confess that I could not see the men; each warrior had dug a grave (probably to bury an enemy in when he caught one) and had concealed himself...one Maori...concluded that to be seen by the enemy meant instant death...however finding after about half an hour that he was still alive he took it into his sapient head that he was invulnerable and exposed himself a little; finding that he still lived he jumped out of his rifle pit and yelled “I cannot be struck by your guns.”
The Waihiku (a brother of the Hapuku) let him dance about for a moment until he became a little calmer, and then from his loophole he shot him dead... replying to the challenge as the smoke cleared away “mate rawa!” (quite dead)...several chiefs on both sides were killed, including the chief in command at Whakatu (Puhera). From what I have been able to gather the Hapuku had forced his way among the leading chiefs, until he threatened to jostle them on one side and assume chief command... [Hapuku] was always willing to commit to matrimony...at the shortest notice if the wife elect had any rank or property... Just as relations between Te Hapuku and Te Moananui became rather strained the tie between them was broken by the death Te Hapuku’s “wife” who was a sister or cousin (it is all one among the Maories) of Te Moananui. The bereavement would have drawn the rival chiefs together in the sympathy of sorrow, but an unfortunate thing came to pass...the box...was found to be too short... [and as it] would not stand cutting the deceased body must, and accordingly the head or feet were detached...Te Moananui did not approve of what had been done...Soon after [Te Hapuku] attempted to take timber from the land claimed by others, and one party fired on the other and war broke out between two hapus of the same tribe, and all because that wretched box was too short!...»

Hineipaketia’s husband, Puhara Hawaikirangi, was killed during the battle of Pakiaka in December of that year. Puhara was the patron of the Roman Catholic mission at Pakowhai, and his loss was considered to be of particular significance to settlers. Urepene Puhara later recalled ‘My father was killed at Pakiaka fight. He was fighting on Te Hapuku’s side. Till the fight Hapuku had not the mana over the land – Hira [te Ota] had’. Urepene went on to say that Moananui, Karaitiana, Tareha and Henare Tomoana were testing Hapuku’s mana as a land seller. ‘My father [Puhara] was unwilling to join in the war but was flattered by Hapuku & aided him’. Hineipaketia stated that ‘Leading up to the Pakiaka fight, Te Heipora and Te Hapuku ‘exercised mana over Heretaunga. Heipora exercised mana over the lands’. After

372 "Thirty Years Ago," Bush Advocate, 16 April 1889, p.2.
373 Napier Minute Book 14, pp.291-92.
374 Ibid., pp.269-70.
Te Heipora’s death she said ‘I was with Hapuku & he exercised it over the land and others’. Hineipaketaia remained loyal to Te Hapuku. She recounted that

‘There was a bush at Pakiaka. It was one of the causes of the fight. Te Hapuku had mana over Heretaunga and Pakiaka. They were fighting with Moananui about the ownership of the forest. Te Hapuku did not sell any of the timber. I don’t know anything connected with the cutting of that timber’.

Arihi Te Nahu believed that the fighting at Pakiaka would not have happened if her father Karanema had been alive,

‘from the time of marriage of Te Heipora & Hapuku up to fight of Pakiaka my father would have had the mana over the land & people. It was his death that caused the fight. My mother was niece of Moananui & my father was continually visiting him. If he had lived he would have acted as one who maintained peace. Te Hapuku had mana over the land from the marriage up to fight. He sold parts of block to Government at different parts. No one objected…I don’t know of anyone having mana but Hapuku between marriage and fight…Hapuku left…because all the chiefs of Wairarapa & [illegible] asked him to desist from further broils as the interests he was maintaining were really Heipora’s’.

Te Heipora’s bones had been buried at Whakatu ‘this side of the Karamu…they were removed from Whakatu and taken to Kaukauroa after Pakiaka fight’.

Samuel Williams recalled events that led to Pakiaka.

‘I visited Hawke’s Bay in 53 and came to reside in 54…I was acquainted with Te Hapuku from the very first…I have had frequent conversations with Hapuku as to his claim to Heretaunga & he always said he had none…Hapuku was one person who was intended to be dealt with in the Pakiaka fight. The fight was not about Pakiaka lands, but lands generally’.

---

375 Hineipaketaia recalled that Te Hapuku took Henare Tomoana ‘to his place to be a person of consequence with him’ She said Henare lived with Karanema and not long after Karanema died. Ibid.
376 Hineipaketaia giving evidence at the 1888 Te Karamu hearing. Ibid., p.270.
377 Evidence of Arhi Te Nahu at the Te Karamu hearing in 1888. Ibid., p.267.
378 Ibid., p.264.
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On Wednesday 3 March 1858 the bodies of the principal men killed during the war had been removed,

‘but several others were still lying in the little burial ground attached to the Catholic Mission Pakowhai; and the lamentations of the women as they sat around the graves, near the dismantled Mission House, could not fail, under those peculiar circumstances, to impress even those accustomed to the native tangi. On the evening of 4 March Te Hapuku set his pa at Wakatu on fire – that morning nearly all people and goods had been removed to the opposite side of the river...Natives were seen running up and down outside the pa, throwing in beams and posts and then firing off their guns...The only building left standing was the little church outside the defences. On Friday morning after a war dance and an unlimited discharge if firearms te Hapuka and his tribe left for Pukawa, accompanied by Mr. McLean’. 380

Hineipaketaia’s husband, Puhara, was buried a little downstream from the Pakowhai bridge and the spot was named Puhara. 381 Hineipaketaia later married Nepia, the son of Te Hapuku and Te Heipora. 382

The 4000 acre Karanema’s reserve was sold to the Crown on 5 March 1858 for £800. 383 The rectangular block stretched from the old Ngaruroro 384 to the top of the hills behind. The land that was intended to be kept ‘for the descendants of Te Heipora forever’ was held for just three years after the original 1855 sale of the Te Mata block. The exact machinations behind the purchase remain unresolved and are currently the subject of a claim. 385 Cowie surmises that the alienation occurred due to competitive selling by the Ngati Te Whatuiaipiti and Ngati Kahungunu hapu and he concludes that Te Moananui was responsible for the sale of Karanema’s Reserve as

381 Buchanan, The Maori History and Place Names of Hawke’s Bay: pp.56-57.
382 Napier Minute Book 22 A, p.314.
384 The old Ngaruroro was to be named the Plassey in reference to the mutiny in the Bengal Army. The old Ngaruroro is now known as the Karamu Stream.
385 The alienation of Karanema’s Reserve is the subject of a claim by the descendants of Te Heipora. The Karanema Reserve Claim (Wai 574) was lodged over twenty years ago and is currently in the process of negotiation.
he had defeated Te Hapuku at Pakiaka. However Te Hapuku was paid £400 on 5 March 1858, the day after he left Pakiaka in the company of McLean and Cooper. This payment is clearly an inducement for Te Hapuku to leave and was part of government policy to use conflict as a means to purchase land. The government also paid for carts hired from locals, brought in all manner of supplies, and widened roads to facilitate Te Hapuku’s removal. A few days later the sales of Porangahau and Tautane were pushed through by taking advantage of the volatile situation. The tension between the two factions remained. According to Colenso, in April 1858, ‘Hapuku heard “from soldiers travelling” that he was about to be attacked’. At the same time Karaitiana and Renata had heard that Te Hapuku was coming and had collected all their forces again at Pakiaka, and were preparing to march to Paki Paki to ambush him. Harawira Tatere’s son Wi, who was returning from Poukawa informed them that this was not the case and the group ‘vented their piri in a great deal of firing’.

It would be another six months before a peace settlement was eventually finalised. In the meantime, Cooper reported that Te Hapuku wished to sell ‘a small and almost valueless’ piece of land at Poukawa, on which he wanted a ‘grog shop and provision store, with one or two other shops’ to be established. Cooper also advised that the Takapau block ‘would be best left alone for the present, until matters are on a more satisfactory footing between Te Hapuku and Hori Niania and at Porangahau’. Te Moananui remained irate about the delay in settling the sale of Kaokaoroa, Ngatarawa and Ruahine. According to Cooper, Te Moananui had threatened to import an army from the Waikato, and exterminate Te Hapuku if payment for his lands was withheld on account of Te Hapuku’s opposition.

Some two months after Te Hapuku had left Pakiaka, Cooper informed McLean that ‘Karanema’s reserve can easily be purchased from Te Hira and his party, but at a

386 Cowie, Hawke’s Bay: pp.41, 54-55.
387 Porangahau was sold on 10 March 1858. Turton, Maori Deeds of Land Purchases in the North Island of New Zealand Vol.II: p.522.
388 Tautane was sold on 11 March 1858. Ibid., p.524.
390 Letter from Cooper to McLean dated 10 May 1858. AJHR, “The Land Purchase Department Relative to the Extinguishment of Native Title in the Ahuriri District,” p.337.
391 Letter from Cooper to McLean dated 29 July 1858. Ibid., p.338.
cost not less than that paid to Te Hapuku - £400’.\textsuperscript{392} This demonstrates McLeans understanding of the workings of mana. Te Hira, Te Moananui and their allies were essentially forced to accept the payment. A meeting was held at Tanenuiarangi on 17 September which was attended by Ngati Whatuiapiti with the exception of a small number including Te Hapuku, Te Haurangi, and Hori Niania. It was unanimously agreed that the system of selling land through chiefs should be abandoned and in future any person guilty of selling property or misappropriating payment should be punished with death. A gift of thirty stands of arms with cartouche boxes and ammunition, and a woman, was made to the visitors who in return gave a woman and some horses. Four days feasting followed with a tangi for those killed at Pakiaka,\textsuperscript{393} and the deed of sale was signed on 29 September 1858. On 5 November 1858 the payment of £400 was made to Te Moananui, Hira te Ota, Henare Te Ota, Karaitiana Takamoana, and Tareha and others.\textsuperscript{394}

The government worked quickly to establish settlers on the block. By 1860 the town sections of Havelock\textsuperscript{395} had been laid out and snapped up with speculators and large land owners. The two auctions realised some £937 and the purchasers included Colonial Secretary William Stafford and Superintendent of the Province of Hawke’s Bay, T H Fitzgerald. William Colenso also purchased a town section that would later be used as the pound.\textsuperscript{396} Te Heipora has only recently been commemorated, but not without public dissent.\textsuperscript{397} The old Ngaruroro was to have been renamed the River Plassey,\textsuperscript{398} commemorating the 1857 mutiny in the Bengal army. The mutiny had been caused by British interference with the caste system ‘that disturbed the power

\textsuperscript{392} Letter from Cooper to McLean dated 10 May 1858. Ibid., p.337.
\textsuperscript{393} The others who did not attend were Paora Kopakau, Ropata Te Waiariki, te Waka Rewharewha, Maika Iwikatea, and ‘a few of their immediate retainers’. Ibid., pp.340-41.
\textsuperscript{394} Turton, \textit{Maori Deeds of Land Purchases in the North Island of New Zealand Vol.II}: p.526.
\textsuperscript{395} Havelock was renamed Havelock North to avoid confusion with Havelock in Te Waipounamu.
\textsuperscript{397} Naming a street Te Heipora Place in a new Havelock North subdivision created a furore with residents claiming it had no relevance and that they would not be able to pronounce it. “Street Naming Stirs Up Tensions,” \textit{The New Zealand Herald}, 6 August 2010.
relations within which they were located’. The township of Havelock was established as a result of similar disturbances caused by interfering with the mana of the Heretaunga and Ahuriri chiefs.

More land continued to be sold by Te Hapuku, Hineipaketia, and their associates. In 1859 the Ruataniwha North and Ruahine blocks were sold, followed by Omarutairi (Takapau), although a 1000 acre reserve was set aside for Hori Niania and Hineipaketia. The other block disposed of was Kereru in which Te Hapuku signed on behalf of Arihi, his eight year old granddaughter.

By 1869 Pakiaka was about to disappear. A steam saw mill was rapidly rendering the ‘Big Bush’ a ‘little grove’. Messrs. Nelson occupied some 2000 acres of ‘excellent land’ to the south-west of the Big Bush including sixty acres of fine flax bushes providing the raw material for the flax mill they had erected. The following year the boiling down works next to the Big Bush were almost completed. The area was being fenced, when an error in the survey became apparent. When ‘the natives’ discovered that the land occupied, as described in the Crown Grant, was not the land sold by them to the Government they stopped fencing. McLean then negotiated with the owner of the land and persuaded them to lease to the company.

Te Hapuku continued to spend the proceeds of his land sales and leases. Racing horses was a particular passion. His laconic sense of humour was apparent in naming a grey gelding, Satan. On one occasion in 1860, at the close of a two day race meeting, Te Hapuku was short of money and ‘requiring more refreshments of a liquid nature’ he demanded some from the publican, who refused. Te Hapuku ‘coolly walked into the booth and handed out case after case of brandy, rum, gin’ and when remonstrated with, replied *turi turi* or shut up. However when Te Hapuku received

---

401 Ibid., p.539.
402 Ibid., p.541.
404 Mr. Cashmore’s Steam Saw Mills "Explanatory," *Hawke's Bay Herald*, 2 September 1870, p.3.
405 “Waipukurau Races,” *Hawke’s Bay Herald*, 19 February 1859, p.3.
his next quarters rent he gave the proprietor £30, some £5 more than his loss as ‘he utu ma taku waipiro or payment for my grog’.406

There was a great deal of concern over Te Hapuku’s continuing loyalty to the Crown after Pakiaka. The Maori King Movement or Kingitanga which had been formed in 1858 to unite the tribes in response to the ongoing pressure to sell land was gathering momentum. Cooper comforted himself that Te Hapuku, ‘will never acknowledge a Maori King, submit to any decisions of any Maori Runanga...or join any league to oppose the sale of land to the Government: he is too ambitious for one, too haughty and imperious the other, and too avaricious for the third’.407 Hineipaketia had written to the Maori King Te Wherowhero about land she had sold at Takapau. The situation was volatile and she was not at all keen to attend a meeting at Takapau about opposition to it. On 11 December 1859 Cooper wrote to McLean about the difficulties.

‘The Takapau looks very queer. I have made two or three attempts to go but though the natives never refused they did not start. At last all was arranged [then] Hineipaketia told me that she had written to the Maori King to tell him to send orders to the runanga to give up their opposition and she said that until she receives his Majesty’s answer she must decline going. She grounds her argument upon the professions of the King Party that they do not wish to interfere with land already sold to the Pakeha’.408

A short time later, Cooper reported that the Maori King flag had been hoisted at Te Hapuku’s pa. The raising of the flag took place when Te Hapuku was away in Wellington and he was reportedly ‘indignant’.409 Despite Te Hapuku’s public reaction, the occurrence would have caused a great deal of anxiety. The King Movement attracted attention in Hawke’s Bay, but did not gain much traction.

407 AJHR, “The Land Purchase Department Relative to the Extinguishment of Native Title in the Ahuriri District,” pp.341-42.
409 AJHR, “The Land Purchase Department Relative to the Extinguishment of Native Title in the Ahuriri District,” pp.351-52.
However the associated runanga or tribal council did. Colenso considered that the runanga had immense power in Hawke’s Bay, even more than in the Waikato. He reported that lands that had been paid for were now ‘sought by the runanga to be restored and both the Te Aute and Middle Roads are sought to be halted’. At Porangahau, Te Kuru had been paid £130 and Wi, £300. Most of this had been spent but the runanga collected the money and sought to return it firstly to the Provincial Government, who refused to have anything to do with it, and then to the General Government. Colenso also reported that ‘The “Queen” (Hineipaketia) and the Chief Hori Niania also publicly sold some of their land to Mr. McLean for £300. – this is also sought to be set aside by the runanga’.

‘Drunkenness, which had lately been increasing to a fearful extent amongst the Natives, has now almost disappeared; and acts of violence, such as seizing horses &c. amongst themselves rarely now occur. The action of the Runangas will, however, I am sorry to say, effectually put a stop to sales of land to the Government in those parts of the district to which their influence extends...But the evil is not altogether unmixed for they have also removed the chance of further bloodshed by preventing lands from being sold by claimants with doubtful titles; or, what is still more dangerous, by rightful and acknowledged claimants, against the wishes of the majority of those interested’.

In 1860 Te Hapuku took part in the Kohimarama conference at Mission Bay in Auckland. At the invitation of Governor Browne, some two hundred chiefs had gathered to discuss land and governance issues that had arisen in the twenty years since the signing of the Treaty. The meeting which continued for three to four weeks was chaired by Donald McLean and essentially sought affirmation of Maori loyalty to the Crown. Browne indicated that Maori disloyalty might lead to their being deprived of the rights and privileges of British citizens. According to one witness, Te Hapuku’s reaction was that he would ‘be quiet until he was slapped in the

410 “To the Editor,” Hawke’s Bay Herald, 22 October 1859, p.5.
411 AJHR, “The Land Purchase Department Relative to the Extinguishment of Native Title in the Ahuriri District,” pp.350-51
412 Orange, An Illustrated History of the Treaty of Waitangi: pp.63-64.
While he was away, Te Hapuku’s favourite wife Hinerangia, who Colenso had previously noted was short of food, took ill and died of influenza.\footnote{413}{AJHR, “Despatches from the Governor of New Zealand to the Secretary of State,” Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives A-05(1865): p.45.}

The following year Te Hapuku’s old adversary Te Moananui died. According to Blake, Te Moananui was ‘a man of splendid physique, a modern Hercules, with a naturally graceful and dignified comportment’. Hapuku on the other hand was considered ‘more of a savage, alike in disposition and appearance. He was thick set of medium height and had a face on which was stamped determination and dogged bravery attributes that were considerably enhanced by the elaborate tattooing with which, with the exception of his eyelids, it was completely covered’.\footnote{415}{Blake, Sixty Years in New Zealand: p.38.}

A correspondent named ‘Kokiri’ at Te Moananui’s tangi at Matahiwi in early 1862. When Te Hapuku arrived,

\begin{quote}
‘the spirit of destruction and slaughter seemed to have taken possession of the old cannibal, as rushing ahead of his men, panting and foaming from the excitement of the just concluded war dance, his savage eyes glittering like those of some ferocious wild beast he bounded amongst those within. As he was advancing towards the welcoming tribe, they had merely looked on his actions as a mimic until he shouted a terrible war cry and one or two had fallen under his clubbed musket, when he was overpowered by numbers and held fast while this suddenly developed fit of cannibalistic madness lasted. Hapuku’s extraordinary conduct was however overlooked or taken by the majority of the “Ngatikahungunus” as a compliment to the mana of their departed chieftain.’
\end{quote}

This observer described Te Hapuku as above medium height, thick set and square, his face was completely covered from the top of his broad forehead to the lower part of a determined and massive chin, by most artistic and elaborate lines of tattoo. He had seen Te Hapuku \textit{des habille} \footnote{416}{Des habilles meaning naked or partly clothed.} and this ‘species of ornamentation was by no means confined to that part of his anatomy’.\footnote{417}{“Some Chieftains,” Press, 3 December 1894, p.3.}
Te Hapuku continued to extract payments for land. He was paid £280 for Northwood’s homestead block at Pourere.\textsuperscript{418} Northwood had leased land prior to the Government purchases and his homestead block was included in a 448 acre reserve. Hapuku claimed an extension of the southern boundary to Tuina, about 2500 acres more than the original quantity.\textsuperscript{419} Hineipaketia and Te Hapuku had also been actively assisting McLean in the Wairarapa purchases including the Mataoperu, Whareama No. 2, Te Awaiti, parts of Pahaua, Wharekaka, Maramamau, Wakataki Reserve (Puketoi) Ruamahanga, and Rongomaia.

In 1861, Samuel Williams wrote to the Editor of the \textit{Hawke's Bay Herald} distancing himself from government land purchase methods,

\begin{quote}
‘it is to say the least a great mistake to suppose that I have at any time approved of all the acts of the Land Purchase Commissioners...I sincerely hope that every allowance will be made for the present feeling of irritation in the Maori mind...caused by the neglect and injudicious proceedings of the Government...’\textsuperscript{420}
\end{quote}

Land sales continued to provide the bulk of the income for some Maori during the 1850s but in Hawke’s Bay it was drying up. The Native Lands Acts of 1862 and 1865 would soon be passed, and the Native Land Court established.\textsuperscript{421} These new mechanisms would usher in a further wave of land alienation and in the coming decade Te Hapuku and Hineipaketia would be just as vigorous in establishing their omnipotence as they had in the previous one.

\textsuperscript{418} Turton, \textit{Maori Deeds of Land Purchases in the North Island of New Zealand Vol.II}: p.546.
\textsuperscript{419} AJHR, “The Land Purchase Department Relative to the Extinguishment of Native Title in the Ahuriri District,” p.383.
\textsuperscript{420} "To the Editor," \textit{Hawke's Bay Herald}, 20 August 1861, p.2.
\textsuperscript{421} Boast, \textit{Buying the Land, Selling the Land: Governments and Maori Land in the North Island 1865-1921}: p.26.
Chapter Three

‘I Liked His Money and He Liked My Land’: Division, Debt, and Destitution

The establishment of the Native Land Court heralded an era in which women were forced to establish their rights in Crown Grants within the new legal framework. In order to establish customary interests within the introduced legal system, Maori women were compelled to participate in lengthy and expensive Native Land Court hearings. The year 1862 saw the introduction of the Native Lands Act which replaced the Crown right of preemption that had framed land tenure during the 1850s. In particular, Section 23 of the 1865 Native Lands Act enabled ‘the extinction of customary Maori tenure’. 422 The legislation allowed only ten individuals to be entered as owners when a certificate of title was issued. Under the new rules land could be be sold directly to Europeans. The notorious ten-owner rule made it easier for land to be alienated. An individual could initiate an investigation into a block of land, forcing those who had an interest to establish their rights. Associated expenses exacted a heavy toll often leaving claimants heavily in debt. 423 Dispossession was invariably the outcome for those who were not of high enough rank or lacked the resources to establish their rights. The subsequent Native Land Act of 1873 allowed for the inclusion of all owners which in many cases were in the hundreds and allowed large tracts of land to be partitioned into small blocks. Fragmentation made it easier for blocks to be purchased piecemeal. 424 The Crown goal was to establish individual title to land in order to further undermine collectivism. 425 Justice Minister Henry Sewell stated that in order ‘to bring the great bulk of the lands in the Northern Island...within the reach of colonisation’, it was necessary to bring about ‘the detribalisation of the Maori...to destroy, if possible, the principle of communism upon which their social system is based...which stands as a barrier in the way of all attempts to amalgamate the Maori race into our social and political system’. 426 The system caused conflict as owners’ jostled for position. Witnesses were sometimes

422 Williams, "Te Kooti Tango Whenua": The Native Land Court 1864-1909: p.71.
423 Orange, An Illustrated History of the Treaty of Waitangi: p.82.
424 Ibid.
overtly and covertly persuaded to distort evidence and often challenged those of higher rank. On one occasion in 1867 Hapuku was forcibly ejected from the Court for disorderly behaviour.\textsuperscript{427}

Mortgages were also increasingly becoming an instrument by which land was being alienated. In 1869 Francis Hamlin wrote to Ormond asking that George Worgan’s native interpreters license be revoked due to,

\begin{quote}
‘the wholesale manner in which lands are being alienated from the natives under the deceptive cloak of mortgage...this scheme is not a general thing, but is carried on by one person in particular (Mr. Sutton) who is assisted in doing so by Mr. G. B. Worgan...several natives have come into town without the slightest idea of treating with their lands: they have been watched in the street by Mr. Sutton...introduced as a rule to a glass or two of spirits, then into the shop where he or she is invited to take an unlimited quantity of goods, - at the same time the Deed is introduced and requested to be signed which, considering the state they are in, is not generally refused...the natives will be made destitute, will consequently resort to stealing and highway robberies together with all other attending evils’.\textsuperscript{428}
\end{quote}

Sutton claimed that Hamlin has sought revenge as he had removed his native work from Hamlin.\textsuperscript{429} In an extract from a private letter written in 1869 he wrote,

\begin{quote}
‘Yesterday in town I heard from pretty good authority, that G. Worgan had recently been to Waipukurau trying to get Arihia [sic] to sign some document (mortgage I suppose). Gold to the amount of £100 had been offered her, and grog ad libitum given, to induce her to sign it, but in vain, she would not. I hope the government will timely see to this kind of work; an immense deal of it has been and is being transacted here which will assuredly bear bitter fruits’.\textsuperscript{430}
\end{quote}

The problem came to the attention of Attorney General James Prendergast. He wrote to McLean,

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{429} John Davies Ormond Papers 45/307 9037 74181, (Hawke's Bay Museums Trust Archive).
\textsuperscript{430} It is noted that Arihi is a granddaughter of Te Hapuku aged about 18 and that she is a married woman. Private letter dated 21 October 1869. Ibid.
\end{flushright}
‘I believe that the number of persons in Napier who are disposed to avail themselves of this willingness on the part of the natives to denude themselves of their means is considerable... I think it would be well at once to revoke Mr. Worgan’s license and to revoke the licenses of all interpreters...the legislation has given every facility to Natives for disposing of their property and I do not see how government can control it’.

Prendergast considered that any investigation was beyond the means of the Government. He stated that ‘It is the responsibility of the interpreters to carefully explain the nature of the transaction and be certain that the transaction is not only well understood but ‘beneficial to the Native sellers’.'  

An example of the workings of the Native Lands Acts in Hawke’s Bay, is one involving Hokomata, also known as Mereana Cannon, a close relative of Hineipaketia and Te Hapuku. Her name, along with seven others, was on the Crown Grant that had been contracted to be sold to a publican named Ellingham, for the sum of £320. Hokomata’s husband William Alexander Cannon stated that she made an X on the parchment without knowing what she was signing. Worgan handed her £1 as he was acting for Ellingham. ‘Recovering any portion of the purchase money from the other grantees on Cannon and his wife’s behalf is very remote, business under the native Lands Act can only be transacted through persons licensed by the government...[so] some enquiry should be made into the circumstances.’

Worgan, by way of explanation, said ‘Hoko Mata was placed on the grants more from the indifference of Te Hapuku than any other reason, the real owner...is Te He [Hineipaketia] wife of Hapuku’s brother’. Worgan said that both sales would have occurred earlier ‘but the natives hoped by delay to force a higher price from the tenants’. The amount paid was ‘at least six times the intrinsic value of the land’. He declined to interfere in the distribution of the £300 and was of the opinion that Hokomata had got more she was entitled to and that Ellingham had been subjected to ‘Native extortion unsparingly’. Hokomata later claimed she was cheated by Hineipaketia. Hokomata said ‘I wanted money, and therefore I executed the

431  Letter dated 11 November 1869 from Attorney-General James Prendergast to the Hon. Native Minister Donald McLean. Ibid.  
432  Letter dates 24 December 1869 from J. N. Wilson to McLean. Ibid.  
433  Letter dated 24 December 1869 from John Wilson to the Native Minister. Ibid.
conveyance. I received £2 in consideration of my interest in that land. Heipora alias Hine Paketia told me when she gave £1 out of the £2, that it was to satisfy my claim as a grantee of that land; but I did not reply to that word of hers’. Hokomata also stated that she had as much right as Te Hapuku and others to lands in the Crown grants of which Te Hapuku’s name is placed. It was also noted that ‘...according to native custom, a man has no authority over the land of his wife’. Boast’s view of the Native Lands Acts is that it is unclear whether individualization was designed to encourage alienation of land, but that it undoubtedly had that effect.

Boast has highlighted the lack of research on women involved in Native Land Court proceedings. He notes that ‘the role played by women in the Native Land Court and Crown granting process is not well understood and could do with more research’. As a generalisation, he considers that women did not play an important role in cases during the ten-owner era from 1865-1873, but in later years some women did become very important in the Court process. In his most recent work Boast acknowledges the difficulty of establishing a definitive list of grantees, due to the spelling errors, illegible hand writing, and persons who were known by several different names. Allowing for these factors, and based on the 1874 official census carried out by Samuel Locke in 1874, which Boast refers to as ‘notoriously unreliable’, he calculates that some two-thirds of the population were not included in Crown Grants. Rank played a central role in who could be admitted as land owner. Boast analysed individual interests under the ten-owner rule between 1866 and 1874. Karaitiana Takamoana heads the list with thirty blocks and Te Hapuku is second.

434 It seems that this is another example of the assumption of the name. Te Hei may be a shortened version of Te Heipora.


438 See footnote 53. Ibid., p.77.

439 Ibid., p.76. See also AJHR, “Approximate Census of the Maori Population. (Compiled by Officers in Native Districts),” Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives G-07(1874): p.12.

440 The population of Hawke’s Bay south of the Tangoio River was 1870. Even when allowing for error in comparison to the number of grantees Boast’s figures indicate that some two-thirds of the native population were not named in any grants. Boast, The Native Land Court: A Historical Study, Cases and Commentary 1862-1887: pp.76-77.
with nineteen blocks. Hineipaketia is placed seventh equal with interests granted in ten blocks. Hoera Pareihe, the son of Ani Matenga Te Patukaikino\textsuperscript{441} and Urepene Puhara the son of Puhara Hawaikirangi rank alongside her. The other women in the list are her close relative Hokomata who is ranked tenth equal with seven blocks, and Akenahi Patoka,\textsuperscript{442} Pukeptuke Tangiora\textsuperscript{443} and Ani ‘Kauere’(Kanara?) who are eleventh equal with six blocks each.\textsuperscript{444}

![Figure 5. Arihi Te Nahu and Hineipaketia? Courtesy Alexander Turnbull Library\textsuperscript{445}](image)

Rank also affected the delivery of justice under the runanga system. In 1862 at the age of eleven, Hineipaketia’s adopted daughter Arihi Te Nahu was sexually assaulted twice and the runanga delivered justice. In the first case an old man of sixty named Wera was found guilty and several of the older men wanted to kill him. The runanga majority rule was that he be outlawed and ‘any pah village or persons found sheltering him would be fined’. It was reported that Wera ran off into the bush. In the

\textsuperscript{441} Hoera Pareihe is the child referred to by McLean at the Waipukurau land sale meetings.

\textsuperscript{442} Wife of Henare Tomoana

\textsuperscript{443} Briefly married to Pohuka Hapuku and then to Mohi Te Atihikoia

\textsuperscript{444} See Boast’s Table: Allocation of Individual Interests by Block 1866-1874. Boast, The Native Land Court: A Historical Study, Cases and Commentary 1862-1887: p.77.

\textsuperscript{445} The unknown woman in the photograph may be Hineipaketia. She is seated which according to protocol indicates that she is of higher status.
second incident the nameless perpetrator was fined £50 and Arihi fined £10. Arihi’s fine was later reversed as she was of higher rank than anybody there, and ‘they thought they had not the right to fine her’. Arihi married Hiraka Te Aroatua, the son of Hori Niania (Te Aroatua), continuing a pattern of strengthening family lines. They had four children all of whom died in childhood. The fifth child Mepera Makurutang was born in 1867. Arihi later said the father was a white man. It is a matter of local knowledge that the father was William Rathbone who was 35 years old and married with a family. She then ran away to Wellington with ‘convicted felon’ Hebberly. She returned with Hebberly and they lived at Te Aute in 1870.

**Te Hapuku’s Financial Troubles**

During the 1860s, with his financial position deteriorating, Te Hapuku continued to accumulate debt. This was exacerbated by his love of racing horses. He and Hineipaketaia and others owed Henry Russell substantial sums of money. In 1870 Ormond wrote to McLean enclosing the reports from Turton, the Trusts Commissioner. The deed of trust purported to convey the whole of the estate and interest of Te Hapuku, to the Hon. H. R. Russell and T. P. Russell, Esq., J. P.

Turton examined Te Hapuku who admitted that he had signed the document but denied that he had given Messrs. Russell the power to sell. Ormond noted that Russell was Te Hapuku’s principal creditor. Russell was in possession of a flock of 3,000 sheep and the run belonging to Te Hapuku, taken under a bill of sale for £700. McLean asked Ormond to take steps to protect Te Hapuku’s interests in

---

447 Napier Minute Book 39, p.300.
448 Napier Minute Book 61, p.13.
449 At Ellerslie in Auckland ‘there was no race for Maori horses, though a Maori horse made an appearance in one of the races; nor were there any of those mixed foot races, Maori and Pakeha, which though perhaps infradig at a great Equestrian display...exacted a great deal of kindly interest among the competitors of both races.’ Hurricane contested the Innkeepers Purse and was expected to perform well but commenced ‘buck-jumping at a furious rate, throwing his rider’ ending his chances. Hurricane was scratched from the £100 Metropolitan Plate the next day.” *The Auckland Races,* *Hawke's Bay Herald*, 14 January 1862, p.2.
450 Amounts entered as owing in the Mount Herbert Ledger and Cash Books:
1867-1879 are Te Hapuku £922 5s 7d, Hine Puketia £75 19s, Arihi £386, Hori Niania £233 3s, 1872-1877? Hiraka £253 8s, Henei Pakitea £139 3s, Haurangi £12, Uripepu Puhera £93 3s 2d, Nepia £15, Watene £57 12s, Arihi £2,294 5s 10d.
1875-1878 Hori Nia Nia £161 16s, Nepia 261 12s 5d, Haurangi £135 2s, Henei Pakitea £179 16s 4d.
See *Mount Herbert Ledger Book 1867-1879,* (Hawke’s Bay Museums Trust Archive). See also *Mount Herbert Cash Books 1867-1877,* (Hawke’s Bay Museums Trust Archives).
consideration of the long friendship he had with the Europeans. Ormond recommended that Te Hapuku assign the management of his property to Messrs. Locke and Lyndon. Te Hapuku agreed, but the majority of his creditors refused to assent and some wished to bankrupt him.\textsuperscript{451} On one occasion Te Hapuku was travelling by buggy in Napier when it was seized and subsequently sold. The newspaper correspondent who reported this incident suggested Ormond was attempting to use Te Hapuku’s predicament to accuse H. R. Russell of fraudulently handling Te Hapuku’s affairs.\textsuperscript{452}

Turton reported that the debt of £739 15s 2d had accrued over the last ten years. ‘This sum would be reduced fully one-half were items for the sale of spirits not legally recoverable, and items the recovery of which is barred by the statute of limitations struck out of the accounts’.\textsuperscript{453} The sum claimed did not include the debts secured by mortgage to Henry Russell of £700 with further advances at 10 per cent, payable on demand in writing. Hapuku also had debts secured by mortgage to Messrs. Kinross and Newton. Hapuku’s personal property was worth £150.\textsuperscript{454} At this time Te Hapuku was trying to sell his interests in Waimarama as he was short of money.\textsuperscript{455} He informed Turton that his people would sell the Okaihau and Te Onepu blocks to pay his debts.\textsuperscript{456} He wrote to McLean ‘I am in trouble; it is not caused by any person, it is through my own fault – the craving of my heart for the food of the European. I am now suffering from my excesses; the cause of my trouble is rum.’\textsuperscript{457}

Te Hapuku’s granddaughter, Arihi Te Nahu did not support him at this time. On 18 December 1871 in response to Te Hapuku’s claim that he had neither mortgaged or sold his interest in the Raukawa East block, Arihi stated that Te Hapuku had wanted her to draw £60 from Mr. Kinross on account of the mortgage of her interest in the Raukawa East block, but she would not agree. Arihi made it clear that both she and

\textsuperscript{452} "Napier,” New Zealand Herald, 5 June 1878, p.3.
\textsuperscript{454} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{455} Journal entry August 1871. Walter Lorne Campbell Journals, (Patrick Parsons Private Collection).
Te Hapuku knew the document to be a conveyance. This demonstrates the tension created by the introduced legal framework.

Response to land sales generally, and the Heretaunga block and seventy mile bush in particular, encouraged the establishment of the Repudiation Movement in the 1870s which was led in Hawke’s Bay by Henare Matua. The aim of the Movement was to investigate all deeds of sale and lease and mortgage that had passed through the Native Land Court since 1866. Sheehan and Russell were very much attached to the movement. Russell was using it as a vehicle to cause embarrassment to his old adversaries, Ormond and McLean.

Te Hapuku remained in a precarious financial position. In December 1873, his creditors were served with a summons in relation to the bankruptcy proceedings. Te Hapuku’s creditors wish to sell twenty eight bales of wool worth £750 which was held at the fellmongery establishment of Henry Russell, but Te Hapuku and Russell would not permit it. The creditors wanted to stop Russell from interfering with the trust property. Josiah Pratt Hamlin stated that Te Hapuku would not allow the trustees to sell the wool as he wished to sell it himself and settle his own debts. Te Hapuku told Colenso he was unable to settle his account due to the tardiness of lease

---

460 The deed had been executed and signed by Te Hapuku and Henry Martyn Hamlin Licensed Interpreter, Edward Lyndon and Samuel Locke 24 August 1871. The creditors were William Colenso of Napier, Walter Hallett of Napier, Messrs. Neal & Close of Napier, William Ellingham of Te Aute, Carl Leopold of Tikokino, William Rathbone of Waipawa Josiah Pratt Hamlin Thomas Kenney Nelson or Nielsen Elizabeth Firth curator of the estate of S. B. Firth, Attached was a schedule of amounts owing and the witnesses signatures. William Colenso £172 11s 3d Kinross £238 10s 7s, T? R Newton £52 10s 1d, Neal & Close £166 and William Ellison £19 10s. The blocks of land attached to the schedule were Whatarakai, Pukekura East, Pukekura West, Pukerowhitī, Te Onepu, Koparakore, Waimarama, Okaihau, Te Aute No. 3, Te Aute No. 5, Te Aute No. 6, Waingahanga [sic], Waikawhiringa, Waipuk(u?), Patangata No. 2, Patangata No.4 totalling 41, 327 acres. The total amount owed to creditors was £1919 17s 7d. The value of his assets were £3644 2s 1d. The interest in some land was for rent accruing as the land was inalienable except by 21 year lease which included Town Sections 81 & 82 Napier and Section 42 Meeanee Spit. Included in the total were two promissory notes from Donald McLean for £81 16s and £47 6s respectively and 3000 sheep valued at £1000 in the possession of H. Russell. Bankruptcy Files: Te Hapuku Affadavit R23212182, (Archives New Zealand, Wellington, 1874).
payments owed to him. Colenso had sent a message to Arihi Te Nahu telling her she should pay part of his account as,

‘She is an heiress in her own right and possessed of a large income, she ought to pay a portion of my demand on him seeing such was for goods (clothing) supplied for her own use in her infancy and childhood (the sole reason I did not write to her direct, was the fact of her shamefully deserting her husband and children and taking up with the convicted felon Hebberley, this (my reason she also well knew). Her answer was that she would pay if Te Hapuku were dead and that my demand was right’. 461

Colenso goes on to say that Te Hapuku has received and squandered many thousands over the last 15 years.462

Arihi Te Nahu also experienced great difficulty in her dealings with Henry Russell. It was alleged that Russell, who was a member of the Legislative Council had taken lands and money in transactions particularly in relation to the Heretaunga block. Arihi Te Nahu and others published a letter in Te Waka Maori to that effect in 1876. The letter was signed by Mangai Uhuuhu, Kingi, Peka Wheraro, Hemaima, Te Wharekiore, and Te Kaho. It included the following extract.

‘He is a perfect Taniwha, this Henry Russell, in his capacity for devouring men; he has a throat like the Parata...we stipulated that Henry Russell was to cease cutting timber he was only to have the grass ; what remained of the timber was to be left for us to cut and sell to any Pakehas who might require timber or firewood...when he drew up the lease he omitted those conditions, and put in his own terms as he desired them...he had departed altogether from our terms, and therefore our signatures were affixed in ignorance...This I say that the evil of this Pakeha is great, exceeding that of any one of the Napier Pakehas; and we, the Maori owners of the land at the Aute, henceforth, disclaim all connection with him’.463

It was claimed that Russell had said,

---

461 Ibid.
462 Ibid.
463 “To the Editor,” Te Waka Maori, 11 July 1876, pp.168-69.
"If you will not let me have your land, you will come absolutely to grief, and I shall not assist you. And, further, you must pay me £50 per month on account of the monies advanced by me to you; you must do this every month until the thousands of pounds which you have received be repaid, that is, unless you lease your lands to me." And so, being intimidated by his threats, some of us agreed to his demands...I did not sign willingly and cheerfully. I have discovered that the whole procedure of this Pakeha, Henry Russell, is reprehensible that his doings are evil in the extreme...he beguiled Arihi te Nahu, a chieftainess of our people, because he wanted to get possession of her lands. He also dealt disingenuously with her with respect to her money in the bank he denied that she had any money there. The evil of this Pakeha is great. He has the habit of asking chiefs of influence among the Maoris to assist him in persuading other Maoris to give up their lands; this he does, thinking a chief's presence would overawe the Maoris, and induce them to let him have their lands.464

Urepene Puhara revealed the real writers of the letters and refuted Arihi’s claims:

‘All those who did send that letter were Mangai Uhuuhu, Hamiora Tupaea, and Arihi Te Nahu’... opened wide their mouths to swallow the money of Mr. H. R. Russell, and also of the Government, and when Mr. Russell will not give them any more money to buy spirits, then they run away to obtain money from the Government’... If Mr. Russell had not helped us, the Maori, people, in the days past, we should have all been dead we should have been like horse dung on the roads. Now friends, cease to speak evil of the names of Mr. Russell and Henare Matua, as they are the men against whom you have written your letter. If Mr. Russell should go from us and join the European side, what would become of us. Was it not Mr. Russell who has kept us alive even up to this day. You ought to remember that we are not of the Government who has caused death to come on us, but we now live as it were in plenty. How is it that I, an old man, can see these evils’.465

As a result of the letters published in Te Waka Maori a libel action ensued in 1877.

464 Ibid.
465 "To the Editor of the Wananga," Te Wananga, 26 August 1876, pp.319-20.
'Some months ago there appeared in the “Waka Maori” a letter signed by a Maori lady (Arihi Te Nahu) and three Maori gentlemen in which the Hon. Henry Russell was made the subject of sundry accusations, which it would be improper at this stage of the proceedings to specify minutely. In colonial parlance, the writers “made it hot” for the Hon. Mr. Russell. The latter now seeks his remedy ostensibly against the publisher and editor of the “Waka Maori” – but really against the Government-by claiming £10,000 as damages. We understand the line of defence is an endeavour to justify the alleged libel.'

During the proceeding in the Supreme Court in Wellington Arihi Te Nahu’s evidence occupied four full days’. Arihi’s evidence was said to be very interesting, ‘as showing how lands have been negotiated for with native females’. Her evidence also reveals conflict with Hineipaketia, when she declared ‘I never received any money for the timber off the Waipapa Block. I have received money for the timber off the Manukairakau. Te Hai [sic] gave me £20.’ When she was asked if she had accepted the £20 paid to her by Te Hei as compensation for all the timber that had been taken she replied, ‘No I was angry with Te Hei. I did not accept the £20 as payment in full for my timber’. Arihi appears to have been concerned about being left impoverished as she recalled ‘I was at Waipukurau and saw that Hori Niania had been deprived of his lands and was destitute, and I was afraid that we should suffer in a like manner’.

The libel case was horrendously expensive. Messrs. Buller and Lewis rendered a bill to the Government of £3,415 15s 3d, which after tax left £2,369 18s 11d. In 1880 witness expenses at 10s per day totalling £194 had not been paid. Among the twenty four witnesses were Hamiora Tupaea, Arihi Te Nahu, Hapuku Te Nahu, Paurini te

466 “The "Waka Maori" Libel Case," Press, 28 August 1877, p.3.
467 “The taking of evidence before the Commission in the Waka Maori libel case proceeded very slowly. ’The examination, and cross-examination, and re-examination of Arihi Te Nahu the first witness for the defence, called by Dr. Buller’ occupied four whole days. ”Napier," Evening Post, 25 July 1877, p.2.
468 Arihi Te Nahu was the second witness. Twenty more witnesses were yet to be heard besides ‘Russell’s Maori evidences’. “The Waka Maori Libel Case," Evening Post, 28 July 1877, p.2.
470 Ibid., p.3.
Whiti, Hokomata, and Hauraki Kautewhata. This is yet another example of how the legal framework disadvantaged Maori in Hawke’s Bay. The witnesses had to petition the government for reimbursement.472

The Death of Te Hapuku

Te Hapuku died in September 1878. He had suffered from a cancerous growth on his neck for some time.473 According to an article in the Hawke’s Bay Herald before Te Hapuku died two factions were fighting over his will. It reported that ‘Te Hapuku got tired out...he will sign no more documents brought to him by either side’. It was reported that he was to manufacture a will ‘out of his own brains’.474 On his death bed Te Hapuku said to his son Te Watene, ‘Do not copy me but protect your matua, hapu, and bring them here to live’.475 According to a newspaper report Grey had visited Te Hapuku just hours before his death. Grey had persuaded Te Hapuku’s old enemy Karaitiana Takamoana to accompany him. After initially refusing, Karaitiana had agreed to visit and it is said that the two men shed tears.476 After Te Hapuku’s death Te Wananga described the scene at Te Hauke,

‘...on the left and next to the coffin was Hene-i-Paketia [sic], a woman of rank equal to any chief in Hawke's Bay. Being one of the oldest women of rank, and closely related to Te Hapuku, she was the principal person in charge of the corpse. She stood in silence, but at times waved her hands to and fro. Next to her, and sitting in a crouching position, with her head bowed down, was the aged wife of Paora Kawaihata, weeping in a low voice, chanting a song of old, expressive of the sorrow of the living for those who have passed from this life’.477

473 A correspondent reported that Te Hapuku had suffered from a ‘cancerous ulcer of the neck’.
474 “It is Worthwhile Being a Maori Interpreter,” Hawke’s Bay Herald, 10 May 1878, p.2.
476 Karaitiana died a year later. "The "Life and Times of Sir George Grey."," Otago Witness, 9 June 1892, p.33.
477 “Funeral of the Late Te Hapuku,” p.286.
Te Hapuku wished to be buried near Hineipaketia’s husband Puhara Hawaikirangi who had been killed at Pakiaka. *Te Wananga* reported that the vault where Te Hapuku was to be interred,

`...had been built on a spot on which in former years had stood a large house which had been occupied by Te Hapuku, and near to which the noted chief Puhara had been buried. Some few days before the death of Te Hapuku, he was requested by the old chiefs to say where he wished to be buried. Some of them suggested that he should be conveyed to the old and sacred wahi tapu at Waimarama, where for ages his family had been buried. To this he demurred, and wished to be laid near Puhara, close to his then home, Te Hauke. Te Hapuku had spent much of his money, and the last months of his life in building two large houses near to where Puhara had been buried. These houses stand on the north side, about four hundred yards from the line of railway which passes in front of Te Hauke, in which settlement these houses stand; on the south, and about one hundred and fifty yards distant is the grave of Puhara. On the east of this grave is the vault in which Te Hapuku was laid`. 478

A free train was provided by the Government and some six hundred people arrived at Te Hauke. At Te Hauke six flags were flying. 479 *Te Wananga* described the spectacle,

`On the day in question could not but be amused at the various and motley dresses worn by the Maori people as mourning for the late chief, from the child of a few years old to the aged and decrepit; the use of every color that the European dyer could show on silk, cotton, or cloth was seen, in as various

---

478 Ibid.
479 A large flagstaff, surmounted by a fish, the latter re-presentation the name of the deceased chief Hapuku stood in the midst of the Te Hauke settlement. The staff was decorated with six flags the first and that beneath the fish was the English ensign; the second was red and white, bearing the word “Winiata”; the third, red and yellow, with a cross and other devices, bore the words, “Kingi Onuitirene” (King of New Zealand). This flag was one sent to Te Hapuku, by the tribes who were the head of the Maori war with the Government, which Hapuku accepted from the messengers, after which he told them to go home, and not to trouble him again; it has been kept by him ever since as a thing to laugh at, and for want of other flags was made to add to the number on the day of mourning. The fourth was green and black, with white devices; the fifth, black and red, had the head and shoulders of a tattooed Native and the word “Otenema.” This flag is one owned by Otene Matua, who had it as the flag of their family to denote them from unfriendly natives in the disturbed times in past years. The sixth, deep black, bore simply the inscription ‘Hapuku’. Ibid., p.88.
costumes and patterns as the multifarious dress-makers in Christendom and Maoridom could devise’. 480

The body of Te Hapuku was resting in a tent where mourners could view him before he was interred in his vault. 481

‘On entering the awning, at the right was seen the widow of Te Hapuku, who in a dress of black was standing waving her hands to and fro, with tears streaming down her face, while she chanted a song of sorrow to him who was now with the dead. At the head was tied at each end a sapling, about six yards long, to which were suspended five greenstone Mere Pounamus, one Meremere of whalebone, and a variety of small greenstone ear ornaments’. 482

Samuel Williams conducted a Church of England burial service in Maori and the coffin was lowered followed by three volleys over the grave. Te Wananga described the hospitality extended to the European visitors.

‘The chiefs and those who were deputed to give a welcome to the European visitors at once busied themselves in inviting the people, especially the Europeans, to enter the large assembly house, where a good display of viands, such as wine, beer, bread, cheese, biscuits, and other eatables were provided for the European visitors. Each and every one who visited Te Hauke on that day were welcomed by the Natives to partake of refreshment. The kai provided for the Maori people was not given till after the train conveying the Europeans to town had left Te Hauke’. 483

It was noted that Te Hapuku’s burial did not follow the traditional practice of burial in a secret place in order to prevent desecration of the remains, or theft of valuables. It was also noted that Te Hapuku’s wife became tapu and as such could not use her hands to place anything in her mouth. It had to be taken from the hands of an attendant. It was observed that ‘She is now sitting wailing at the foot of the coffin, which holds the last remains of her once dreaded lord and master’, in which place, according to custom, she must remain until after the funeral. The funeral had been

480 Ibid., p.286.
481 "Funeral of the Late Te Hapuku," Hawke's Bay Herald, 1 June 1878, p.2.
482 "Funeral of the Late Te Hapuku," p.287.
483 Ibid.
postponed in the hope that ‘Kawana Grey’ might attend.\textsuperscript{484} Grey could not attend. He sent a telegram, which included a proposal for a memorial.

‘Sir G. Grey and his friends think that a lasting memorial should be put up for Te Hapuku, one which may be seen by future generations, and one on which may be read an account of Te Hapuku, so that all who read it may know how much esteem he was held in by those who knew him. Sir G. Grey and his friends therefore say that if you, the chiefs and tribes and people wish it, he and his friends will assist in erecting such a memorial for Te Hapuku’.\textsuperscript{485}

---

\textsuperscript{484} “Napier,” p.3.
\textsuperscript{485} “Funeral of the Late Te Hapuku,” p.288.
In 1891 Hapuku’s tomb was found to have been desecrated. On 17 September a child was to be interred and ‘a European named Charles Myers who lives with the Maoris at Te Aute’ was instructed to dig a grave and could not find a spade. When looking in the small house erected over the Hapuku tomb he found the spade and discovered that the tomb had been opened. It contained three coffins. The bottom one was Te Hapuku’s, the middle one was that of Nepia Hapuku and Watene Hapuku was on the top. The tomb was of brick and about six feet deep with about four feet above the ground. Enough bricks had been removed to allow a man to enter the tomb. Given the tapu nature of the site the local constable was summoned to investigate. The lid of Watene Hapuku’s coffin had been forced off, and the glass plate in the inner zinc coffin smashed and the remains rummaged through. Part of the lid of Nepia Hapuku’s coffin was also forced off but the contents were undisturbed. There was evidently little of value within but ‘an impression prevails to the effect that gold and silver articles, and greenstone heirlooms are buried with the bodies in the tomb’ is thought to have provided the motivation.\textsuperscript{486} In 1894 the tomb was broken into again. This was discovered when the vault was opened to inter another family member. Te Hapuku’s coffin had been removed and opened, the coffin of the second son was at the bottom of the vault and that of the other son was standing on end. Both sons were exceptionally heavy men and one of the coffins had a double lining of lead. The corpses were intact. It was noted that the vault was quite close to the buildings in the pa, and therefore it seemed strange that such a desecration could be take place without being detected.\textsuperscript{487}

At the time of Te Hapuku’s death, Arihi Te Nahu was under financial pressure as well. Henry Russell had attempted to execute a judgement for £3700 he had obtained. However the Hawke’s Bay Herald reported that ‘Upon inspection of her assets all that was in Arihi’s possession at this time consisted of Maori mats, valued at five shillings’. The officer bearing the warrant of execution was forced to return to town empty handed.\textsuperscript{488}

\textsuperscript{486} “Tomb Desecration at Te Aute,” Hawke’s Bay Herald 1891, p.3.
\textsuperscript{487} “Despoiling the Dead: Sensational Occurrence in Hawke's Bay,” Wanganui Chronicle, 20 November 1894, p.2.
\textsuperscript{488} “An Execution Upon a Judgement,” Hawke’s Bay Herald, 10 May 1878, p.2.
Arihi’s complex legal problems and debts were mainly connected to the high profile political, legal, and personal manoeuvrings surrounding the lease and sale of the Heretaunga block in which she was grantee. Thomas Tanner had negotiated with Henare Tomoana to lease the 19,385 acre block for £600 per annum. Tanner, who was occupying the block, wished the lease to be formalised. The block was passed through the Court and after protracted negotiations the ten owners were selected and a certificate was issued in April 1867. The ten grantees became absolute owners of undivided one-tenth shares. Tanner and his syndicate entered into a new agreement to lease the block for twenty-one years at £1250 per annum. 489

Arihi’s involvement in land dealings with Henry Russell had left her heavily in debt to him. Russell attempted to secure Arihi’s interests in the Heretaunga Block to secure his debt. In about March 1872, Arihi made a lease with a purchasing clause for her share of the Heretaunga block, in Russell’s favour. The lease was for three years and the rental was £300 per annum, with a right of purchase for £6000. It was agreed that any money advanced to Arihi should be deducted from the purchase money. 490 Russell had incrementally advanced a total of £1500 to her. By November that had increased to over £1700. On 16 November 1872 a deed was signed in Wellington between Henry Russell, Arihi Te Nahu and her husband Hiraka Te Aroatua, for four blocks of land totalling 31,637 acres, as security for any monies advanced. Interest was payable at eight per cent per annum. Hiraka said of the agreement that he ‘had nothing to say at that time....it was Arihi alone who transacted the business...’ 491 Arihi had been in consultation with Tanner who had informed her that Russell’s deed ‘was not good’, as she was underage. 492 There was disagreement concerning payments made by Russell to Arihi. Arihi insisted that monies she had received from Russell were rent for Heretaunga. Russell had asked her to sell the land to him for £6000. 493 Russell said Arihi had been so extravagant that there ‘was no end to her demands’. Russell claimed that she had threatened to go

490 “The Case of Arihi Te Nahu: Friday, February 27,” Hawke’s Bay Herald, 28 February 1880, p.3.
491 Hiraka could not recollect when he and Arihi had married but they had five children. Four had died and the fifth was alive and was aged five years. JLCDNZ, “Further Report from the Commissioner Under the Native Lands Frauds Prevention Act, 1870,” p.14.
492 Ibid.
493 “The Case of Arihi Te Nahu ”, Hawke’s Bay Herald, 21 February 1880, p.3.
to Mr Tanner if he refused her demands. In the circumstances he thought ‘it best to secure himself as far as possible’. Arihi summed up the situation succinctly when she stated ‘All I have to say is, that I liked his money and he liked my land. All I have to say is that I would take a large sum of money for the land’.

When Russell applied for a certificate under the 1872 deed it was refused as the land had already been dealt with in 1867. The Trust Commissioner ruled that the lease was a fraud by ‘two natives Hirika [sic] and Arihi with the knowledge and consent of Russell, on Tanner and the syndicate’. The lease was ‘against good equity and good conscience, and is therefore null and void’. The certificate was withheld and the decision was ‘received with cheers’.

During this period Arihi submitted several petitions to the government. In one she stated that Henry Russell was endeavouring to get possession of her land at Te Aute, by alleging that he had purchased it. She insisted in her petition that the £1,700 was not payment for land but was for costs of legal proceedings in Wellington and also to induce her to ‘stay with’ Russell, and ‘not to go to other Europeans’. The Committee did not have the time ‘to enable them to make such inquiries as would justify them in reporting an opinion on the subject-matter’. Henry Russell also unsuccessfully petitioned requesting relief in relation to the same £1700.

In another petition, Arihi wished to free herself from the control of her trustees.

‘The petitioner states that she is sad, sore, and depressed owing to the bad acts of her trustees, J. N. Wilson, Esq., solicitor, and Henry Russell, Esq., and prays that they may be overthrown, and that petitioner be allowed to look after her own interest, money, lands, and other things she may be seized of. She prays fervently and earnestly that they, the trustees, may be deposed. I am directed to report as follows. That in the case of Arihi Te Nahu no evidence whatever has been brought before the Committee to support the allegations of the petition;

494 “The Case of Arihi Te Nahu: Friday. February 27,” p.3.
498 Ibid., p.24.
and further, that this case is before a Court of justice having competent jurisdiction; and therefore the Committee has no recommendation to make to the House.\textsuperscript{499}

In a previous related petition Arihi expressed concern about how retrospective legislation would affect her legal and property rights.\textsuperscript{500} This was due to her personal circumstances. Arihi stated she had been married to Hiraka when certain advances were made by Russell to her. Hiraka had not lived at Te Aute with her, they had fallen out and he had gone away to his own people. She said she had gone to Wellington in 1872 as ‘a prisoner’ of Russell who had paid all her bills while she was there. After her return Russell gave her money when she required it from time to time. She had read the bill of items but insisted the debts were not hers. Russell said he kept a separate account of transactions with Hiraka. Arihi stated that all advances would be repaid out of the lease of the Heretaunga block. Mr. Lascelles contended that the lease had failed to be considered valid so any advances made against it could not be charged to a separate estate. Russell contended that all advances were expected to be paid from her separate estate. Mr. Bell pointed out that when a married women living apart from her husband, contracted debts, her separate estate was chargeable.\textsuperscript{501}

In 1881 Arihi succeeded to a substantial proportion of Hineipaketa’s interests that had been passed through the Native Land Court. On 19 December a deed was signed placing the land conveyed by Hineipaketa to Arihi Te Nahu in trust to Josiah Pratt Hamlin and Samuel Locke. The deed specifically declared they were for the sole and separate use and benefit of herself and her children, independent of Hamiora Tupaea and any future husband, free of his debts, control, and engagements.\textsuperscript{502}

\textsuperscript{499} AJHR, "Native Affairs Committee (Reports of): Nga Kupa a Te Komiti o Te Runanga Mo Nga Mea Maori." \textit{Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives} I-02(1879): p.11.

\textsuperscript{500} A Bill dealing with the matters referred to in the petition, and validating Maori marriages, was before the fore the House, and the Committee therefore recommend the petition to the consideration of the House in connection with the said Bill. AJHR, "Reports of Native Affairs Committee," \textit{Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives} 1-03(1877): p.18.

\textsuperscript{501} "Civil Sittings," \textit{Hawke's Bay Herald}, 17 June 1881, p.3.

\textsuperscript{502}The land was at Waimarama, Whakawiringa, Paeroa, Pukekura East, Te Aute No.3 Te Onepu East, Kaimotumotu North and Koparakore, as well as other blocks Whenuakura, Pukekura West, and Rowhitu H. Tupaea and Arihi Te Nahu to J. P. Hamlin and S. Locke (Settlement Napier) R11187982, (Archives New Zealand, Wellington, 1881).
In 1883 a notice was placed in the *Hawke’s Bay Herald* to that effect.

‘Notice is hereby given that by deeds dated the 16th day of August and the 6th day of September, 1881 all the right, title, and interest of Hineipaketia in the lands known as the Waimarama Block, Whakawiringa Block, Paeroa Block, Onepu East Block, Pukekura East Block, Te Aute No. 3 Block, Kaimotumotu North Block, and Koparakore Block were conveyed to Arihi Te Nahu, of Paki Paki, aboriginal native woman, and by deed dated the 19th day of December, 1881 the said Arihi Te Nahu and Hamiora Tupaea, her husband, did convey and assure all their right, title, and interest in the said lands and others known as the Te Aute No. 2 Block, Pukekura West Block, Whenuakura Block, in trust to Samuel Locke and Josiah Pratt Hamlin. A. Lascelles Solicitor directed all persons claiming any interest in the said lands under lease or other deed from the said Hinepaketia or Arihi Te Nahu are therefore required to pay all rents to the said Samuel Locke and Josiah Pratt Hamlin’.

Hokomata was also involved in extensive Maori Land Court hearings and clashed with Te Hapuku and Hineipaketia who wished to usurp her rights to her lands. In the 1876 Waihengahenga block (Te Aute No. 3) hearing, Hokomata states she ordered the survey of the block and pointed out the boundaries. Six of her relatives were dead and she was the only surviving relative. Te Hapuku acknowledged that the land belonged to Hokomata and that her family had continuously occupied it. However, he stated ‘I claim a share in this land, I am descended from the elder brother, she is by the younger. The claims are myself, Hokomata, Te Ruihi, Hineipaketia, Nikaore te Wharepouri, Te Waihiku, and Manuera’. Hokomata then stated that she wished the land to be made inalienable. There were no objections. The block continued to be a source of ongoing acrimony. Hokomata placed a notice in the *Hawke’s Bay Herald* in response to an Impounding Notice signed by John Hapuku. She wrote in reply, ‘I should desire to know where his land and boundaries are’. He responded ‘the Boundaries of my Lands are those of Te Hapuku a chief. You are not one, therefore cannot show the boundaries of any land’.

---

503 "Advertisement," *Hawke’s Bay Herald*, 8 January 1883, p.3.
504 Napier Minute Book 4, pp.161-62.
505 "Notices," *Hawke’s Bay Herald*, 10 June 1882, p.3.
Six years after Te Hapuku’s death, the legacy of his financial troubles surfaced again. In 1884 Hokomata claimed an interest in the Koparakore block which she said had been leased to a Mr. Chapman by the original ten grantees about fifteen years before. Hokomata said the other nine grantees were entitled to an equal share with her. She did not have the certificate of title and believed that it was in Napier. Mr. Chapman had sold the lease to another Pakeha for £700. Henare Tomoana insisted he was the greatest owner in the land. There had been disputes and Te Hapuku was one that quarrelled. He had not opposed Te Hapuku as he had not known that the land was his. Hokomata said she did not live on the land, as her husband did not like flat land. She was ‘afraid of quarrelling so did not go on the land’ although Te Hapuku ‘summoned her’ to help lease the land to Chapman. The case was brought to a rapid conclusion when it was stated that there was a mortgage on the land. Hokomata’s claim was dismissed. The block had been mortgaged by Te Hapuku, Hineipaketia and several others to Mr. Newton, a Napier merchant, on 31 December 1871, and Newton was given the power to collect rents and issue receipts. No Crown Grant had been registered and Te Hapuku had leased the 1278 acres on 12 June 1869 to Frederick Martin Chapman for twenty one years at an annual rental of £60.

In this same period Roto-a-Tara, the coveted lands of Ngati Te Whatuiaipiti and the scene of some of the most intensive tribal fighting in New Zealand’s history, suffered an undignified desecration at the hands of Samuel Williams. Williams diverted the Waipawa river ‘back to its old course’ so that it joined the Tuki Tuki four miles below Waipawa. His nephew Allen was placed in charge of draining Roto-a-Tara and the surrounding swamp adding several thousand acres of farmland, and destroying a prolific food source in the process. Williams’ solution for the loss was to help Ngati Te Whatuiaipiti develop cropping, horticulture, and sheep and

---

506 Kingita Tohunga later gave evidence at the Koparakore A Partition hearing. When asked if Te Hapuku had a larger interest than Te Hei he said they had about the same interest in the land. Napier Minute Book 33, pp.276-77.
509 James Hector Graham, "Whakatangata Kia Kaha: Toitu Te Whakapapa, Toitu Te Tuakiri, Toitu Te Mana: An Examination of the Contribution of Te Aute College to Maori Advancement" (Ph.D., Massey University 2009), p.31.
cattle farms. Williams who had long opposed the methods of purchasing by the government agents owned 25,450 acres of land in 1882.\textsuperscript{511} He also leased large areas of land including a 21 year lease of the undivided interests of Arihi and Hineipaketia and seven others in the Pukekura East block of 2110 acres.\textsuperscript{512} As more land and resources disappeared, the living battled to succeed to the interests of the deceased, creating further conflict and more time and expense in the Courts.

\textsuperscript{511} Ibid., p.212.
Chapter Four

‘Sad, Sore, and Depressed’: The Consequences of ‘Succeeding’

For women who wished to retain their land or succeed to the interests of the deceased, the process often meant extended and expensive court battles. The experience of Hineipaketia’s adopted daughter Arihi Te Nahu and her contemporaries in Hawke’s Bay illustrates the determination and dedication that was required to succeed to and hold land within the introduced legal framework. For Arihi Te Nahu, the 1880s was a period of endless court appearances and petitions involving disputes over land, succession, and wills.

A significant number of Maori women were able to access colonial political processes and institutions. They signed petitions and wrote letters, not just concerning land ownership but also to maintain and strengthen social bonds. Ani Mikaere states that in the decade 1886-1896 Maori women petitioned Parliament more than forty times. Arihi Te Nahu and many of her contemporaries were very familiar with the processes of the Native Land Court and used the system to pursue old and new rivalries often with no regard for other affected parties. This is certainly borne out in the actions of Arihi over the Karamu Reserve, a block of land set aside by the purchasers of the Heretaunga block.

When the Heretaunga Block was surveyed the Karamu Reserve was included. The land was transferred to Thomas Purvis Russell and Samuel Locke to be held in trust for those parties that the Native Land Court might in future decide had an interest. In the interim period the land had been occupied by some of the grantees in the Heretaunga Block, along with those who considered they had an interest but had not been grantees. No action had been taken under the deed of trust until Arihi Te Nahu and others who were not occupiers of the block claimed an interest in the land and proceeded with legal action in 1886. Hineipaketia supported Arihi and was present in

This action was opposed by Henare Tomoana and other grantees and their attempt to be included as parties in the action failed. The Supreme Court decided that the Karamu Reserve belonged to seven of the original grantees including Arihi. Arihi’s solicitor then applied for an order of sale, or partition. The case proved to be very expensive and in order to cover Court and partition costs, the Court ordered that the land be sold with the exception of the portion belonging to Henare Tomoana and two other grantees. The injured parties sought an injunction to stop the sale as they had been occupying the land for twenty years which effectively gave them ‘possessory title’. The action was taken by Pene Te Ua and Reihana Paukena on behalf of the occupants and the Government supported their action as ‘the effect of this sale would have been to deprive the equitable owners and occupants who were not grantees of their ancestral home and to render them destitute’. The sale was suspended, and an agreement to apportion the interests of all parties was reached, which left as far as possible the buildings and gardens within the Ngatihori portion. The Karamu Reserve Act 1889 was enacted in order to effect this agreement.

Arihi continued to petition the government. She and the other four grantees who had taken the legal action in Te Karamu complained that the delay by the Supreme Court in forwarding their titles in the subdivision had caused ‘severe loss’ and they asked that a ‘portion of the land be set aside to pay for the survey’. The Committee had no recommendation to make. That same year Arihi again petitioned asking that the

---

516 Evidence of Arihi Te Nahu at the Karamu hearing on 31 January 1888. Arihi stated ‘I know the Heretaunga block. When a child I lived on it. I first lived at Te Karamu on the block. It is the land now before the court. My father died before my recollection...I was taken by Te Hae [sic]—a woman now in Court’. Napier Minute Book 14, pp.261-71.
517 Hineipaketia stated ‘This is the first time I have given evidence in Court’. She went on to say ‘I have known Arihi since birth. I am a Rangikoianake. ...We all returned with the people. Hapuku and his wife and child went to Ngaue near Pakowhai...Hapuku and Heipora cultivated in Heretaunga...I was of the household of Hapuku & we cultivated at Heretaunga—we took eels at Tarakaihae. Ibid., pp.268-71. Tarakaihae was situated at the intersection of Churchill and Clive Streets and Park Rd in Hastings. It was the largest of four shallow lagoons, the others being, Ngakaroro close to where Norton Rd meets Heretaunga St, Ngahari was just past Outram Street on Norton Rd and Te Awamokahae was close to where the Southland drain joins the old Ngaruroro. See Buchanan, The Maori History and Place Names of Hawke’s Bay: p.59.
518 “The Karamu Reserve,” Hawke’s Bay Herald, 8 November 1888, p.2.
519 AJHR, “Karamu Reserve (Report and Award Relating To).”
trustees in charge of her property be removed, and the land placed under her own control. Once again the Committee had no recommendation to make.\textsuperscript{521}

Challenging of wills and establishing rights and succession when no will was left by the deceased was also becoming increasingly common. One high profile case was that of Renata Kawepo who had died childless in April 1888.\textsuperscript{522} His great-niece Airini Donnelly\textsuperscript{523} had long since fallen out with him due to her aggressive and often underhand tactics in both Civil and Native Land Court cases. Kawepo left a will in favour of his adopted son William Broughton, who was a favourite of his. Donnelly challenged the will and produced a second will, dated 12 April 1888. She claimed Kawepo had changed his mind in his final hours.

\begin{quote}
‘At the foot of the document was the signature “Renata Kawepo,” with a cross or mark between the two words, and there were also the signatures of two persons as attesting witnesses, one of them being Te Teira, an uncle of Mrs Donnelly, and the other Te Roera, who was related to Te Teira...’\textsuperscript{524}
\end{quote}

The case was taken all the way to the Privy Council, which ruled in favour of Airini Donnelly.\textsuperscript{525} The protracted litigation impacted financially and emotionally on Broughton who later died in mysterious circumstances.\textsuperscript{526}

Arihi was also embroiled in a similar case involving the deceased estate of Haurangi Te Waihiku. Haurangi died on 19 August 1889 and Hori Niania Te Aroatua and Arihi Te Nahu disputed his will. According to Arihi, Haurangi bypassed her and other older relatives in favour of the children, as he considered they had neglected him and left him dirty. In her defence Arihi said she often had to leave on Court business, so she could only attend to him when she was there. She said Haurangi had wanted her to collect rents due to him but she had said she would only do so if he made a will. Arihi admitted that on several occasions she tried to induce Haurangi to

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{521}{Petition dated 28 August 1888. Ibid., p.40.}
\footnotetext{522}{"Renata Kawepo," Hawke's Bay Herald, 16 April 1888, p.3.}
\footnotetext{523}{Donnelly was also known as Airini Tonore or Airini Karauria.}
\footnotetext{524}{"Privy Council, The Omahu Case," Daily Telegraph, 19 August 1891, p.2.}
\footnotetext{525}{Ibid.}
\footnotetext{526}{"Mysterious Death. Found Hanging from a Tree," The Wairarapa Daily Times, 11 March 1908, p.5.}
\end{footnotes}
make a will in her favour, a fact which she never attempted to disguise. According to Robert Cooper, Haurangi said he had made a will in favour of Watene’s son. Haurangi said, “Look at the state I am in; look at the filth I am in.” Haurangi said Watene drew his rents, and sold his horses and cart. Speaking to Arihi he said, ‘I wish you to look after me. I won’t have another will drawn out, but will have Watene’s will destroyed. You look after me and I will leave you my property’. Meremere Wipeno, Haurangi’s adopted daughter, lived with Haurangi in his house at Te Aute and had looked after him. Haurangi was very deaf, and she had to speak very loudly to make him hear her. Haurangi died in her arms. After Haurangi’s death Arihi visited and reproached Meremere for keeping the body in the house instead of sending it to the big meeting house. Meremere said that Arihi had ‘neglected Haurangi in his life time, but made a fuss over him after he was dead’. Arihi had previously visited with Pohuka Hapuku to get Haurangi to destroy the will in Watene’s favour, and make one in favour of his grandchildren. To that Haurangi had replied ‘Old Hapuku at his death did not say I was to leave the land to the grandchildren’.

Meremere acknowledged that Arihi was a chieftainess but Arihi did not rank above her. According to Maori custom Meremere said she did not have to obey Arihi’s instructions. Arihi had never instructed her and Meremere had never obeyed her. Meremere said she did not dislike Arihi, but had no regard for her. She denied that she was angry with Arihi for removing Haurangi’s body. It was Arihi who was angry with her for telling her not to remove the body. Arihi said she would cut her head off. Meremere told her to ‘come and do it’. The first time Meremere heard Haurangi express his ill feeling towards Arihi was when she sold a coach belonging to Haurangi. On another occasion Arihi took a trap to go to Te Hauke.

527 “Hori Te Aroutua v. Arihi Te Nahu,” Hawke’s Bay Herald, 23 January 1889, p.3.
530 Meremere Wipeno’s mother was from the same tribe as Haurangi’s, and was a chieftainess. "This Day," Daily Telegraph, 24 January 1889, p.3.
531 A trap is a horse drawn vehicle.
Meremere said Arihi had never brought Haurangi anything in the way of clothing or provisions such as tobacco, spirits, or sugar, and had only visited him twice. She was not aware that Arihi was paying off a debt incurred by Haurangi as Arihi claimed.\footnote{This Day, p.3.}

Another witness, Reina Paoa, who lived a short distance from Haurangi’s house at Te Aute visited him often and was also looking after him. She and several others were present at Haurangi’s death. Reina knew Arihi and Hamiora, but did not see them there that day. Timu, Meremere, Hineipaketia, Reina, and her sister generally looked after Haurangi on Friday. She had never seen Arihi speaking to Haurangi. On one occasion Arihi had asked Reina to accompany her to visit Haurangi to interpret for her. Hineipaketia accompanied them. They all asked Haurangi to destroy the will he had made in favour of Watene. Haurangi got angry, and would not agree, saying, ‘Destroy my will; for what reasons?’ Arihi said she wanted a will in favour of the grandchildren and ‘all of us’. Haurangi told both of them to go away.\footnote{Ibid.} Archdeacon Samuel Williams also gave evidence. He said he was ‘acquainted with Haurangi intimately’ having known him since 1853. Since Haurangi had been invalided, he had seen him twice every two months in his capacity as a clergyman. Williams spoke the Maori language but it was impossible for Haurangi to hear anything. Haurangi told Williams he had left his property to Watene and his family. The codicil was signed in Williams’ presence and Haurangi thoroughly understood it. Williams had never seen Arihi there, nor had Haurangi mentioned her to him.\footnote{Ibid.}

During the hearing Hineipaketia was described as an unmarried woman living near Haurangi’s. She said she often saw Haurangi but had never seen Arihi at Haurangi’s house. Williams said Hineipaketia was always the medium in business matters. On one occasion George Kelly, a native interpreter, recalled that he had paid some railway compensation money on 7 Feb 1887. After paying Hineipaketia ‘they went across’ to Haurangi’s. Hineipaketia ‘shook him and told him the business they had come about’.\footnote{Supreme Court - Special Civil Sittings, Hawke’s Bay Herald, 25 January 1889, p.3.} Railway rents were a consistent source of income.\footnote{In 1883 the Court was to determine the ownership of the 153 ¾ acres in Otawhao block, which included the railway line from Takapau to the first bridge beyond the Kopua station. The claimants}
incident occurred in 1882 in which Hineipaketia appeared in court charged with ‘having used transferred railway tickets’ given to her by Watene Hapuku. She pleaded guilty and was fined 1s and costs. Hineipaketia was referred to by the *Hawke’s Bay Herald*, as ‘Te Hei, a Maori woman’.\(^{537}\)

Hamiora Tupaea, Arihi’s husband, admitted that he had asked Haurangi to sign a will in favour of Arihi. According to Hamiora, the will was written on 17 August and he had read it aloud and Arihi had repeated it in Haurangi’s ear. Haurangi had answered ‘very good.’ Hamiora claimed that Haurangi wished Arihi to be the executor of the will. He then wrote Arihi’s name in, and gave Haurangi the pen to hold. He returned it to him, and he signed the name; moved to his side and Arihi brought his hand to the pen to make his mark, as Haurangi was also blind.\(^{538}\) The ‘long and wearisome’ case came to an end with no prospect of the jury agreeing. Counsel agreed to take a three-fourths verdict and judgement for the plaintiff was entered, with costs on the highest scale.\(^{539}\)

Arihi was not alone. That year a further five succession claims although they were adjourned as the parties were attending Nepia Hapuku’s tangi at Te Hauke.\(^{540}\) Nepia Hapuku died in March 1889 at the Wairoa races. It is unclear as to whether Hineipaketia had remained married to him. Nepia had made a will dated 5 February 1889 in which he left Arihi Te Nahu, her daughter Mepera Maku, and Hapuku Te Nahu his substantial land interests.\(^{541}\) She stated that on previous occasions there had been no objections. Nepia’s parents were both dead and Arihi was the child of Nepia’s elder brother. ‘All the near relatives of deceased are well provided for with

---

\(^{537}\) Watini [sic] Hapuku was also charged at the same time, with having transferred two railway tickets. The prisoner pleaded guilty, and said he did not know he was doing wrong. He was ordered to pay a fine of 5s, or in default to go to prison for 48 hours. “In the Resident Magistrate's Court,” *Hawke’s Bay Herald*, 27 June 1882, p.2.

\(^{538}\) Hamiora gives the date of death as 31 August.”Hori Te Aroatua v. Arihi Te Nahu,” *Daily Telegraph*, 22 January 1889, p.2.

\(^{539}\) “The Maori Will Case,” *Hawke’s Bay Herald*, 25 September 1889, p.3.

\(^{540}\) “Waipawa,” *Daily Telegraph*, 2 March 1889, p.3.

\(^{541}\) Nepia Hapuku had interests in a large number of blocks including Rotoakiwa, Te Aute No. 2, Te Waihuahua, Pukeomaru, Pukekura East, Pukekura East. Will of Nepia Hapuku R23216104 Record No. 528 AAOW 22760, (Archives New Zealand, Wellington).
land.’ The order was made in favour of Arihi, Mepera Maku, and Hapuku Te Nahu. ⁵⁴²

Nepia did in fact have a daughter. In 1896, an application was made to add Hikihiki, to the list of names in the Poukawa block. Arihi apparently did not challenge the decision. Hikihiki was said to have been the daughter of Nepia and Ngahiha who was Haurangi’s wife. There was some debate about the paternity of the child. Suspicion was aroused as Haurangi had not left any children, despite having several wives. Urepene Puhara said Haurangi was impotent. The child Hikihiki was said to look like Nepia. Nepia had also produced no children despite having numerous wives. At one time Ngahiha was one of Te Hapuku’s wives. ⁵⁴³ According to Arapata Hapuku, Te Hapuku had taken Ngahiha from Haurangi. ⁵⁴⁴ Urepene Puhara said that he [Te Hapuku] looked upon Hikihiki as being the daughter of his son Nepia. Te Hauwaho was also a candidate in the paternity stakes. A committee was to decide paternity, but when the child was born her appearance indicated it was Nepia’s child. Both Pohuka Hapuku and Tangatake Hapuku agreed that she was Nepia’s daughter. When Hikihiki married, Nepia had objected saying the husband was of ‘the common people’. The court admitted her to the list. ⁵⁴⁵

Engaging with the Native Land Court would have fatal consequences for Mereana Hokomata. On 10 April 1891 she was hit by a train and killed at Paki Paki. ⁵⁴⁶ She had been involved in a succession claim and was due to give evidence when the Court was moved to Hastings. The inquest into Hokomata’s death was only concerned as to whether or not the train driver was at fault. There was no investigation into the possibility of foul play, the likelihood of which could not be easily dismissed. The death of Paurini Te Whiti, a few days later, added to the intrigue. Paurini was to have given evidence on behalf of the deceased Hokomata but he died at Cowper’s boarding house in Waipawa. ⁵⁴⁷ According to evidence at the

⁵⁴² Napier Minute Book 36, p.157.
⁵⁴³ Napier Minute Book 39, pp.260-64.
⁵⁴⁴ Napier Minute Book 22 A, p.312.
⁵⁴⁵ Napier Minute Book 39, pp.260-64.
⁵⁴⁶ Hokomata was described as a first cousin of Te Hapuku’s. "Hokomata," Hawke’s Bay Herald, 11 April 1891, p.2.
Hokomata was on a short cut from Moroney’s hotel to her house, and for some reason was sitting on a concrete abutment at one end of an open sleeper bridge over a creek that crosses the line a little south of Paki Paki. She was ‘apparently asleep’. The express train from Napier, approached at the rate of twenty five miles an hour, and came around a curve about one hundred and fifty yards from the bridge. The driver saw ‘a dark object lying across the rails’, and immediately put his brakes on as hard as he could and sounded the whistle. As he got closer he saw the woman was laying with one arm over the rail and her head upon it. The train could not be stopped until it was a couple of lengths over the bridge. The driver and the guard went back and found that the body had fallen head first onto the bank of the creek below. The commotion caused by the stopping of the train, attracted ‘a score of natives’. They declined to receive the body or assist in retrieving it and ran away. The guard and driver with the help of some passengers and placed it in the van and took it to Waipawa. Her body was taken from there to Paki Paki. ‘Hapuka’ insisted that as the Government found the body they were responsible for the expense of removal. He was told that ‘the government found the body here and here it would stay unless they took it away’. The *Daily Telegraph* reported that,

‘the deceased’s death will be fraught with much importance to her husband, her children and successors. She has left four half-caste children alive, the oldest of which is 31 years. She had considerable interest in the Land Court, and had a succession claim that should have been dealt with yesterday. Some of the natives say the officials were to blame, as but for the determination to remove the court to Hastings she would not have gone home. She has been a famous woman in her time and I am told she figured largely in the early history of Hawke’s Bay settlement.”  

---

548 Married to William Alexander Cannon (?-1913) not to be confused with William Cannon of Clive whose native wife Riria/Lydia Niwa Taihekeheke also died in April 1891.  
549 This was not Te Hapuku as he had died in 1878. It is likely to have been Hapuku Te Nahu, Arihi Te Nahu’s brother.  
Many years later the family of Hokomata successfully fought the Hapuku family for her interests. The Native Appellate Court awarded the family of Hokomata 350 acres.\textsuperscript{551}

**The Death of Hineipaketia**

Two days after Hokomata’s death Hineipaketia died on Sunday 12 April 1891. She had suffered from consumption for some time. Her death received little public attention. On 13 April 1891, the *Daily Telegraph* reported her passing briefly,

‘News has just been received in Hastings of the death of a chieftainess of very high rank, at Te Hauke. Her name is Hineipaketia. She was however usually called Tia.’\textsuperscript{552}

Hineipaketia died at the home of her adopted daughter Arihi.\textsuperscript{553} Arihi looked after her body and buried her.\textsuperscript{554} Hineipaketia left no will and Arihi once again had a battle on her hands in order to succeed to her remaining interests. At the time of her death Hineipaketia had a European servant Eliza.\textsuperscript{555} Eliza was present when Hineipaketia told Arihi she was leaving all her interests to her.\textsuperscript{556} Arihi said she was in charge of all her affairs and received her rent,\textsuperscript{557} and that Hineipaketia had asked her to fence and cultivate the land for her and her teina.\textsuperscript{558}

In 1895, the second cousins of Hori Niania Te Aroatua who had since died claimed that the adoption of Arihi Te Nahu and Tangatake had not been proven. The Court confirmed the former decision that the adoption of Arihi was fully proved, and Tangatake was entitled to share with her. The decision respecting the rights of an adopted child was made according to native custom. It was stated that complete adoption would be where the child was taken in early infancy and lived with the adopting parent up to marriage or adulthood. If the adoption was of this nature then

\textsuperscript{551}The Court also awarded Akenehi Tomoana and her family 350 acres and that of Urepene Puhara’s 263 acres. *The Native Appellate Court,* *Hawke’s Bay Herald*, 23 September 1898, p.2.

\textsuperscript{552} "Hastings," *Daily Telegraph*, 13 April 1891, p. 3.

\textsuperscript{553} Evidence of Arihi Te Nahu in the Poukawa hearing of 1896. Napier Minute Book 39, p.299.

\textsuperscript{554} Napier Minute Book 22 A, p.314.

\textsuperscript{555} Ibid., p.313.

\textsuperscript{556} Ibid., p.314.

\textsuperscript{557} Ibid., p.314.

\textsuperscript{558} Evidence of Arihi Te Nahu in the Poukawa hearing of 1896. Napier Minute Book 39, p.299.
circumstances would be taken into account when considering the rights, if any, of the adopted child. There was no particular ceremony attached, it was sufficient that the adopted child was recognised as such. The child would almost invariably be a blood relative and if the adoption was made with the consent of the tribe or hapu and the adopted child remained with that tribe or hapu, it would be entitled to share the tribal or hapu lands. The child would also be entitled to succeed to the property of the adopting parent along with near relatives. The child would lose those rights if the adopting parent was neglected in old age, or if the child ceased to act with, or as a member of, the hapu.\(^{559}\) The rights could also be modified by way of ohaki.\(^{560}\)

That same year a Mr. W. Douglas wished to purchase Koparakore A and B. The block included the Poukawa railway station and the railway line that passed through it. Some of the owners were willing to sell and others including Arihi were not.\(^ {561}\) The following year Tangatake applied to succeed in Te Aute No.6., but Mr. Dinwiddie objected on behalf of Arihi.\(^ {562}\) There was no objection in Te Aute 6B and Arihi and Tangatake succeeded with equal shares.\(^ {563}\) Te Aute No.3 was also on the list but Mr. Dinwiddie produced the 1881 deed\(^ {564}\) conveying the interest of Hineipaketia to Arihi Te Nahu and stated that Arihi had succeeded to all the other lands included in the deed.\(^ {565}\)

The succession process continued into the twentieth century. In 1902 Tangatake Hapuku and Arihi Te Nahu succeeded to Hineipaketia’s interests in the Whitiataara block at Takapau as they had already been recognised by the Court. There were no objections to their being included as adopted children.\(^ {566}\) In the same block there were difficulties with succession to Hori Niania Te Aroatua, who had two wives and

---

559 Succession to Hineipaketia, alias Henerieta Te Hei in Otawhao A 19 June 1895. Napier Minute Book 38, pp.348-50.
560 Ohaki was defined in this decision as a verbal expression of wishes and intentions of ‘a native’ shortly before death in the presence of or otherwise made known to near relatives. Ibid.
561 The court viewed the property in order to ‘establish the value of the land to assist them in the decision as to the boundaries’. "Our Hastings Correspondent," Daily Telegraph, 29 August 1895, p.2.
562 Tangatake stated ‘Te Hei is dead. No children. She had adopted children. Arihi Te Nahu & myself. Left no will. I ask that Arihi and myself be awarded this (lease?) – we are relatives of deceased’.
Napier Minute Book 40, p.204.
563 Ibid., p.208.
564 H. Tupaea and Arihi Te Nahu to J. P. Hamlin and S. Locke (Settlement Napier) R11187982.
565 Napier Minute Book 40, p.208.
566 Napier Minute Book 54, pp.87-88.
two families. His will left all his interests to the children of the second wife. The children of the first wife claimed they had a right independently of their father. The Court decided they did not.\textsuperscript{567} This block was later sold to the Crown.\textsuperscript{568}

In September 1907 Arihi Te Nahu died. She was described as a ‘noted Maori chieftainess...said to be the only Native who could claim chieftainship over all the hapus between Wairarapa and Poverty Bay’. It was noted that the Duke of Edinburgh, who visited the colony in 1868, called her Princess Alice, and she had been known by that name to Europeans ever since.\textsuperscript{569}

Hineipaketi remains as one of the forty-eight current owners of Motu o Kura, or Bare Island, that lies off the Waimarama Coast. The other owners include Te Hapuku, Te Waihiku, Tangatake, Tuahu, Puakepuke Tangiora, Akenehi Patoka and Harawira Tatere.

\textsuperscript{567} Ibid., pp.88-89.
\textsuperscript{568} It was opened for settlement in 1911. The 1300 acre block situated midway between Norsewood and Takapau, had a ‘nice aspect’ and was described as ‘a rich area of land suitable for closer settlement’. It had been inspected by the Hon. James Carroll, acting Prime Minister, when he visited Takapau. He considered that it was ‘well suited for dairying, and was told locally that it could be cut up with advantage into fifty acre farms’."Local and General," \textit{Hawera & Normanby Star}, 25 May 1911, p.4.
\textsuperscript{569} “Personal,” \textit{Manawatu Standard}, 24 September 1907. p.5.
Figure 7. Whakapapa of the principal female chiefs in 1890
Conclusion

Maori women have been rendered almost invisible in New Zealand historiography due to the effects of Christianity, colonisation and the associated introduced legal, political, economic and social frameworks. Much historical discourse around nineteenth century events has tended to be framed through a patriarchal lens. The labels ‘male’ and ‘female’ as colonial categories continue to get in the way of writing history ‘as it happened’ which perpetuates received colonial perceptions of the nineteenth century.

The retrieval of Hineipaketia from the shadows, illustrates the importance of balance in history. Hineipaketia featured in some of the most important events in nineteenth century Hawke’s Bay which impacted on the trajectory of New Zealand’s history. This thesis has retrieved the threads of the life of Hineipaketia in relation to those around her and the events she lived through and those before her time. It traces the trajectory of Hineipaketia’s life from her early years, to the battle at Te Pakake in 1824, the subsequent exodus of the people to Nukutaurua, the siege at Kaiuku, and their return to Heretaunga around the time of the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi. It continues through the tumultuous decade of the 1850s, when much of the ancestral land in Hawke’s Bay was alienated, followed by her engagement with the Native Land Courts.

The female presence is continuous in Maori history. The origins of humanity, the whenua, the transfer of knowledge and wisdom, and the maintenance and restoration of balance are central to that presence. Women were the vessels of all knowledge which was reflected in and transferred through whakapapa that connects the people with everything in the universe. The role and importance of women in traditional Maori society begins with Papatuanuku, the earth mother, who represents the beginning of all life, her children who are the custodians of the earth, the ocean and the sky and ‘ending’ with Hinenuitepo who is the guardian of spirits after death.

This thesis has demonstrated that prior to the arrival of Europeans in Hawke’s Bay, rank rather than gender determined the extent of authority within tribal structure. This premise concurs with the observations made by Binney, Mikaere, Salmond,
Orange, Macdonald, Wanahalla and others. Some historians have marginalised the fundamental importance of Maori women laid down in early cosmology, as Mikaere has noted. Binney too states that European attitudes towards women seem to have progressively indoctrinated nineteenth-century thinking.570

Introduced ideals and customs negatively impacted on traditional practices and beliefs. The imposition of colonial structures subordinated Maori women and contributed directly to the diminution of their value in Maori society and consequently, in the new regime. Alcohol and tobacco also worked within the introduced framework to further undermine the social structure on which the power of women rested.

Despite the social, political, and economic upheaval, the effects of the ‘musket wars’, and the ongoing marginalisation of women due to the increasing emphasis placed on an introduced patriarchal structure, Maori women of rank continued to hold powerful positions within their tribal framework.

Claudia Orange notes the Crown’s roving Treaty official, Major Bunbury’s preference for male signatories of the Treaty of Waitangi, which angered women of equal or higher rank. While it is now known at least thirteen women signed the treaty, the gender neutral nature of many names led to the default assumption that signatures were those of male chiefs. It is yet to be determined how many signatories to New Zealand’s most important document were in fact made by women.

The arrival of missionaries, the encroachment of Christianity and the accompanying patriarchal hierarchy, persistently undermined existing traditional social structures and consequently the position of Maori women in the shifting social order. Early missionaries, including Colenso, had difficulty recognising Maori customary marriages. Some individuals, including Te Hapuku, had more than one partner, and these unions were recognised by the Native Land Courts. Women could, and sometimes did, object to arranged marriages, instead selecting their own partner or partners. Hineipaketia’s ancestor Te Huhuti pursued Te Whatuiapiti against the

wishes of both hapu. Hineipaketia had more than one partner and her adopted daughter and successor, Arihi Te Nahu, had several.

Maori marriages and alliances were established in order to forge, and or, strengthen economic and political ties in order to preserve existing traditional social structures. Te Hapuku was an astute exemplar of this. He married strategically while at the same time elevating and enhancing his own status and mana by forging and maintaining relationships with ‘persons of consequence’ in both the Maori and European worlds.

Te Hapuku gathered ‘people of consequence’ around him with a view to increasing his status and rights, particularly through his involvement in the 1850s controversial land sale transactions with Donald McLean and the Crown, up to the fighting at Pakiaka in 1857. The persons of greatest consequence were women, including Hineipaketia, Te Heipora, and Arihi Te Nahu. McLean recognised that the assent of Hineipaketia was essential and acknowledged her superior rank. He also recognised that Te Hapuku had the ability to convince her, thereby making each party to a chain of manipulation. Hineipaketia’s consent was necessary for Te Hapuku to operate in the manner he did.

Hineipaketia worked closely with her high profile albeit lower ranking relative, Te Hapuku and Donald McLean. Yet the names of Te Hapuku and Donald McLean the Crown Land Purchase Commissioner, dominate the historical discourse of this period. Where Hineipaketia is mentioned, she is identified with and or blamed for the alienation of large tracts of land. The research of Banner, Binney and others finds that the introduced European market economy worked against Maori interests. Banner concludes that the colonial government’s intentional choice of a particular type of market economy that defined buyers and sellers, rather than the actions of any single person, or even all those persons operating within it, led to large scale land alienation. The government choice of market economy initially assured the enhancement of the mana of Hineipaketia, Te Hapuku and Arihi Te Nahu but played on old and new rivalries with other chiefs.

While it has been recognised that exposure to the new market economy affected Maori, little recognition has been given to the significant role it played in undermining women’s control and authority. Land alienation was central to the erosion and disempowerment of Maori women. The market economy contributed to the dispossession of those who were not at the very top of Maori hierarchal structure, or who did not have access to the resources that were necessary to successfully negotiate the introduced systems. Women of lower rank were incrementally isolated from traditional structures that provided an economic, political, and social base. Women of rank were forced to fight from within and without their hapu to maintain their rights within a legal framework that encouraged the dispossession of their own kin. Those who were in a position to attach themselves to as many blocks of customary owned land as possible did so. The sale of the Waipukurau block in particular precipitated further and ongoing alienation of land throughout Heretaunga and paved the way for other areas, particularly the Wairarapa. This argument is clearly illustrated in the trajectory of land transactions involving Hineipaketia and her successor, Arihi Te Nahu, as demonstrated in this thesis.

Donald McLean identified and exploited the complex and finely balanced inter and intra hapu relationships which challenged the mana of the various leaders when negotiating land purchases. A key aspect of the government drive to purchase land was the creation of what Boast refers to as an ‘indigenous landed aristocracy’ which alienated the majority of kin in the process. Individual Maori of rank who were able to affix themselves to a valuable piece of land, whether entitled to or not, could and often did, use that opportunity to reinforce their power and exploit their position and convert land into money in order to access the cash economy and consumer goods. The new cash economy created largely by land sales fuelled the demand for consumer goods. Demand for goods also saw the establishment of lines of credit at stores and through private individuals, introduced an escalating cycle of debt and desperation.

Hineipaketia’s successor, Arihi Te Nahu, was forced to fight in the Native Land Court in order to succeed to Hineipaketia’s remaining lands after her death. She was

---

one of many women who were affected by the imposition of the introduced legal framework, which forced women of rank to fight expensive legal battles in order to substantiate their rights to land.

There remains a dearth of inclusion of Maori women in nineteenth century New Zealand historical discourse. The depictions of Maori women, communicated through schools, and in the wider historiography of New Zealand’s colonial past, needs reviewing. Maori women need to be written back and made more visible in New Zealand’s historiographical landscape.

The study of Hineipaketia and her successors demonstrates that Te Hapuku, Hineipaketia and others, were subjected to a set of circumstances largely controlled by the machinations of the Crown and implemented through Donald McLean, who cajoled individuals and played on old rivalries in order to gain as much land as possible and establish settlers. As is evident throughout this thesis Hineipaketia and Te Hapuku were inextricably bound by events that unfolded around them, with Hineipaketia’s status and mana much needed by the lesser ranked Te Hapuku. Hineipaketia remained loyal to Te Hapuku, looking after his body in death. She continued to be recognised as the person of highest rank in the district until her death in 1891, thirteen years later. The final word should go to Hineipaketia.

‘We cultivated at Heretaunga – we took eels at Tarakaihae’.

‘I don’t know how to look at a map’.

---

573 Napier Minute Book 14, pp.268-69. Tarakaihae was situated at the intersection of Churchill and Clive Streets and Park Rd. It was the largest of four shallow lagoons, the others being, Ngakaroro close to where Norton Rd meets Heretaunga St, Ngahari was just past Outram Street on Norton Rd and Te Awamokahae was close to where the Southland drain joins the old Ngaruroro. See Buchanan, *The Maori History and Place Names of Hawke's Bay*: p.59.

574 Evidence given by Hineipaketia in the 1888 Te Karamu hearing. Napier Minute Book 14, p.271.
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